



## **WestminsterResearch**

<http://www.wmin.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

### **How can we manage the tourist-historic city? Tourism strategy in Cambridge, UK, 1978–2003.**

**Robert Maitland**

School of Architecture and the Built Environment

This is an author-produced electronic version of an article published in the *Tourism Management*, 27 (6). pp. 1262-1273, December 2006.

The definitive version is available at:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.06.006>

---

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners. Users are permitted to download and/or print one copy for non-commercial private study or research. Further distribution and any use of material from within this archive for profit-making enterprises or for commercial gain is strictly forbidden.

---

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch. (<http://www.wmin.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail [wattsn@wmin.ac.uk](mailto:wattsn@wmin.ac.uk).

**How can we manage the tourist-historic city?**  
**Tourism strategy in Cambridge, UK, 1978-2003**

Robert Maitland

Director, The Centre for Tourism,  
University of Westminster

Centre for Tourism  
University of Westminster  
35, Marylebone Road  
London NW1 5LS  
UK

T: +44 207 911 5000

F: +44 207 911 5171

[R.A.Maitland@wmin.ac.uk](mailto:R.A.Maitland@wmin.ac.uk)

## **Abstract**

This paper draws on research into twenty-five years of tourism planning and management in Cambridge, UK, to explore the long-term effect that tourism strategies can have in managing the development of tourism in historic cities. It focuses particularly on strategic aims and the policies designed to implement them through regulating the city. It finds that five successive Tourism Strategies from 1978 onward have had consistent aims, strongly influenced by the locality characteristics of Cambridge. It explores how strategic aims are derived, focusing on the balance between local and external influences, and how policies to implement the aims are developed. It argues that locality factors, and the role of local regimes and policy communities are more important than national government policy in accounting for aims and policies. It suggests that tourism management issues are rarely finally resolved, and the most important element of policy is creating capacity for continuing management.

## **Acknowledgements**

This paper is based on continuing research into tourism policy in Cambridge carried out jointly with Brian Human, Head of Policy and Projects, Environment and Planning Department, Cambridge City Council. His contribution to the paper is gratefully acknowledged.

## INTRODUCTION

This paper draws on research into twenty-five years of tourism strategy in Cambridge, UK, to explore the long-term effect that tourism strategies can have in managing the development of tourism in historic cities.

Our understanding of how best to manage tourism in historic destinations remains limited, and as Ashworth and Tunbridge (2000:138) observe it is 'managed in a variety of different ways even within the same national or urban situation, and ... no single administrative or executive model for its creation can be deduced'. In the UK and elsewhere, some attempts have been made to review the experience of managing urban tourism in historic cities, and draw good practice lessons (e.g. English Historic Towns Forum, 1991, 1999). Such analyses can provide valuable insights, but attempts to draw general lessons are usually based on cross-sectional analysis of practice in different destinations. This leads to familiar problems of comparability and makes it hard to track the long term and cumulative effect of strategies for managing tourism. Longitudinal analyses of how tourism management has developed in a destination over time avoid these problems, but are rare, and when they do exist often focus on tourism development in new or expanding destinations, rather than tourism management (e.g. Klemm 1992, 1996).

Cambridge City Council has made an unusually sustained effort to use tourism strategies to manage and regulate its tourism industry and the impact that visitors have on the city. The first strategy was adopted in 1978, and was followed by fully revised strategies in 1985, 1991, 1996 and 2001, when the current strategy was adopted. This paper examines how tourism strategy has developed in the city, and focuses particularly on strategic aims and the policies designed to implement them. It identifies and attempts to account for changes that have

taken place over time. In doing so, it begins to develop a longitudinal analysis of tourism policy in one historic city, and sketches a framework that might be applied elsewhere

### CONTEXT FOR TOURISM POLICY MAKING IN CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge has a wealth of historic buildings confined within a tight core, largely defined by the River Cam and medieval street pattern. The city is a renowned centre of education and is a focus for economic growth, especially around knowledge-based industries. Visitors are attracted by the Colleges, other historic buildings and the overall sense of place of the city, and their numbers have grown from 2.1m in 1971 to 4.1 million in 2001 (Cambridge City Council 2001). The ratio of visitors to residents is almost 38:1, comparable with some other European heritage cities such as Salzburg (36:1) and much higher than Oxford (11.5:1) (van der Borg et al 1996). Visitors are concentrated in the historic core, and most come for a day visit only, and do not stay long (Davidson and Maitland 1997; Evans, Maitland, Edmundson and Morley 2001). This leads to familiar tourism management problems.

Consideration of tourism policy must 'recognise the significance of external factors such as changing competitive conditions', (Laws and Le Pelley 2000:240) and over twenty five years, external factors affect not only the extent and nature of tourist demand, but also the broader context in which tourism policy is made. Hall (2000) suggests that international tourism policy has had four broad phases since 1945. The most recent phase, from 1985 to the present, has seen increased focus on environmental issues, less direct government involvement and more emphasis on partnership between public and private sectors. This reflects the major economic change and spatial restructuring that has taken place in advanced capitalist economies over the last quarter century, changes which have had both material and symbolic effects on places (Harvey 1989).

Towns and cities have found themselves needing to restructure their economies towards services and consumption, in the search for new ways to make their living and to provide jobs. They have had to do so in the context of increasing competition between places and the growing importance of positive image and branding to attract inward investment (Kearns and Philo 1993, Morgan, Pritchard and Pride 2002), and have increasingly turned to tourism development. The process is most familiar in former industrial cities (Judd and Fainstein 1999) but can also apply to tourist-historic cities, as Meethan (1997) shows in his discussion of York. However, the Cambridge sub-region has prospered during recent rapid economic change and restructuring. It has experienced growth related to high tech and research-based enterprises, in its academic activities, and through its role as an attractive sub-regional service centre. It has a level of amenities to attract mobile professionals of the 'creative class' (Florida 2002), and a strong, positive, internationally known brand, derived from images of the Colleges and the reputation of the University. Tourism has synergies with these other economic activities since it has a role in promoting Cambridge as a global brand, but there is potential for conflict too – through competition for limited development sites, congestion problems, and concerns that tourism could degrade the city's image. Whilst tourism is a very high profile activity in the city, its economic role is of much less significance, supporting just 6% of the total jobs in the area ((Davidson and Maitland 1997; Evans, Maitland, Edmundson and Morley 2001). This means that for most of the last twenty-five years, there has been little pressure to support major tourism development as a new source of economic activity. This contrasts with York, where the decline of employment in engineering and confectionary manufacturing led to a significant move towards services generally and tourism in particular (Meethan 1997).

Fainstein, Hoffman and Judd (2003: 4) point to the importance of global influences on tourism, and the impacts of the global tourism production system, but argue that the global influences are on urban tourism are mediated by 'institutions, rules and regulations ...

constituted at different scales', and that 'relationships between the global and the local are complex and highly contingent'. They draw on regulation theory to 'explore the rich institutional structure that has emerged to regulate local tourism' (6) and identify four types of regulatory framework operating at the destination level.

### *1 Regulating the visitor to protect the city*

Many tourist-historic cities have long sought to manage visitors to protect the city's fabric and character, but increased threats of terrorism and incivility have meant that concerns with regulating visitors are now shared, to a greater or lesser extent, by most cities.

### *2 Regulating the city*

This encompasses physical construction and reconstruction to adapt the city for visitors, but also involves marketing and managing the city image and its 'symbolic markers' (McCannell 1976:111).

### *3 Labour market regulation*

Workers in tourism are affected by the regulations and institutions applied to their labour markets; these vary from country to country and are rarely specific to tourism.

### *4 Regulation of the industry*

Firms are regulated (e.g. through hotel grading), and managed in their approach to, for example, marketing and collaboration with other elements of the industry in the city.

The balance of the regulatory framework will vary from city to city (as well as from country to country). For a tourist-historic city like Cambridge, local policy is likely to focus on regulating visitors, in order to protect the environment for visitors and residents alike, and regulating the city to manage and probably discourage new developments aimed at visitors,

thus managing symbolic representation. Specifically local labour market regulation has limited scope in the UK, whilst most regulation of the industry will be outside the direct control, or influence of the local authority, although marketing and other collaborative initiatives can be important.

### TOURISM POLICY AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

Institutions, rules and regulations at the national level form part of any explanation for changing local policy. Ashworth and Tunbridge (2000) suggest that public sector planning approaches to managing the tourist-historic city began with preservation (dating from the nineteenth century), to be followed by conservation planning (from around the 1960s) and heritage planning (from the 1980s). These approaches reflect different objectives and values – for example, preservation’s major goal is building survival, heritage planning’s major goal relates to heritage consumption. However, they argue that there is no implied progression, or requirement that one approach must replace the others, so during the last twenty-five years we might expect to see heritage planning co-existing with a continued concern for conservation and preservation.

#### TABLE I ABOUT HERE

Table I sets out the most significant tourism policy initiatives in the UK at the national and regional level, together with policies and plans produced by the City of Cambridge and Cambridgeshire County Council.

Whilst the Development of Tourism Act (1969) established a national tourism organisation (NTO), it did not create a framework for tourism policymaking and planning at a local level. Local tourism policy was an option not a requirement – although it would inevitably feature



to some extent in statutory land-use planning. Central government concerns with tourism were largely economic, and interventions were sporadic, although the industry's job creating potential gained government attention in the 1980s (Davidson and Maitland 1997). The first three tourism strategies that Cambridge produced were therefore developed with little or no guidance from the national level on what they should include, and with no national policy into which they might fit. It was not until the 1990s that Government began to pay serious attention to tourism policy in destinations. In terms of land-use planning, a clearer national framework of guidance was developed through a series of Planning Practice Guidance Notes (PPGs). PPG 12: Development Plans and Regional Planning Guidance (HMSO 1992) identified tourism as one of the nine key strategic topics that should be included in local development plans, and PPG 21: Tourism (HMSO 1992) provided advice for planning for tourism and exhorted local planning authorities to see it as an element of local development. However, with the exception of detailed advice on the controversial issue of caravan sites, there were few specific suggestions as to how they should do so.

Perhaps of more significance were a series of reports reflecting the emerging concern with the environment and with sustainability, and a change of tone from the strong market orientation of the 1980s. *Tourism and the Environment: Maintaining the Balance* (Department of Employment 1991) was of particular importance. It emphasised tourism management as a process of 'reconciling the potentially competing needs of the visitor, the place and the host community' and called for a process of destination management that was holistic and integrated with other policy areas. This initiated discussion of themes, including sustainability, that were further developed during the decade, and emphasised the importance of a comprehensive approach to management that involved all stakeholders.

This is the context for tourism strategy development in Cambridge. Aims and policies are discussed next, followed by a discussion of how we can account for what we observe.

## THE AIMS OF TOURISM POLICY IN CAMBRIDGE

This review focuses first on strategic aims – what Strategies are trying to achieve overall – and then on the policies required to implement them.

### Overall Strategic Aims

All five Strategy documents set out a range of aims and objectives for tourism in Cambridge (the terms ‘aims’ and ‘objectives’ are in practice used interchangeably in the documents). In addition, the four Strategies from 1985 to 2001 contain succinct strategy statements that spell out broad directions for the planning, development and management of tourism. Whilst aims and strategy elements are not consistently repeated in identical form, many are very similar and may be seen as different ways of expressing the same idea. They can be summarised as the five overall strategic aims shown in Table 2.

### TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

The ambitious intention of *increasing the benefits of tourism whilst tackling the perceived problems* has been at the heart of all the strategies from 1978 to 2001. While visitor numbers have increased considerably over the last twenty-five years, this basic position has not. The 1978 Strategy (Cambridge City Council 1978) states that the reasons for preparing the strategy are: (i) the impact on the environment, especially the Colleges (paras 1.05-1.06); (ii) the perceived benefits of tourism; and (iii) to reconcile the two (‘blessing or blight?’). The study seeks to ‘shift the final answer towards a more positive view of the industry’ (para. 1.09).

Concern for the *visitor experience* is embraced from 1990 onward. This follows naturally from the first two aspects of the strategic direction – satisfied tourists are more likely to spend money and measures to manage environmental impacts (and improve the environment) will benefit other residents and visitors. Moreover, civic pride means that the Council wishes Cambridge to be associated with a pleasant experience. Since the 1990s this is also associated with the growth of the city as an international player in the expanding field of knowledge based industries, which is enhanced by a positive image or brand.

The 1985 Strategy is unusual in its more proactive approach to *tourism development* as a whole, but since then all the Strategies emphasise the need for the development of *certain markets/types of tourism*. The 1978 Strategy is exceptional since, as the first coherent policy on tourism, it focuses principally on dealing with a series of identified problems, and reflects the then relatively underdeveloped expertise available in the City Council.

Sustainable tourism only emerges as a specific strategic direction in 2001, although the concept of sustainable tourism was established in public policy at least as far back as 1991. This point is taken up in the Discussion.

There is then some consistency in the overall strategic aims of tourism policy in Cambridge. How far can these strategic aims be related to changing government policies for tourism? Table 3 summarises the major aims of relevant government advice and policy documents since 1991, when government interest in tourism policy increased, as noted above. The Table sets out the main aims of government advice and policy for tourism, and identifies how far they are reflected in Cambridge Council's Tourism Strategies.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Familiar concerns with tourism's economic contribution appear, with references to the environment also prominent. Much less is said about the needs of the visitor. It is clear that in the great majority of cases, Cambridge Tourism Strategies' aims are in harmony with those of central government. However, this almost as true for the Strategies that precede the Government policy advice as for those that succeed it. We return to this point in the discussion.

### Policies

The five Strategies set out a range of policies and supporting actions that are designed to deliver the strategic aims. The number of policies within each Strategy varies: there were 19 in 1978 and 1985, 32 in 1990, 28 in 1996 and 19 in 2001. Aims and policies are designed to manage and enhance the city's tourism offer. We can group them in terms of Jansen Verbeke's (1986) well-established framework, which sees a city as a leisure product that comprises:

- Primary elements which attract the visitor, and include both specific *attractions* (e.g. the Colleges) and their wider *setting* – the sense of place derived from, for example, the historic street pattern
- Secondary elements that support the visit – e.g. hotels, restaurants
- Additional elements of tourism infrastructure, ranging from tourism information to parking facilities.

Of course, it is difficult to fit all elements of the tourism product neatly into these categories (Shaw and Williams 1994). For example, in Cambridge, transport issues are not additional

elements but mainly addressed at improving primary elements - the setting and sense of place.

Policies seek to enhance the offer by managing and regulating tourism in the city, and so can also be viewed in terms of the modes of regulation that we discussed earlier – regulating visitors, regulating the city and regulating the industry. For example, the strategic aim of tackling tourism problems and protecting the environment can be addressed by visitor regulation to disperse visitors, and by regulating the city through traffic management, and measures to improve design and cleanliness of public spaces. Some policies contribute in more than one area – for example marketing can do more than simply provide information. It can be used to regulate the visitor by promoting lesser-known attractions, thus dispersing visitors and helping maintain the sense of place.

#### TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

Table 4 shows how aspects of the primary, secondary and additional elements of tourism have been regulated in Cambridge. In only one case - camping and caravan site - has a policy reached an apparently final conclusion. All other aspects are subject to continuing policy attention.

#### DISCUSSION

This review suggests five significant features in Cambridge's tourism policies over the last quarter century.

## 1 Consistency of aims

Strategic aims develop from the 1978 Strategy, which is focused on identifying and tackling problems, and from 1985 to 2001, aims are generally consistent. Although the strategic aims are articulated in a number of ways, the focus is on five overarching strategic aims (Table 1) that seek to maximise the benefits and tackle the problems associated with tourism in Cambridge.

All Strategies' aims are consistent with Hall's post 1985 phase of tourism policy, and with the 1990s concerns with market failure, expressed as concerns with sustainable tourism. The early Strategies anticipate the subsequent popularisation of these concerns; this is discussed further below.

## 2 Locality factors are crucial to strategic aims and policies

The strategic aims are strongly influenced by the nature of Cambridge as a place, perceptions of tourism issues and the context set by the broader economic prosperity of the city. The aims and issues reflect all three of the approaches identified by Ashworth and Tunbridge. Preservation of historic buildings is largely assured by statutory listing but much of the focus of regulating visitors is concerned with preserving an appropriate setting and atmosphere for them. This shades into conservation planning, and the focus on the visitor experience in the aims of all but one of the strategies can be seen as reflecting a concern with heritage planning and the city as product. The policies to regulate tourism are focused on regulating visitors to protect the city, supported by measures that regulate the city itself to protect and enhance its physical and symbolic structures, further influencing visitors. The persistence of most aims and policies reflects the need for 'continuous process management maintaining

different equilibria at different times [that] ... merges imperceptibly into ... local land-use planning' (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000:140).

The exception to the generally consistency of aims between strategies is the 1985 strategy. It places much stronger emphasis on proactively developing tourism, less emphasis on tackling problems it causes and says nothing about improving the visitor experience. This was the only Strategy to be prepared at a time of economic downturn when local economic prosperity and employment were seen to be at risk. This changing economic context shifted tourism policy toward a more unambiguously developmental stance. From 1990 onward, when local prosperity seemed once more assured, the policy stance reverted to concerns with balancing the paradoxical aims of increasing tourism benefits whilst tackling the problems it creates. There is an interesting comparison here with the policy realignment in favour of tourism in York in 1995. As Meethan (1997) shows, previous antipathy or 'hands off' approaches to tourism were replaced by active support as it became clear that job losses in the confectionary industry and the closure of the railway engineering works meant that 'For the city of York, tourism represents the new urban order, and the future for its economy' (340).

Economic restructuring turned out to have a much less severe effect on Cambridge, so in retrospect the policy shift of the late 1980s looks more like an aberration than realignment. In less favourable economic circumstances, however, it seems inevitable that a more pro-tourism approach would have continued to be developed.

### 3 The form that Strategies take

Tourism policy is a non-statutory process, developed on the City Council's initiative with little advice or encouragement from national level until the 1990s. That meant it was both an

exploratory process and one that could adapt policy quite quickly to changing circumstances. One result was that the Strategies take different forms over the years as approaches to tourism management in the city develop and new concerns emerge, and that the language in which policy is framed changes. This contrasts with the local land-use plan, a statutory requirement whose content and form is closely prescribed by legislation and national government advice – and which can be changed and developed only through lengthy legal processes.

This accounts for sustainability as a specific strategic aim not occurring until 2001, although national policy on sustainability was emerging in the early 1990s (for example, PPG 21, 1992: see Table 3). In the absence of national government requirements it was possible to develop policies to promote sustainability under aims that were already well established. Sustainability was mentioned at a number of points in the 1996 Strategy and although it did not appear explicitly as a strategic aim, it was seen as implicit in the approach:

‘Underlying these objectives is the requirement for the Strategy to be sustainable, and to contribute to and be consistent with the Council’s Local Agenda 21 Strategy.’  
(Cambridge City Council 1996:12)

Equally, some of the key elements of what came to be referred to as ‘sustainable tourism’ were long established in Cambridge policy – some as far back as 1978. Notable examples are the need to respect the environment, to promote public transport for tourism, restrict the use of private cars and coaches, and manage impacts on the Colleges and elsewhere in the city. All these fit comfortably into the English Tourism Council’s recent definition of sustainable tourism – ‘managing tourism’s impacts on the environment, communities and the economy to make sure that the effects are positive rather than negative for the benefit of future generations (2001:8)



#### 4 The role of national Government in policy

A top-down view of policy making would see localities responding to central government policy initiatives. In this case, national policy seems to have had little influence on policy aims. The first three tourism Strategies in Cambridge were devised and implemented before there was any substantive national policy on tourism. The emphasis on tourism as a source of employment in the 1985 Strategy is consistent with the focus of *Leisure, Pleasure and Jobs* (HMSO 1985), but the latter came too late to influence the Strategy. The coincidence of timing illustrates a mutual recognition of the job creating potential of tourism at a time of high unemployment rather than national government policy having an effect in the locality.

When more national policy arrived in the 1990s, its aims proved largely consistent with the City's current strategic aims – but also with those it had already developed over many years. The Strategies of 1978, 1985 and 1990 anticipate almost all the aims of government policy since 1991. Even allowing for the difficulties in interpreting often vaguely worded aims, there is little evidence that national policy was suggesting much that had not already been developed in the locality. This is consistent with Godfrey's (1998) findings from a survey of UK local government tourism officers. He noted that national policy was changing in the 1990s, and that 'a more comprehensive approach to planning and management of tourism has been strongly endorsed by local tourism officers'. But whilst these local attitudes are in line with changing national policy 'the extent to which local opinion has been influenced by this national policy shift is difficult to measure' (ibid: 218). Again, specific locality factors seem to be important, even when other heritage cities are considered. Meethan's account of policy realignment in York acknowledges the importance of local factors but also emphasises that the realignment 'needs to be seen in the wider context of changes in central government guidance on tourism' (1997: 340). In Cambridge, changing guidance had little

effect on policy aims (though it could have aided their implementation in some cases, for example in winning appeals against refusal of planning consent).

## 5 How tourism policies develop

If there is little evidence of influence by government policy, how are the aims of local policy determined? One explanation would be the existence of a tourism 'regime' (Stone 1989). Stone's influential study of development in Atlanta, USA, over some 40 years concluded that a coalition of city hall and business leaders had developed that was able to substantially reconfigure and develop the city over a long period. It was able to do so since it was sufficiently stable and there was enough common ground between the members to pursue consistent aims. He described this coalition as a 'regime'. Miller (1999: 345) points out that regime theory "attempts to analyse and to some degree prescribe, how a 'capacity to govern' can emerge 'in the midst of diversity and complexity' within a social democratic capitalist society". The capacity to govern depends on "long-term collaborative coalitions that acknowledge members' mutual interdependence' (Stone 1989, quoted in *ibid*). Building and retaining this type of coalition requires "cooperative networking, solidarity, trust and mutual support" (*ibid*.345).

Previous studies of tourism policy in Cambridge (Maitland 2002) have shown that effective collaboration and a high degree of trust has been established between key tourism stakeholders in the city – including several departments of the City Council; other public authorities in the sub-region, including adjacent local authorities, the county council and the regional tourism organisation; a series of tourism and non-tourism businesses operating in the city centre, and property owners; the Colleges and the University; and local residents. We could see this group of stakeholders as having the qualities of a regime, in terms of

development of tourism policies in Cambridge. Of course, such a regime did not exist at the start of the period we are considering, and it has been part of the task of policy to construct an effective collaboration between parties with differing interests (Maitland, *ibid.*) so a local regime could be only part of the explanation for policy development.

Human (1995) saw local policy for tourism in Cambridge at the apex of a policy triangle, supported by the policy frameworks at regional and national level. Whether national policy actually supports local aims of course depends on policy consistency, and Human argued that one way in which consistency could be achieved was through the city 'developing its own policies and, wherever possible, using its influence to change the policies of other agencies to its advantage'. Although this influence attenuated beyond the local and County level, 'nonetheless there is a considerable degree of convergence' (228).

How might convergence be achieved? The idea of policy communities, comprising those who have a stake in particular policy areas is long established (for example Rhodes 1992). Laslo (2003) points to the importance of the development of 'policy communities' between 'local and non-local policy entrepreneurs' (1081) in tourism development and policy. We can speculate that the development of tourism policy as an important element in heritage cities in Britain was accompanied by the development of a policy community that linked policy entrepreneurs and managers in leading cities and elsewhere, who debated problems and exchanged ideas - and helped develop and guide thinking at central government level that was later embodied in policy. This network or community could be seen as having been formalised as The English Historic Towns Forum (EHTF) in 1987 - again predating formal guidance from central government - and an EHTF Tourism Group was set up in 1992.

## CONCLUSIONS

Over twenty-five years, the key strategic aims of tourism policy in Cambridge have remained relatively unchanged. Although inevitably driven by global economic and social change that affects all destinations, they are strongly mediated by the characteristics of the particular locality, and were developed at a time when there was no significant policy direction from national government on tourism management in historic cities. When national advice and policy emerged, it proved largely consistent with past and current practice in the locality. There was clearly not a top down policy process, in which the city followed clear aims set by national government. It is probably more helpful to think in terms of a collaborative or interactive process (Hall 2000) in which policies emerging in leading heritage cities are shared and developed through policy networks, which themselves link in to policy development at the national level through a policy community. If that were so, there would be interesting implications for the focus of future tourism policymaking, and the possibility merits further research.

Over the years, a substantial array of policies has been developed to regulate tourism in Cambridge to fulfil strategic aims and to manage elements of the tourism product. Despite that, it is rare for an issue to be resolved once and for all. At first sight, this might seem depressing: has twenty-five years of policy had so little effect? Not necessarily. First, policy has to hit a moving target – or rather an ever-increasing number of moving targets. The number of issues to be addressed rises as visitor number increase, whilst wider changes in an increasingly pluralist society mean more stakeholders involvement. At the same time, the capacity of tourism managers to carry out initiatives increases with experience, and as stakeholders are drawn into the policy process, so expectations and opportunities for new initiatives increase. In addition, new policy measures may have unintended consequences, as the dynamic tourism industry adapts to a changing regulatory framework; this means that

further adaptation is required. For example, charging or closures at the most popular Colleges increases visitor numbers at the less popular, previously less affected by tourism pressure.

Second, it seems likely that the effects of tourism policy in Cambridge have been felt outside the city – it helped pioneer some tourism policies for heritage cities that found their way into government policy and thus to other cities. Finally, most issues are ones that will inevitably require continued management – visitor dispersal or traffic management, for example: whilst Cambridge remains a tourist destination, it is difficult to see how such issues can ever be finally resolved. In that sense perhaps the most important policy priority is to assemble a tourism regime that has sufficient coherence to maintain a long-term focus on key aims, and to build support for the regulation of visitors, the city and the industry that is necessary to achieve them. This has been achieved in Cambridge, providing a basis for consistent and, perhaps, sustainable policy.

Can we really claim to be able to tackle the problems that tourism creates in heritage cities sustainably in the long term? This study shows the question is not easily susceptible to a general answer, as specific locality factors are crucial. However, Cambridge is comparatively favoured. The impacts that restructuring and other global changes have had on the city have been benign, so that there was no need to pursue tourism development to create employment, and the city has benefited from the efforts of local policy entrepreneurs who built an effective regime and played an important role in wider policy development. Despite that, visitor numbers have risen relentlessly, and that seems set to continue. Even consistent tourism strategy means managing growing problems, not solving them.

## References

Ashworth, G.J. and Tunbridge J.E., (2000), *The Tourist - Historic City: retrospect and prospect of managing the heritage city*. Pergamon Oxford.

Cambridge City Council (1978) *Tourism in Cambridge*. CCC

Cambridge City Council (1985) *Tourism in Cambridge: Positive Management Selective Development*. CCC

Cambridge City Council (1990) *Cambridge Tourism: The Way Ahead*. CCC

Cambridge City Council (1996) *Cambridge Tourism Strategy*. CCC

Cambridge City Council (2001) *Cambridge Tourism Strategy 2001-2006 and Action Plan 2001-2002*. CCC

Davidson, R. and Maitland, R. (1997) *Tourism Destinations*. Hodder and Stoughton, London

Department of Culture, Media and Sport (1999) *Tourism – Towards Sustainability*. DCMS London

Department of Culture, Media and Sport (1999) *Tomorrow's Tourism*. DCMS London

Department of National Heritage (1997) *Success Through Partnership – A Strategy for Tourism. Competing with the Best*. DNH London

Department of Employment (1991) *Tourism and the Environment- Maintaining the Balance*. DE, London.

English Tourism Council (2001) *Time for Action*. ETC

English Historic Towns Forum, (1991), *Getting it Right - A Guide to Visitor Management Plans in Historic Town*. EHTF

English Historic Towns Forum, (1999), *Making the Connections*. EHTF/ETC/EH

Evans, C, Maitland, R, Edmundson T, and Morley S (2001) *Planning for Tourism and Leisure*.

Department of Local Government, Transport and the Regions, London

Florida, R. (2002) *The Rise of the Creative Class*. New York Basic Books

- Godfrey, K. (1998) Attitudes towards 'sustainable tourism' in the UK: a view from local government. *Tourism Management* 19,3, 231-224
- Hall, C.M. (2000) *Tourism Planning: Policies, Processes and Relationships*. Prentice Hall
- Harvey, D. (1989) *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Her Majesty's Stationery Office (1985) *Pleasure, Leisure and Jobs*. HMSO London (1985)
- Her Majesty's Stationery Office (1992) *Planning Policy Guidance Note 12: Development Plans and Regional Planning Guidance*. HMSO London
- Her Majesty's Stationery Office (1992) *Planning Policy Guidance Note 21: Tourism*. HMSO London
- Hoffman L, Fainstein S, and Judd D. [ed] (2003) *Cities and Visitors: regulating people, markets and city space*. Blackwell. Oxford
- Human, B. (1995) Visitor management in the public planning policy context. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol 2: 4
- Jansen-Verbeke, M. (1986) Inner City tourism: resources, tourists and promoters. *Annals of Tourism Research* 13: 79-100.
- Judd, D. and Fainstein, S. (1999) (eds) *The Tourist City*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Kearns, G. and Philo, C. [ed] 1993 *Selling Places: the City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present*. Pergamon Oxford
- Klemm, M. (1992) Sustainable tourism development. Languedoc-Roussillon thirty years on. *Tourism Management* 13, 2 169-180
- Klemm, M. (1996) Languedoc-Roussillon: adapting the strategy. *Tourism Management* 17, 2 133-147
- Laslo, D. (2003). Policy Communities and Infrastructure of Urban Tourism. *American Behavioral Scientist*. 46, 8 1070-1083
- Law, C.M. (2002) *Urban Tourism*. Continuum London
- Laws, E. and Le Pelley, B. (2000) Managing Complexity and Change in Tourism: The Case of a Historic City. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 2,229-246

- MacCannell, D. (1976) *The Tourist*. Schocken. New York
- Maitland, R. (2002) Partnership and Collaboration in Destination Management. In Weber K [ed] *City Tourism 2002* Springer
- Meethan, K. (1997) York: managing the tourist city. *Cities* 14, 6 333-342
- Miller, C. (1999) Partners in Regeneration. *Policy and Politics* 27, 3 343-358
- Morgan N, Pritchard A and Pride R. (2002) *Destination Branding: creating the unique destination proposition*. Butterworth- Heinemann. Oxford
- Rhodes, R.A.W. (1992) *Beyond Westminster and Whitehall: the sub-central governments of Britain*. London. Routledge.
- Shaw, G. and Williams, A. (1994) *Critical Issues in Tourism: A Geographical Perspective*. Blackwell Oxford
- Stone, C. (1989) *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta 1946-1988*. University of Kansas Press. Lawrence
- Van der Borg, J. Costa, P. and Gotti, G. (1996) Tourism in European Heritage Cities. *Annals of Tourism Research* 23, 2



**Table I Cambridge Tourism Strategies – Policy Contexts**

| National Policy   |      | Regional Policy                                  |      | Local Policy                                     |      |
|---|------|--|------|--|------|
| Document  | Date | Document   | Date | Document   | Date |
| Development of Tourism Act                                  | 1969 |  |      | Cambridge Town Map                               | 1965 |
|   |      | East Anglia- A Tourism Policy (EATB)             | 1977 |  |      |
|   |      |  |      | Tourism in Cambridge                             | 1978 |
| Local Government and Tourism Circular 3/79                  | 1979 |  |      |  |      |
|   |      |  |      | Cambridgeshire Structure Plan                    | 1980 |
|   |      |  |      | Guest House Policy (CCC)                         | 1982 |
|   |      |  |      | Specialist Schools in Cambridge                  | 1983 |
| Tourism and Leisure New Horizon (ETB)                       | 1983 |  |      |  |      |
| Pleasure, Leisure and Jobs (HMSO)                           | 1985 |  |      |  |      |
|   |      |  |      | Tourism in Cambridge P M & S D                   | 1985 |
|   |      | East Anglia Tourism Policy into the 1990s (EATB) | 1989 | Cambridgeshire Structure Plan                    | 1989 |
| Plan for Success 1991-95 (ETB)                              | 1990 |  |      | Tourism in Cambridge Way Ahead                   | 1991 |
| This Common Inheritance (DoE)                               | 1990 |  |      |  |      |
| Tourism and the Environment: Maintaining the Balance (DE)   | 1991 | RPG East Anglia RPG6 (DoE)                       | 1991 |  |      |
| PPG12: Development Plans and Regional Policy Guidance (DoE) | 1992 |  |      | Deposit Draft Cambridge Local Plan               | 1992 |
| PPG21: Tourism (DoE)  | 1992 |  |      |  |      |
| Sustainable Development UK Strategy (DoE)                   | 1994 | Tourism Policy for East Anglia (EATB)            | 1994 |  |      |
| Sustainable Rural Tourism (DNH)                             | 1995 |  |      | Cambridgeshire Structure Plan                    | 1995 |
| Tourism: Competing With The Best (DNH)                      | 1997 |  |      |  |      |
|   |      |  |      | Cambridge Tourism Strategy                       | 1996 |
|   |      |  |      | Cambridge Local Plan                             | 1996 |
| Tourism Towards Sustainability (DCMS)                       | 1998 |  |      |  |      |
| Measuring Local Impact of Tourism (DCMS)                    | 1998 |  |      |  |      |
| Tomorrow's Tourism (DCMS)                                   | 1999 |  |      |  |      |
| Perspectives on English Tourism (ETC)                       | 2000 | Strategy Tourism East of England (EETB)          | 2000 |  |      |
| Time for Action - Strategy for Sustainable Tourism (ETC)    | 2001 |  |      | Cambridge Tourism Strategy                       | 2001 |
| National Sustainable Tourism Indicators (ETC)               | 2001 |  |      |  |      |
|   |      |  |      | Cambridgeshire Structure Plan [Approved version] | 2003 |
|   |      |  |      | Deposit Draft Cambridge Local Plan               | 2003 |

City Tourism Strategies that form the basis of the discussion in this paper are shown in shaded boxes. National policy includes Acts of Parliament, advice from central to local government through circulars and guidance notes ('advice' that local government is expected to follow), government reports and advice and reports from the national tourism organisation (NTO), which is more discretionary.

**Table 2 Cambridge Tourism Strategies: Strategic Aims**

| Strategic Aim   | Tourism Strategy |      |      |      |      |
|---|------------------|------|------|------|------|
|   | 1978             | 1985 | 1990 | 1995 | 2001 |
| Increase/maximise the benefits  | X                | X    | X    | X    | X    |
| Tourism problems /protect environment   | X                | X    | X    | X    | X    |
| The visitor experience  | X                |      | X    | X    | X    |
| The type of tourism/sector/development  |                  | X    | X    | X    | X    |
| Tourism more sustainable  |                  |      |      |      | X    |
| 1978: Tourism in Cambridge, Cambridge City Council, November 1978, p. 49<br>1985: Tourism in Cambridge: Positive Management Selective Development, Cambridge City Council 1985, p.10.<br>1990: Cambridge Tourism: The Way Ahead, Cambridge City Council, April 1990, p.7<br>1995: Cambridge Tourism Strategy, Cambridge City Council, April 1996, p.12<br>2001: Cambridge Tourism Strategy 2001-2006 and Action Plan 2001-2002, Cambridge City Council, June 2001, p. 7 |                  |      |      |      |      |

**Table 3: National Government policy and Cambridge Tourism Strategies**

| National Policy Document  | Date | Objectives   | Cambridge Tourism Strategy – Strategic Aims and Tactics |                  |                  |                  |                  |
|---|------|--|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|   |      |  | 1978  | 1985             | 1990             | 1996             | 2001             |
| Tourism and the Environment – Maintaining the Balance <sup>1</sup>                              | 1991 | 1. The environment has an intrinsic value above use as tourism asset<br>2. Tourism has potential to benefit community, place and visitor<br>3. Manage impact of tourism for long term sustainability<br>4. Tourism respect scale, nature and character of place<br>5. Seek harmony between needs of visitor, place and community<br>6. Adapt to change, but not at the expense of these principles | X   | X                | X                | X                | X                |
| Planning Policy Guidance: Development Plans and Regional Planning Guidance (PPG12) <sup>2</sup> | 1992 | 1. Plans to ensure that development and growth sustainable<br>2. Include land use policies on tourism<br>3. Include social considerations in planning<br>4. Environmental considerations in planning to include environmental quality, global warming, resource use  | X   | X                | X                | X                | X                |
| Planning Policy Guidance: Tourism (PPG21) <sup>3</sup>  | 1992 | Achieve sustainable development that:<br>1. Supports growth and benefits the economy<br>2. Protects and enhances the environment   | X<br>X  | X<br>X           | X<br>X           | X<br>X           | X<br>X           |
| Success Through Partnership – A Strategy for Tourism, Competing with the Best <sup>4</sup>      | 1997 | 1. Increase growth in inbound tourism earnings<br>2. Increase growth in domestic tourism earnings  | X<br>X  | X<br>X           | X<br>X           | X<br>X           | X<br>X           |
| Tourism – Towards Sustainability <sup>5</sup>   | 1998 | 1. Establish policy frameworks<br>2. Make tourism more sustainable<br>3. Managing visitor flows<br>4. Environment friendly transport<br>5. Better physical planning<br>6. Tourism for all  | X<br>X<br>X<br>X  | X<br>X<br>X<br>X | X<br>X<br>X<br>X | X<br>X<br>X<br>X | X<br>X<br>X<br>X |
| Tomorrow's Tourism <sup>6</sup>   | 1999 | 1. Support economic growth<br>2. Support sustainable development<br>3. Support an inclusive society  | X   | X                | X<br>X           | X<br>X           | X<br>X           |

<sup>1</sup> Seven principles for the balanced development of tourism, p. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Very little specifically about tourism.

<sup>3</sup> Deduced from paragraphs 1.1 – 1.2.

<sup>4</sup> Set as two key targets on p2.

<sup>5</sup> A consultation paper raising issues, rather than a policy statement; it informed the preparation of *Tomorrow's Tourism*.

<sup>6</sup> The reasons for preparing the strategy, p. 9

**Table 4. Policies: tourism product and type of regulation**

|  | <b>Regulating Visitors</b>                    | <b>Regulating the city</b>             | <b>Regulating Industry</b>        |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Primary: Attractions</b>              | Admission to Colleges (pass scheme; charging) | Increasing appropriate attractions     | Disability access                 |
|  | Increasing appropriate attractions            | Control of language schools            |                                   |
|  | Control of language schools                   |  |                                   |
| <b>Primary: Setting / Sense of place</b> | Dispersal of visitors                         | Transport: use of public transport     |                                   |
|  | Transport: traffic management                 | Transport: car parking                 |                                   |
|  | Marketing                                     | Transport: coach parking / man't       |                                   |
|  | Information: signs                            | Disability access and information      |                                   |
|  |   | Quality/management of the public realm |                                   |
|  |   | Street life and activity               |                                   |
| <b>Secondary</b>                         |   | Planning policy for accommodation      | Planning policy for accommodation |
|  |   | Camping and caravan site               | Encourage serviced accommodation  |
|  |   |  | Business support                  |
|  |   |  | Disability access and information |
| <b>Additional</b>                        | Marketing                                     | Disability access information          | Marketing                         |
|  | Information: literature                       |  |                                   |
|  | Tourist Information Centre                    |  |                                   |
|  | Information: signs                            |  |                                   |
|  | Transport: access to the city                 |  |                                   |

Source: derived from:

1978: Tourism in Cambridge, Cambridge City Council, November 1978,

1985: Tourism in Cambridge: Positive Management Selective Development, Cambridge City Council 1985.

1990: Cambridge Tourism: The Way Ahead, Cambridge City Council, April 1990,

1995: Cambridge Tourism Strategy, Cambridge City Council, April 1996,

2001: Cambridge Tourism Strategy 2001-2006 and Action Plan 2001-2002, Cambridge City Council, June 2001,