Abstract: This case study shows how contrasting planning systems—one regulatory and the other proactive—have resulted in markedly different tourism developments in Niagara Falls (Canada and the United States). In both border cities, older "downtown" areas have been eclipsed; in US Niagara Falls, tourist-oriented facilities and services have been consciously mixed with normal central business land uses, forming a well-defined tourism business district. The nature of such districts is examined, along with tourism and municipal planning issues that influence relative attractiveness and competitiveness. Conclusions are drawn on modeling the tourism business districts and on planning strategies for creating them. Keywords: tourism business district, recreation business district, urban tourism planning, Niagara Falls.

Résumé: Planification pour les quartiers de commerce touristique. Cette étude de cas montre comment deux systèmes contrastés de planification—un régulateur et l'autre proactif—ont abouti à des aménagements touristiques bien différents aux Chutes du Niagara, au Canada et aux États-Unis. Dans ces deux villes frontières, les vieux centre-villes ont été surpassées; aux États-Unis, les installations, entreprises et services touristiques ont été intégrés intentionnellement aux utilisations foncières ordinaires du quartier commerçant, créant un quartier commerçant touristique bien défini. On examine les caractéristiques de ce genre de quartier et les questions de planification touristique et urbaine qui influencent l'agrément et la compétitivité. On tire des conclusions au sujet des modèles de quartiers commerçants touristiques et des stratégies de planification pour ces quartiers. Mots-clés: quartier commerçant touristique, quartier d'entreprises récréatives, Chutes du Niagara.

INTRODUCTION

The term "tourism business district" (TBD) can be used to describe concentrations of visitor-oriented attractions and services located in conjunction with urban central business district (CBD) functions. In older cities, especially in Europe, the TBD and CBD often coincide with heritage areas. Owing to their high visibility and economic importance, TBDs can be subjected to intense planning by municipal authorities.
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Analysis of TBDs has both theoretical and practical applications. The form and evolution of TBDs reveals much about the nature of urban tourism and its impacts, while analysis of the planning systems influencing TBDs can contribute to concepts and methods for better planning of tourism in urban environments.

The TBD can be contrasted with "recreational business districts," which are most commonly associated with beach resorts. The two concepts are related, but as revealed in the ensuing review of literature and case studies, TBDs and RBDs differ in form, function, and planning-related issues.

Following a review of the research tradition, this article examines the contrasting planning systems affecting tourism in Niagara Falls (New York, USA and Niagara Falls Ontario, Canada), with particular emphasis on how their relative attractiveness and competitiveness are being changed. The forms and functions of the contrasting tourism centers are examined, based on field observations, interviews with city officials and industry leaders, and a review of available documents. A number of photographs illustrate the differences. Conclusions are drawn on modeling the TBD and appropriate planning strategies for creating them. In an earlier article (Getz 1992), the historical development of Niagara Falls has been documented, with a focus on the applicability of the destination lifecycle concept, and including documentation of a survey of local tourism experts.

The Research Tradition

The study of TBDs is part of a well-established research tradition concerning urban and resort morphology, although most attention by tourism researchers has been paid to seaside resorts. Gilbert (1939) initially explored the morphology of the English seaside resort, but, according to Meyer-Arendt (1990a) did not identify urban sectors within resorts. Wolfe (1952) studied Wasaga Beach, an inland resort in Canada, noting the existence of zones or tourism activity including a central "honky-tonk" area of commercialism. Barrett (1958) examined 80 seaside resorts in the United Kingdom and produced what Meyer-Arendt has called "perhaps the first conceptual morphological model of 'recreational' land-use zonation at seaside resorts" (1990a:40). Barrett's model included a zone of "frontal amenities."

Stansfield and Rickert extended this line of research by focusing on the "recreational business district" (RBD): "a linear aggregation of restaurants, various food stands, candy stores and a varied array of novelty and souvenir shops which cater to visitors' leisurely shopping needs" (1970:215). These unique retailing areas were characterized as being shaped by the pursuit of maximum accessibility to the major resource (New Jersey beach resorts and Niagara Falls, Ontario were used as examples), and were separated from the normal central business district. They were also marked by their seasonal rhythm and special range of service functions, which tended to exclude the needs of permanent residents.

Lavery (1971) employed the concept of an RBD in his model of the
British seaside resort, with an RBD and traditional central business district adjoining, but functionally separate (see Meyer-Arendt 1990 for illustrations of the various models). Taylor (1975), using a case study in East London, South Africa, included commercial and non-permanent accommodation in the land use classification employed to define the recreational business district. In so doing, Taylor shifted the emphasis from retailing to a broader consideration of visitor-oriented urban functions. Pigram (1977) confirmed the Lavery and Barrett models and the clear presence of RBDs in Gold Coast resorts in Australia.

Examining Gulf of Mexico seaside resorts, Meyer-Arendt (1990a; 1990b) concluded that the RBD is a key component of resort morphology and that the original RBDs continued to be the cores of present RBDs. In his comparative, historical analysis of resorts, overnight accommodation was included in defining the RBD, because it often preceded and stimulated other commercial development. The three-stage model that resulted from this analysis featured, one, an "exploration stage", in which a path was made back from a boat landing on the shore; two, "infrastructural development," including a causeway from the mainland, subdivision of land for seasonal homes, and an RBD; and, three, "settlement expansion" in which development spreads along the beach and then re-development (e.g., condominiums) threatens to modify the RBD. However, the essentially T-shaped pattern of these resorts, formed by the interaction of coastline and perpendicular access routes, has largely been retained.

Stansfield later returned to the coast of New Jersey and re-examined Cape May. He found that in 1988 mini-malls had developed within the original RBD and its area had expanded. The traditional CBD, however, had become much more seasonal in orientation: "visitor patronage has converted a more or less typical CBD into a more tourist-oriented, non-seafront form of RBD" (1990:32).

Jeans (1990:277) has contributed an additional element to Lavery's model by suggesting that "a common semiotic morphology can be imposed on seaside resorts," namely the "patterns of meanings which are built into the landscape" (1990:277, 279). These meanings, applied to culture (the urban landscape) and to "nature" (the sea), together with zones of transition and ambiguity (the beach), shape both resort morphology and user behavior.

Pearce (1989) has summarized and critiqued the resort morphology research tradition, with particular emphasis on the development of typologies of tourist development. He concluded that urban areas have been relatively neglected with respect to examination of the process of tourism development, and that no typologies in citics or towns had been postulated. He asserts that "Morphological studies must now be related more explicitly to demand and to the planning process and the role of the various agents of development explored more thoroughly" (1989:87).

Ashworth and Tunbridge (1990) have examined tourism development and planning in the "tourist historic city." They modeled accommodation patterns and the various forms of tourist-historic city, em-
phasizing relationships with traditional central business districts. They also argued that the resort function is present to some degree in all cities.

It is the multiplicity of visitor-oriented urban functions that makes the term "recreational" less appropriate than "tourism" in this context. Urban tourism was examined by the University of Salford (Law 1985), including case studies in Europe and the United States. From these, typical components of urban tourism were identified: conferences and exhibitions; heritage; waterfronts; museums and art galleries; shopping; eating and drinking; entertainment, theatres and concert halls; sports facilities; viewpoints (often in buildings) and connections (pedestrian and transit systems).

Jansen-Verbeke (1986) has modeled the inner-city tourism system, denoting the main components as "activity places" and "leisure settings," with secondary elements being "hospitality and shopping services" and conditional elements being accessibility and touristic infrastructure such as information. To Jansen-Verbeke, the inner-city environment provides a leisure function for all kinds of visitors, regardless of the trip purpose.

Together, the literature on resort morphology clearly demonstrates the importance of the recreational business district, but this concept has been applied predominantly to seaside cases. Because the term "recreational" implies a predominance of tourist-oriented businesses, it is less appropriate in cities where a blending of functions occurs, and particularly where the tourist- and resident-oriented activities overlap (as in the case of tourist-historic cities). Furthermore, the Cape May and Gulf Coast studies cited above suggest that the interrelationships between CBDs and RBDs are dynamic, with blending occurring over time. Table 1 summarizes major differences between TBDs and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism Business District</th>
<th>Recreational Business District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All-year orientation</td>
<td>Seasonal orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrated form</td>
<td>Linear or T-shaped form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractions may be completely cultural and purpose-built</td>
<td>Attractions are usually natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May incorporate or develop separately from traditional CBDs</td>
<td>Develop separately from resident-oriented CBD; may merge with, or influence the CBD over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functions include:</td>
<td>Functions include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Catering/beverages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services</td>
<td>Entertainment/amusements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractions</td>
<td>Gifts and souvenirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor services</td>
<td>Some accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major shopping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image and meanings are predominantly cultural/urban</td>
<td>Cultural and natural images and meanings are blended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Comparison Of TBD and RBD Forms and Functions
RBDs, incorporating observations made in the ensuing discussion and case study.

TBD Planning

Owing to the increasing significance of urban tourism, many municipal planning departments and public agencies have sought to plan the TBD, often in conjunction with economic development, urban renewal or redevelopment schemes, and normal central business district (CBD) functions. In some centers, tourism is viewed as a major catalyst for desired changes. In many towns and cities natural or heritage attractions provide a logical focus of the TBD, leading to greater concern for planning and regulation. The widespread development of conference and exhibition facilities in CBDs has been a major factor shaping this trend, as has development of major cultural and entertainment facilities. Cities with waterfronts have an advantage, but inland communities have not ignored tourism. The end result has been a deliberate blending of traditional central business functions with visitor-oriented attractions and services.

Examples of urban TBDs are plentiful. Redstone documented North American downtown revitalization plans, noting how a “special image” and “new and interesting happenings which the different character of each city can provide, would be an additional attraction for visitors and tourists as well as a source of pride for the local community” (1976: xvi). Partners For Livable Cities (McNulty 1986) closely examined the value of tourism in helping to create better urban living environments. Law (1985) cited Baltimore (USA), as have many other observers, as a prime example of planned tourism and business districts, focused on the Inner Harbor and nearby Convention Center, Festival Hall, Civic Center, and Charles Center. Burtenshaw, Bateman, and Ashworth (1981) examined the tourist center in Western European cities, noting the special problem of housing being displaced by hotels and guest houses.

Many TBD planning issues identified in the literature can be divided into four groups. (1) Developing Tourism: to create attractions, infrastructure, and services; to promote urban visits and to develop an attractive image; to coordinate efforts within the industry and between the industry and government agencies; and to provide appropriate land use/development incentives and controls. (2) Using Tourism as a Catalyst: to attract other forms of development/investment; to generate a positive image of the area; and to facilitate conservation and amenity provision through tourism. (3) Balancing Tourism with Other Urban Functions: to determine the role and priority of tourism vis-à-vis resident-oriented services and business or industrial development; and to evaluate opportunity costs. (4) Dealing with Negative Impacts: to account for such negative effects as reduction of affordable housing, inflated land costs, traffic congestion, pollution, prostitution, crime, loss of leisure opportunities for residents.

It is readily apparent from this list and the previous discussion that the task is complex. Numerous city agencies, and usually agents of senior governments must be involved, and the private sector is looked
upon as being the source of much or even all of the new capital investment. Often formal public/private development partnerships are created. So great is the planning challenge associated with TBDs that a multi-decade period is generally required for implementation, together with rounds of public input and plan revisions.

But not all TBDs are fully or even partially planned. Some have developed in a free enterprise environment, while others have been subjected to varying levels of control or regulation, but not strategic planning. Two contrasting styles of planning, resulting in quite different TBDs, are discussed in this paper.

THE NIAGARA FALLS CASE STUDY

Although a great deal of attention has been paid to Niagara Falls as an attraction, little has been written about tourism planning in this destination. This is despite the fact that considerable public investment in tourism has occurred on the New York side and numerous tourism planning and marketing studies have been prepared on the Ontario side. The two cities make an interesting and revealing case study: Development of tourism has evolved in line with similar product and market influences, but their different planning systems have generated contrasting tourism core areas (see Table 2 and Figure 1).

Niagara Falls, New York

Formal planning of the Tourism Center of Niagara Falls, New York, goes back to the early 1970s, prior to which the city was faced with old tourism infrastructure and a poor reputation compared to the Canadian side. Much of the impetus for concerted planning efforts arose because of a decline in the industrial base and steady depopulation (the so-called “rustbelt” phenomenon). In this context, tourism was to be a catalyst for rejuvenating the economy and for renewal of the decaying office core and surrounding, older residential areas. The situation was somewhat extreme, and this in part explains the enthusiasm for radical solutions.

The city has also aggressively pursued industrial development in newer areas, and is seeking renewal of its traditional Main Street retailing area, all part of a package promoted as a “Renaissance” (City of Niagara Falls n.d.). Main Street (a traditional linear “downtown”) is now eclipsed by the Tourism Center both for shopping and offices, and suburban malls have drawn business towards the periphery.

The first major action was completion of the International Convention Center (1974—cost: $34 million; all in US dollars), which also functions as a large entertainment facility, followed by a master plan for an urban renewal area of 82 acres, called the Rainbow Center. Redstone, in a book called The New Downtowns, cited this plan as “a comprehensive redevelopment program—one of the few cases in which an entire business district has been reconstructed in a city the size of Niagara Falls” (1976:180). The plan was intended to create a multifunction center for tourism, conventions, and trade exhibits, retailing, entertainment, and act as a traditional central business district. Main
Table 2. Comparison of the Tourism Business Districts in Niagara Falls, Ontario, and Niagara Falls, New York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Ontario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Single concentration adjacent to falls and Rainbow Bridge</td>
<td>Two loosely connected concentrations: Falls View is attracting more recent investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separate from traditional main street</td>
<td>Separate from old downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Mainly car access</td>
<td>Mainly car access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Includes bus terminal</td>
<td>Bus terminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong internal pedestrian orientation</td>
<td>Weak pedestrian flow except along Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No people-mover system</td>
<td>Main NPC people-mover system, mainly along the Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major internal parking facilities</td>
<td>Most parking is peripheral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak period congestion</td>
<td>Peak period congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major road improvements are planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>A planned Tourism Center which appears as a unified visitor-oriented district</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several very unique but relatively low-profile buildings</td>
<td>Clifton Hill appears tacky, but alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Falls View lacks cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Several towers dominate the landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractions</td>
<td>Convention and entertainment facility</td>
<td>No major convention center; hotels have facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Themed shopping and indoor malls</td>
<td>Mostly souvenir shopping; no malls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lackey Plaza event venue</td>
<td>No purpose-built event venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wax museum</td>
<td>Wax and other small museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geological museum</td>
<td>Niagara Falls Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water park</td>
<td>Marineland and water park outside the TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aquarium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American Ctr.</td>
<td>Amusement park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maid of the Mist boat tours</td>
<td>Maid of the Mist and incline railways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cave of the Winds</td>
<td>Table Rock Tunnels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wintergarden</td>
<td>NPC greenhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State park</td>
<td>NPC parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 observation tower</td>
<td>3 observation towers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helicopter rides</td>
<td>Helicopter rides are remote from the TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Festival of Lights</td>
<td>Imax theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other special events</td>
<td>Festival of Lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other special events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Mostly large hotels</td>
<td>Mostly motels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>Restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information centers</td>
<td>Information centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State interpretive center</td>
<td>Sightseeing tours (bus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Functions</td>
<td>Major office buildings</td>
<td>Intrusive railway line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Features of the plan were the pedestrian orientation and a competition that led to the design and development of the Lackey Plaza in front of the convention center. Figure 2 shows the convention center, Lackey Plaza and a nearby office building; Figure 3 looks across Lackey Plaza towards a mix of old and new commercial space (the office tower in the background in 1991 was unoccupied, and awaiting potential conversion to a hotel); and Figure 4 is a view down the pedestrian mall showing the Wintergarden in the background and a mix of office and retail space on either side.

Financing of this ambitious master plan included the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (through Urban Development Assistance Grants, UDAG), the New York State Urban Development Corporation and Division of Housing and Community Renewal,
and the City of Niagara Falls and its Urban Renewal Agency. Approximately $60 million in public funding and $100 million in private investment were anticipated (Redstone 1976).

Over the ensuing two decades, development of the Tourism Center has roughly followed the master plan, but there have been departures, particularly in failing to make all the envisaged improvements to the road system. Developments during that period did include the Rainbow Center Shopping Mall, the Wintergarden, Niagara Splash Water
Park, Falls Street Faire and Falls Street Station (two themed shopping areas along either side of the mall; in mid-1991 they had been completed but not occupied), The Native Center for the Living Arts (the "Turtle"), and several hotels.

In 1989, a major proposal for a factory-outlet megamall (intended for construction in 1992) was announced with great acclaim, as it would add considerably to the Center's attractions and potentially be a catalyst for additional developments. The proposal, made by the owner of an existing outlet mall just outside the city boundary, is for 1.2 million square feet of retail space, encompassing over 200 factory outlet stores, plus a hotel and large parking area. The 85-acre site is to be assembled by the city as an urban renewal project, and it had been
designated for a number of years previously as a land bank for appropriate initiatives. Impacts of the proposal on tourism could be enormous. The developer suggested that 55% of projected $350 million sales (first year) would be from foreign visitors (Benderson Development Company 1989). The primary target group is the Canadian shopper, both independent car-based travelers and bus tours, many of which would be organized by the developer. Hotels, restaurants, and other attractions would likely benefit from new demand. As well, the megamall would augment facilities and activities of the Festival of Lights and other special events. It could also make a "people mover system" more viable and enhance marketability of the convention center.

Justification for government involvement in the megamall project is related to its value as a job creator (about 2,000 permanent positions) and for its role in blight clearance, as the area to be utilized contains some run-down housing. With these goals, large amounts of public financial support are to be given. A $7 million federal UDAG grant was sought (this federal aid program was to terminate, making it the city's last chance to apply) and $24 million is to be provided by the city's Urban Renewal Agency, based on local borrowing supported by the city and county (to be repaid from increased sales tax revenue) and the State Job Development Agency. In addition, the governor of New York committed the state to assistance by means of road improvements. Private investment was to total $80 million, of which $75 million in borrowing would be provided by the state's Industrial Development Agency bonds. All the state support is directly linked to the city's and county's designation as a "distressed area" because of high unemployment rates, so that tourism is really an indirect beneficiary of urban renewal and job creation schemes.

Niagara Falls committed 15 staff members to implementation of the megamall, with the city Planning Department taking the lead. Their tasks included obtaining environmental approval; amending the urban renewal area plan; obtaining UDAG funding approval; achieving agreement between the city and county on borrowing strategies; obtaining necessary state assistance; negotiating a contract with the developer; acquiring and clearing all the land; and relocating 300 households and 50 small businesses from the area. Clearly it is an enormous challenge, yet one for which the city has acquired experience through decades of planning and developing the Tourism Center.

As it has evolved, this Tourism Center is an excellent example of a publicly planned and assisted tourism business district, incorporating the traditional CBD functions of office buildings and retailing. It has developed into a compact zone of major, all-year attractions and services, with ample parking and easy pedestrian movement. The TBD has a range of accommodations, dominated by newer or recently renovated hotels, all in close proximity to the falls and the Rainbow Bridge. Its "new" tourism products in the form of themed shopping/entertainment and events give the center an image of modernity. Assuming the proposed megamall is completed, Niagara Falls will undoubtedly undergo an even more significant tourism renaissance, perhaps even overtaking its Canadian rival in attractiveness and competitiveness.
Niagara Falls, Ontario

In contrast, the Canadian side of Niagara Falls has no similarly compact, planned tourism center, nor is the predominantly regulatory planning system particularly suited to achieving one. It has a more dispersed pattern of attractions and services; Table 2 shows a number of disadvantages compared to the New York side. The Clifton Hill area was identified by Stansfield (1970) as a “recreational business district,” while the Falls View area is much more devoted to accommodation with some attractions and shopping. Together, they are tending to merge, and they do present the opportunity for planned intervention to develop a TBD.

The degree of dispersal is marked by several visually prominent observation towers, and there is no single “anchor” or dominant attraction. There are four main concentrations of tourist activity: Queen Victoria Park and Table Rock, where the Niagara Parks Commission (NPC) runs concessions and the Table Rock Tunnel attraction; Marineland, which is a mile from the falls; Falls View on the ridge above the falls; and the Clifton Hill strip of motels, minor attractions, shops and services, along with the adjacent Maple Leaf Village amusement park and shopping/entertainment complex. Figure 5 shows Clifton Hill, with the tower of Maple Leaf Village in the background. Figure 6 is a view across vacant land, alongside the railway, toward the Imax theatre (a white pyramid) and the Skylon Tower, in Falls View.

Pedestrian movement is concentrated along the parkway from Table Rock to Clifton Hill, otherwise the dispersed tourism development pattern makes pedestrian movement impractical. Traffic congestion and parking problems along the Niagara Parkway and Clifton Hill areas have been addressed by the NPC through the elimination of on-road parking, channeling most cars away from the falls to large parking lots, and introducing a people-mover system. The tourism industry has been critical of the people-mover, because it fails to connect the park to outlying businesses.

Figure 5. Niagara Falls, Ontario, Clifton Hill
Much of the tourism product is "old," consisting of minor attractions and services such as wax museums, fast-food outlets, souvenir shops, and rides. Marineland theme park has developed very slowly and does not attract a high proportion of visitors. Length of stay is very short (Economic Planning Group of Canada 1988), giving rise to problems for specific businesses and widespread demands for new attractions and upgraded services.

The city of Niagara Falls has an old Official Plan to regulate land use, but has largely ignored tourism. As of mid-1991, the Planning Department was completing a major review and update of the plan and was committed to addressing all the major tourism-related issues and to taking a more positive role to develop tourism, rather than to simply regulate it. There have been no urban renewal efforts related to tourism, although the city has been renewing its traditional downtown, which is remote from the tourism areas (Figure 7, taken in 1991, illustrates the depressed downtown—Queen Street—replete with vacant shops). As well, there have been no major provincial or federal funding programs that could have been applied to any initiative similar to the Tourism Center on the New York side.

Advice on the municipality's role and possible planning strategies for tourism has been provided in several consulting studies. The Economic Planning Group of Canada (1988) advised the city to create an urban resort experience by way of new attractions, particularly entertainment, shopping and special events, and more full-service hotels. Quality convention and meeting facilities were seen as advantageous. Two concentrated and themed shopping areas, based on a pedestrian mall design concept (i.e., from Clifton Hill to the Skylon Tower and Queen Street—the traditional downtown) were recommended.

To implement this strategy, the consultants suggested changes to the city's Official Plan so that it would identify sites and create suitable tourism center concepts. The city would then put land use zoning and regulation in place to encourage appropriate development, with pri-
private investment invited to implement the detailed plans. This approach would be a radical departure from the city's planning style, which has reacted to problems caused by tourism, and would be more like the style of economic and urban renewal planning practiced on the New York side. The city, however, felt it lacked the means—legal and financial—to accomplish these goals.

As part of the Official Plan review, another consulting firm reported to the city on tourism development strategies. Malone Given Parsons (1991) proposed a more modest strategy in which the main existing tourism development areas (Clifton Hill and Falls View) be intensified and the people-mover system expanded to serve a much wider area.

The people-mover system was developed by the Niagara Parks Commission to alleviate congestion problems near the falls, but it has been a source of friction with the industry. Attempts by the NPC to use its powers to control access and land development along its park system have also angered the industry as well as local municipalities, leading to recognition of the need for permanent consultation and planning cooperation. In 1988, the NPC released a major report to provide a "100-year vision, a 20-year plan, and a 5-year action plan" (Niagara Parks Commission 1988). It was far reaching in scope, including a proposal for a new bridge just upstream of the falls, which could have the effect of augmenting the tourism activity around Marineland.

Another proposal, called The Gateway to Ontario and Canada, would be a major visitor reception center located in the Falls View area. A major canal running through the city was also suggested, with the idea that it could provide a setting for multifunctional developments, including tourism. But the industry was initially unimpressed with the NPC plan, thinking that it failed to address the need for major attractions to increase the length of stay of tourists.

Even with a major shift in planning style, the Canadian Niagara Falls will lag far behind in the creation of a concentrated TBD and "new" products. The most likely location for initiatives will not be the
Clifton Hill strip, unless major private land assemblies can occur, but the Falls View area. There, land exists for much more intensive and preplanned development, and the NPC Gateway proposal could become the catalyst.

MORPHOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The full historical development of tourism in Niagara Falls has been described in Getz (1992). Essentially, the morphological process differs from beach resorts (see Meyer-Arendt 1990a for models) in two key respects. One, the intervention of planning came early, so that after the creation of state and provincial parks in the 1880s commercial development was forced away from the natural attraction. Two, in the 1970s, the New York city planned a Tourism Center that has become a TBD. Niagara Falls, Ontario, still has a more traditional RBD in Clifton Hill, plus peripheral strip developments and potential for intensified development in Falls View.

One element in common with beach resorts is the dominance of commercial development nearest to the natural resource. In many cities with waterfronts, and in tourist-historic cities, the TBD is shaped by the pulling power of both the natural or heritage resource and the traditional CBD, resulting in "bridging" developments of spatial shifting as the TBD forms (Ashworth and Tunbridge 1990). Mountain resorts also display a tendency for tourist-oriented services to locate close to the natural resource, as accessed by ski lifts.

However, TBDs can form independently of natural resources, in which case they are more likely to start as small entertainment or cultural districts within a dominant CBD. But as urban authorities and business interests concentrate on creating more livable environments, planning efforts to foster a TBD, or urban resort image, will become more pronounced.

As discussed elsewhere (Getz 1992), Niagara Falls does not closely follow the hypothetical destination life-cycle model. Planned formation of the TBD, and current planning initiatives on the Ontario side, reflect a permanent state of "maturity" in which aspects of consolidation, stagnation, decline, and rejuvenation are interwoven and constant. As planning attention focuses increasingly on the concept of a TBD, the evolutionary processes are replaced or seriously altered by normative concepts pertaining to the design and function of a TBD.

A TBD Model

The ingredients of a TBD will vary, but clearly include attractions, services for businesses and visitors, and traditional CBD functions. The presence of offices seems to be increasingly essential; the office workers are an additional market for visitor-oriented services, and add to the urban flavor of the TBD. Complete separation of visitor and resident-oriented functions appears to be impractical and undesirable in the modern city. A pedestrian orientation or people-mover system is an attractive ingredient, and concentration is also highly desirable—both to provide an exciting ambience and to maximize accessibility. A "centerpiece," such as a convention or arts center can be the catalyst.
Figure 8 is a schematic model emphasizing functions rather than spatial patterns. The essence of the TBD is a synergistic relationship between CBD functions, tourist attractions, and essential services. Access into and within the TBD is critical, including safe and leisurely pedestrian access for tourists. The synergy must not only create a critical mass of attractions and services to encourage tourists to stay longer (preferably overnight), but must reinforce the image of a people-oriented place. Accordingly, special events and a festive ambience should be provided. Where heritage resources are present, they are both an attraction and a method for delivering unique tourist-oriented services, such as food and beverages through adaptive reuse of buildings.

CONCLUSIONS

The TBD has in many communities become a focus of planning initiatives and, therefore, must be examined in the context of public policy, particularly tourism, economic development and urban renewal. The
location, form, and functions of TBDs are not always dependent on natural resources, and can definitely be manipulated or in some cases even fabricated in the blending of visitor-oriented and traditional CBD functions.

Based on the Niagara Falls case study and the earlier findings, a number of strategies for planning tourism business districts can be suggested.

Urban Renewal or Redevelopment

As in Niagara Falls, New York, tourism can be the catalyst for major redevelopment schemes and urban renewal programs. In the case study, a strong natural attraction provides the impetus, but elsewhere the development of convention and cultural centers can similarly act as visitor and investment magnets. Strong public sector support and subsidies appear to be necessary, and controversy over slum clearance should be expected. A deliberate mix of land uses, to blend TBD and CBD functions, is a hallmark of this approach. Land shortages and congestion are possible costs of this strategy.

Conservation

In the tourist-historic city, the attraction is both the preserved heritage and the ambience augmented by leisure services. Reuse and adaptation of old buildings for services and accommodations is a major feature of this approach. Where heritage resources are weak, they can be reinforced or even partially created through imaginative design. Again, strong public planning is necessary, and possible subsidization to prevent destruction of the resource base. Typically, these will also be multi-purpose areas combining tourist-oriented, CBD, and residential uses.

Multi-Nodal

As shown by Ashworth and Tunbridge (1990), more than one node of accommodations and visitor services exists in many cities. Sometimes, there will be a superior TBD setting and peripheral visitor-oriented strips, or there may be two competing nodes as in the case of Niagara Falls, Ontario. There is also no reason why more then one TBD should not be planned, assuming that attractions or accessibility can support them. The advantages lie in dispersal, thereby hopefully avoiding congestion, and in taking advantage of more than one magnet. However, the nodes may be competitive and tend to sprawl towards each other.

Infilling or Intensification

Where strong CBD functions already exist, accommodations, attractions, and visitor services can be infilled through planning controls, incentives, or by direct public investment. This is the case in many large cities where tourism is clearly an ancillary sector.

Free Enterprise

The main disadvantages of allowing development to set its own course and pace is revealed by the example of Niagara Falls, Ontario.
Although this city has certainly developed with strong land-use regulation, there has been no real attempt to steer the industry or create a TBD. Consequently, development is spread out, there are no strong focal points for visitors other than at the falls, and no major facilities have been built by the public sector. An advantage, however, is the greater availability of development land.

The survey of local experts in Niagara Falls provided a number of insights pertinent to any TBD planning strategy. Foremost in the minds of local tourism experts were the desire for new attractions, higher quality shopping, and public-private partnerships in tourism planning and development. Private investors look for incentives and leadership from the city and senior government agencies. Strong cooperative marketing of the destination will also be necessary, as individual businesses cannot undertake this task efficiently.

Where a concentrated TBD is planned, as in Niagara Falls, New York, land shortages and congestion might follow. The industry appears to favor greater locational choice, meaning dispersal rather than concentration, and might very well react negatively to locational restrictions. On the other hand, the success of a tourism center might very well depend on such regulation of development.

One should question, however, whether the costs of such public/private enterprise are always justifiable. Urban renewal, including the planned megamall project in Niagara Falls, New York, requires displacement of established businesses and homes and the bulldozing of an entire neighborhood—an approach not accepted on the Canadian side. The justification in this particular case relates both to the rundown and crime-ridden characteristics of the target area, as well as the ready availability of alternative housing and commercial property in a depopulated city. Tax incentives and direct financial assistance given to the Tourism Center developments are a real cost to all levels of government, and carry an opportunity cost as well (i.e., whether the same investment can achieve similar outcomes if applied to another sector). Such investment has been justified by high unemployment and the area's past industrial decline, showing that tourism has been perceived to be an equally suitable economic base for the city.

In short, the planning of TBDs is inherently mixed with other urban planning and development issues, and for the most part requires strong intervention by public agencies—both for planning and regulation, and for investment or subsidy. Creating effective tourism business districts is a major challenge for cities, and will require very long planning horizons.
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