

LMF - Technical Appendix 3

Consultation Baseline Findings

Output A - 20.05.2008

Introduction

About this report

A formidable amount of formal and informal consultation with some relevance to the Legacy Masterplan Framework (LMF) has taken place and is in fact ongoing. To inform both the planning and content of the LMF Consultation and Engagement Programme, and the initial work done by the LMF Design Team, Beyond Green has reviewed the findings of a wide range of consultations and summarised them in this report, which can be considered the consultation and engagement equivalent of Baseline Findings.

We have aimed to be as comprehensive as possible. However, to meet the criteria for inclusion in this report, sources needed to be:

- **assimilated material**, based on
- **genuine stakeholder engagement**, and
- **focused on legacy or providing relevant legacy information.**

The first of these criteria means that Beyond Green has looked at little in the way of raw data. The soundness of this report therefore depends to some extent on the soundness of the individual consultations (which we hope to have accounted for using the second requirement) and the rigour of their analysis previously conducted.

The types of consultation findings summarised in this report vary in terms of their level of detail, and we have sought to reflect this, excluding only the ends of the spectrum which are too general or too specific to have utility. The report itself is in places an aggregate of summarised findings, so inevitably some of the headlines may be things the workcluster teams already know.

Nevertheless, to the best of our knowledge a comparative review of legacy-related consultation has not been attempted hitherto and therein we believe lies the value of this exercise and the purpose of this document.

Report structure

The **General** chapter covers those findings which could not be easily assigned to any one workcluster or which have been judged to apply to all. After that the chapters are themed by workcluster: **Use and Activity**; **Parklands, Public Realm and Linkages**; **Infrastructure, Transport and Renewable Energy**; **City Form and Types**; and **Planning Program**.

Where relevant to more than one workcluster, but not applicable to all, findings are repeated in different sections in order that these may act as stand alone chapters. Despite this repetition, the report as a whole is applicable to **Strategic Sustainability**: a dedicated chapter that included all findings relevant to this cross-cutting workcluster would simply reproduce the content of the entire remaining document.

Each workcluster chapter is divided into three sub-sections: findings that arose from **Formal Consultations**, those that were identified as part of **Local Activities** conducted by smaller organisations, and those pertinent to Legacy that originate in **Pan-London Consultation**. The latter category includes findings that are specific to particular London Boroughs, but were identified as part of a London-wide process or by a non-Borough-specific organisation or body.

One or more reference is provided in Roman numerals [i, ii, iii, etc.] indicating the source of each finding mentioned.

1 General findings

This chapter covers those findings which could not be easily assigned to any one workcluster or which apply to all – it is not a summary of the other workcluster specific findings.

There are no findings of this nature identified from **Local Activities**.

1.1 Formal Consultations

Regeneration: The desire for the Olympics to be a catalyst for regeneration has been widely expressed. The regeneration benefits that have been identified are broad and diverse, but might be summarised as the creation of sustainable mixed communities [x]. As defined by the Legacy Partners, that means the LMF Core Area will be a great place to live, work, play and visit, to attract private sector investment in order to provide a vehicle for wider regeneration [ii]. Across stakeholders, other broad aspirations were for a cleaner neighbourhood, greener urban environment, more housing made available, better quality affordable and social housing, safer neighbourhoods, richer social and cultural life, greater civic participation, lower unemployment, a broader range of small businesses, affordable facilities for residents (especially for children and young people), and better educational facilities and higher attainment in local schools [vi].

At one event, stakeholders felt that the development of the Park must not be independent from regeneration activities that are taking place outside the red line boundary of the Olympic Park, such as in Stratford City [ii].

At a local level, almost two thirds of respondents at a large event in Newham wanted people to think of the borough post-2012 as ‘a friendly, diverse place where everyone gets on’ [v].

In terms of how these kinds of benefits might come about, one consultation found that those who perceived the Olympics’ potential for regeneration usually expected to benefit by default (through infrastructural developments) rather than through their active engagement with opportunities to increase employability, develop skills, improve health, partake in cultural events, volunteer, etc. [vi].

On the other hand, concerns about the risks of interventions aiming to regenerate the area have been registered. Attendees at the Legacy Now Launch event felt that gentrification can be a barrier to a successful legacy community and that it is essential to mitigate the risks of gentrification by ensuring integration, the surrounding communities must be included [xiii]. Those fears have been echoed by other stakeholders anticipating greater economic inequalities, inflation, a process of residualisation, and the loss of environmental amenities [vi].

The LMF as a destination: In several consultations, a vision of the LMF and East London as a visitor destination has been strongly expressed [ii, x]. It has been said that it should be a place for both locals and for all Londoners [iii].

Relevant previous examples have been cited as places that have been popular destinations both for the international, national and local markets [ii]. It has been suggested that it is the sheer density of people living and working in these places that has attracted the tourists due to the vibrancy created [iii].

On the other hand, tensions between local needs and being an international destination have been voiced. Stakeholders have been concerned that the LMF could create an affluent area disconnected from its surroundings, which will increase inequalities [x].

Making and maintaining places to be proud of: As expressed at an ODA and LDA visioning event in 2007, making places in legacy is a multifaceted project in which numerous strands, such as arts and culture, sport and environment need to be woven together [ii]. At the same event, it was strongly felt that legacy should deliver more than just a Park and that it was about making a new city district that will need to function on many levels [ii].

The idea of establishing the area as a new address in London has been supported, but it has also been felt that a number of different, more local, 'places', can also be sustained within that – that this is a large area with space for different urban characters [iii].

Key general factors in making this place successful have been identified as: the development of a shared vision, possibly based on the memory of the Games [ii]; the maintenance of quality at all levels of the process, from robust business plans, design and to construction or implementation [ii]; making a place that when families achieve a higher earning power they don't have to leave the area in order to move up the property ladder [iii]. It has also been noted as important to understand how places that are now viewed as successful – (e.g. Brick Lane, Borough) have changed over time: in the past these places have struggled. What made the difference? Are they really as successful for residents as they are for visitors? [iii].

At a local level, at an event in Newham, respondents chose from a range of validated image statement selections, what they thought of as the best description of the area (including Newham). By far the most common impression across all groups was the description "Benefiting from the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games" (35% of mentions) [vi].

Similarly, a desire to make Waltham Forest a "World class borough" through local pride and community Spirit has been identified [viii]. It has been said that communities should have a real sense of ownership and commitment to the area [iii].

General perceptions and attitudes towards the process: At the Legacy Now Launch event, it was suggested that the local community have a negative perception of the Games and the legacy because they do not see their lives changing, do not feel informed of the changes going on around them, and are lacking in confidence. They feel that what they are being promised will not be delivered, for example aspirations for 50% affordable housing [xiii].

Project Scope: A conflict has been identified between aspirations for a "100 or 200 year scope with appropriate targets and standards" and the "standard project scope of 20-30 years" [i, ii].

1.2 Pan-London Consultations

Physical and non-physical aspirations: Whilst Pan-London Consultations identified aspirations for physical regeneration from the London Boroughs of Tower Hamlets and Hackney [xx], a view from the voluntary and community sector was that too much emphasis is currently placed on physical and high profile legacy [xxi]. Instead, this sector stressed the following needs: to distinguish between legacy benefits that arise from local people's involvement in staging the Games and those that will emerge post-Games, to strengthen existing infrastructure and resources (e.g. through training), and to recognise local activity at a local level [xxi].

Other non-physical legacy aspirations included promoting racial harmony by developing close links between Third World teams and local people, and enhancing the worldwide reputation of both East London and the city as a whole [xxii].

Sustainability: Stakeholder responses to the draft London 2012 Sustainability Plan stressed the importance of using the Games as a catalyst to behaviour change in legacy, and pointed to the New South Wales Government's "It's a Living Thing" campaign as an example. These responses pushed for more challenging and exemplary sustainability standards that are reviewed on an ongoing basis, with domestic homes singled out as an example of where this should be applied [xxiii].

2. Use and Activity

2.1 Formal consultations

The importance of use: The importance of considering the range of residents, workers and other users of a place has been recognised [iii, x], as has the need to learn from the most successful parts of London and create a place that is successful right from the start. Places that have changed over time and are now viewed as successful (e.g. Brick Lane, Borough) were cited in particular, but it was also questioned whether these areas are as successful for residents as they are for visitors [iii].

The places shown as examples are tourist attractions because of the activity and the people. The sheer density of people living and working in these places has attracted the tourists due to the vibrancy created [iii].

Equality: There was a desire for the area in legacy not to price out the existing communities and create an affluent area disconnected from its surroundings [x]. Concerns exist that inequalities could be created, with Canary Wharf cited as an example of where this has happened before [ix].

Providing and promoting skills, training and jobs for local people: A major and widespread concern for a range of stakeholders across consultations is that local people benefit from opportunities for skills, training and jobs provision and promotion from legacy [i, vii, x, xiii].

Suggested ways of ensuring that that will happen included: outreach programmes to reach those out of the system; involving local construction companies from the early stages of development, thereby providing local jobs in a specific sector; avoiding pricing out of small local businesses; setting target figures which specify a proportion of jobs that will be for local people, and prioritising affordable workspaces in legacy [x, xiii]. An overall suggestion was the need to focus on the economic legacy rather than just the park aspect [x].

It has been recognised that jobs go well beyond construction and hospitality [ix, x]. Alternatively, some people felt that the “Olympics should be the catalyst but won’t be the creator of sustainable jobs” [ix].

It has been suggested that social enterprises could deliver across a wide range of industries to an estimated £5 billion worth of goods and services; this would work alongside partnerships with bigger companies [x].

It has also been pointed out that many people want to get involved in enterprise but do not have the skills because funding and training is not accessible for them – so it will be important to focus on community provision and funding training and job opportunities in legacy [xiii].

Understanding and promoting area-specific economic activity: Stakeholders have noted that different economic clusters are aspired to by different Host Boroughs [i]. Consultations have found information about their characteristics and concerns about how they link up – it has been suggested that employment uses in the LMF area will both influence, and be influenced by, the quantum, type and location of employment uses in the surrounding area [iii]. For example, if Stratford City will form an epicentre to the LMF masterplan, the question has been asked how will it economically affect the surrounding smaller centres? Some stakeholders have felt that the LMF area must be flexible to changes and complement the surrounding area, and that steps will need to be taken to ensure any potential conflict between different competing new economic hubs is avoided [iii].

It was noted that Stratford City and the IBC/MPC are likely to become employment anchors, ideally, some hoped, with flexible employment to encourage a mix of types and activities and to reflect medium to long-term phasing. It was felt that a good model was of high trip generating uses clustered in local centres and hubs [iii].

A volunteering and employment route map: It has been suggested that a route map to signpost volunteering and jobs in individual boroughs would ensure a joined up integrated approach; such a system of signposting would show people existing opportunities in their area and places they can go to change their lives. It would be important to explain the offer, providing a clear outline of how to access projects and links locally with training providers. There are many different hooks, stakeholders felt, and different types of organisations that are part of legacy, for example the hospitality industry, that could provide avenues into volunteering and jobs [xiii].

Housing: Affordable housing has been frequently mentioned as a priority of legacy [i, vii, xiii], but there are conflicting stakeholder opinions as to the levels of affordable and family housing, and the right combination of social and intermediate [i]. To get the right mix, it has been suggested that further discussions on housing models are required [iii]. Some existing local residents are sceptical or concerned as to whether they will be able to afford to live in the area in legacy, either in new housing or as a result of existing property price/rent rises [vii, ix].

Stakeholders believe that homes should meet the needs of the current and future residents [xiii], and the LMF should avoid creating isolated housing developments with no transport or facilities nearby [x].

Sheltered accommodation or specialised housing for the elderly has also been mentioned as a specific need [ix, x].

Accessible provision of sporting venues and facilities for the community: The major concern across stakeholders and consultations around sports facilities was that they be accessible to everyone in the community in legacy (not just elite athletes) [i, x, xi, xiii]. The Aquatics Centre and Velodrome/Cycling facilities were singled out as needing to cater to the needs of the community [xiii].

Groups specifically mentioned as needing to be remembered and catered for were elderly people [x] and disabled people [i].

It was also mentioned that the sporting venues in legacy, including open spaces, will need to be carefully thought about and planned, so that each community use and multi-faceted facility will not be in direct competition with each other [iii].

Priority concerns for some stakeholders were no net loss of community facilities [i, x] and that sports and community facilities should be affordable for all in legacy [xiii].

Sports facilities should be varied and accessible and multi-use facilities should be able to incorporate a series of functions and uses [xiii].

Some stakeholders felt that if good, accessible training facilities are built in the legacy this will assist in community integration and the regeneration of East London [xiii].

Young people in Hackney have expressed a desire for the following facilities: a multi-purpose youth club; accessible low cost sports facilities; a bike track; cinemas; a boxing club; a skateboard park; motocross; bowling; and pay facilities for young children [vii].

It was suggested that a way to maximise the possible uses for stadiums were using them as sports academies, a cluster of medicine and related sports sciences [x]. Commercial uses for venues were also put forward, i.e. high quality, flexible office area space, education for media cluster and sports venues for profitable activities such as sports health, training, football academies, etc. [x].

Single delivery structure for sporting venues: Some stakeholders felt that the sporting venues need to work together within a single delivery structure in order to create a visitor destination. This should, stakeholders felt, be achieved as part of the LMF and business planning process; establishing a cohesive vision and strategy for the venues and Park to work together as a well connected single attraction; if a single delivery structure is not created conflict may arise and the venues may work against each other which will fail to create a viable and commanding visitor destination [iii].

Local centres/hubs: The LMF could focus on creating a heart or hub of a new urban district for the surrounding communities (including those created by adjacent fringe masterplans) and wider London, as the area currently lacks a real centre. This hub however, is most likely to be at Stratford City and there is a perceived need to ensure that Stratford Town Centre provides a good downtown retail offer and anchor and is not overshadowed by the Stratford City development [iii].

The area between Stratford City mall, the Aquatics Centre and the Stadium has been identified as a potential major new hub for the area, and the plaza in front of the Aquatics Centre as a very significant new urban space [iii].

Adaptability: The ability of a place to reinvent itself, to adapt and change over time to meet future uses and needs has been identified as key in several stakeholder discussions [iii, x]. It has been anticipated that conflict may arise over the provision of adaptable and dual usage buildings

as opposed to the development of 'quick and easy' single purpose buildings that will not adapt over time [iii].

Industry-Led Mixed Use Development: A conflict has been identified between support for industry-led mixed use development (from strategic and community organisations) and objections to and concern about that prospect [i].

Culture: Some stakeholders felt that the area needed the development of a large civic or cultural institution which would encourage visitors from communities within walking distance and London as a whole (and which would ideally be linked to other activities on site e.g. media industries). Others felt that culture needs to be spontaneous and not forced by the static provision of buildings and institutions. It has been considered important that Stratford City (a likely local 'hub') is reconciled with any large scale cultural institution so they do not have a detrimental effect on each other [iii].

Stakeholders have suggested that the following need to be done:

- Support East London's artistic community by offering affordable working spaces for artists, active artistic options and a 'Creation Centre' where large-scale artistic/cultural infrastructure can be created [x].
- Define target groups to work out what needs to be developed in terms of culture [x].
- Develop business plans for cultural activities/developments and involve key stakeholders [iii].
- Generate a new nighttime economy in East London, through new cinemas, theatres, restaurants, cafes and bars in the area [iii].
- Include community or cultural anchors (cultural places, meeting places etc.) to complement and balance the sporting anchors: these should be commensurate with the number of new residents [iii].
- Develop a local tourist offer that goes beyond the Games and sits alongside the cultural offer, incorporating hotel developments to encourage investment and more local jobs in this industry [iii].

Health impact: Around a third of those asked at Newham's Big Sunday event thought the Games could improve health and encourage people to take up new sports. Of these, women were more likely than men to say that improving health would be an important effect of the Games. Improve Health was also the second most popular option for those working part-time, the unemployed, students and those retired whereas for those working full-time it was the fifth most mentioned item [v].

Social infrastructure: It has been suggested that key social infrastructure issues need to have a heightened profile [ii], particularly around the financial implications for the provision and timing of

facilities. There has been consensus among certain stakeholders that social infrastructure should be located to have the optimum catchment area and role in creating integrated communities. These locations should, it is felt, ideally disregard borough boundaries and the 'red line' boundary of the Olympic zone. However, for this to be deliverable, agreements and special arrangements will need to be in place between the relevant authorities, as early as possible to inform the masterplanning process. This will require high level discussions between the relevant authorities [iii].

2.2 Local activities

Key uses: Residential and retail uses, sports facilities and tourist attractions were drawn out as key features [xiv, xvi]. Refining the sports theme, the development of sports academies has been suggested as an alternative to traditional forms of higher education [xiv].

Social infrastructure: Social infrastructure, and particularly health and education facilities, were mentioned [xiv]. Creating and promoting an aspirational “eco lifestyle that heals rather than harms” was also suggested [xiv].

Low-carbon energy: The use and promotion of low-carbon forms of energy-generation, in particular combined heat and power (CHP), and other green technologies, was advocated, as the promotion of the area as a centre for green-technology industries [xiv].

Economy: “A modern, mixed economy” is a good way of describing the overall suggestions for the kinds of business that it was said should be supported in legacy [xiv]. Office and other workspaces could be provided for clusters of large businesses and SMEs in the media, creative and cultural sectors – stimulated by the IBC/MPC legacy [xiv]. It was also suggested that small businesses and start ups, specialists in green technologies and next generation entrepreneurs linked into universities, should benefit in legacy [xiv].

Arts and culture: The Rich Mix arts centre in Shoreditch was cited as an example which could be built on to attract cultural talent too progressive for established London arts scene [xiv]. Young people also made several creative suggestions about specific features that they would like to see, including “a brand new chocolate factory”, “an amazing water world” and a “swimming pool for dogs” [xvi].

People: A key finding of one consultation report was that for the broader business community, the individual elements within the site are less important than the overarching story around improvements to infrastructure, local workforce and environment [xiv]. Legacy, it was said, will be “as much about people as it is about places” [xiv].

London Education Centre: Interviews with East London schools, community-based organisations, and strategic bodies such as the GLA and the LDA reveal strong support for a London Education Centre in the Olympic Park proposed by the University of East London. It is envisaged that the centre would be legacy use of the Games-time “One Planet Pavilion” [xvii].

2.3 Pan-London consultations

Opportunities for work and training: In consultation, the London Boroughs of Tower Hamlets, Waltham Forest and Hackney have expressed the hope that local people will benefit from training and employment as a result of the Games and legacy, and that economic prosperity will result [xx].

Hackney would like to roll out an extended job brokerage network for the media, IT, tourism and service sectors, and the London Borough of Waltham Forest will host a “one stop jobs shop” in Leyton, both boroughs hoping to assist people in capitalising on opportunities presented by legacy [xx].

As well as just providing jobs, the hope has been emphasised that the Games and legacy will raise aspirations, increase the take up of training, and ultimately generate opportunities for groups living in the five boroughs to realise high quality employment [xxiii]. The need for these jobs to be sustainable in the long-term has also been mentioned [xxii, xxiii].

The opportunity to raise awareness of barriers faced by disabled people attempting to take advantage of employment and training opportunities has also been recognised [xx].

There is an aspiration to prove that the Games can create long-term wealth by creating thriving businesses and uplifted communities with a “can do” spirit [xxii].

Young people’s views of safety: In an online survey, young people felt the following make London’s spaces and places feel really safe for young people: police (63.2%), clear views of what’s around you (54.6%), good street lighting (51.1%), CCTV cameras (49.1%), clear paths and pavements (44.5%) [xviii]. In the same survey, “personal safety” received the highest number of “very important” answers (86.3%) as to how important certain things are for making London a good city for young people [xviii].

Health and well-being: In an online survey, young people felt the following were really important to make a place more comfortable and pleasant for young people: play and sports facilities (68.1%), shelters (52.3%), green landscaping (49.2%), public toilets (45.6%), places to sit (44%), performance spaces (43.9%), public art (35.6%), welcoming signs (23.8%) [xviii].

While it has been suggested that sports facilities will be a welcome benefit, it was also said that healthy lifestyles rather than sport per se should be the goal. For older people, for example, sport may not be an appropriate way of increasing physical activity [xxii, xxiii].

Some thought that employment should also be considered as a major factor in determining health [xxiii].

Use of venues in legacy: The London Borough of Newham has spoken of a sustainable stadium as a key component of legacy benefits. It believes that to be sustainable the stadium needs regular use by an anchor tenant such as a major football club, and that use for football would not

prevent the stadium being used for other events, such as the World Athletics Championships. It has expressed a belief that a 20-year events programme should be secured for the legacy stadium and that any commercial operation of the stadium should be balanced with community and borough uses, including large-scale community-based cultural events. As such, Newham has expressed a desire that the ongoing feasibility study for the stadium be driven by the long-term legacy and not by the use in the Games. The borough has voiced concern that reducing the capacity of the stadium from 80,000 to 25,000 seats post-Games will make it more difficult to bid for future events [xx].

Newham has also expressed concern that the Aquatics Centre will not be appropriate for community use, and that provision for 'leisure water' is not included in the design of the centre because of capital cost and site constraints [xx].

An attractive, affordable built environment: Stakeholders responding to a survey from the London Thames Gateway Forum expressed their hopes as including a "nicer built environment", more social homes for rent, and the conversion of the Olympic Village into affordable housing [xxii].

Culture: The Host Boroughs have expressed concern that there is a risk that opportunities for a wider cultural legacy could be overlooked in the legacy planning process, and that limited resources will be available for cultural programmes [xx].

3. Parklands, Public Realm and Linkages

3.1 Formal consultations

Public realm: Stakeholders have felt that the public realm needs to be a beautiful space which is an attraction in its own right and that it should be flexible and able to evolve with time and cater for all age groups [xiii].

Respondents (172 on canvass cards) to a survey in Stratford City stated that they use public open spaces mainly for the following: walk through on journey, relaxing, sitting around, shopping, people watching, go for a walk in green spaces and get fresh air, do something with the kids, meet friends, having a cup of tea or coffee, eating out, exercising, jogging, dog walking, hanging around, entertainment, having a cigarette, waiting, going for a picnic [iv].

In the same survey, the following are among the most mentioned as felt to be most often missing from public spaces: nice seating, toilets, space for children, activities, entertainment, events, exhibitions, youth centres, something for people to do, nature, trees, grass, flowers, sculptures, fountains, maintenance, cleanliness, more dust bins, cafes, places to have some food, security, police presence, lighting, more space, some shelter against the weather, covered walkways, signage, friendly people [iv].

Safety and security in public spaces were a top concern for most people in the Stratford City survey. Good maintenance of the public realm was also considered vital. Seating, public toilets and spaces for children to play were felt to be often missing in public spaces. Events and entertainment were also mentioned. Overall it was felt that public spaces should offer something for everyone [iv].

It has been suggested that the area between Stratford City mall, the Aquatics Centre and the Stadium has the potential to be a major new hub for the area – the plaza in front of the Aquatics Centre is a very significant new urban space for the area [iii].

Connectivity (in general): Many stakeholders have expressed a desire for legacy to improve connectivity and develop accessible and extensive transport links, including local bus networks [x]. It has been suggested that by ensuring issues such as connectivity and severance, type and integration of industry and social infrastructure, have a heightened profile, there might be increased public focus and debate on these key issues [ii]. Conversely, concerns have been expressed over the creation of isolated housing developments with no transport or facilities nearby [x].

It has been suggested that improving linkages could have many benefits. Specific suggestions have been to remove physical barriers dividing the affluent City fringe from what are seen as the impoverished communities in East London [x, xiii]. Stakeholders have felt that any new amenities, venues, park, waterways and transport must be permeable to ensure they are not perceived as physical and social barriers.

Some stakeholders have stressed the importance of strong physical links to Eton Manor, and that the legacy facilities on this site should unlock the connection between the major legacy sports venues in the Park. Stakeholders felt that the Velopark creates an opportunity to shorten the 'mental' distance to Eton Manor and the Hackney Marshes beyond [iii].

Cycling and walking links: Some stakeholders would like to see improved connectivity/accessibility such as improved cycle/pedestrian routes and links [i].

Stakeholders have emphasised the importance of ensuring a cohesive urban fabric, but have acknowledged that delivering it through infrastructure connections from key interchanges into and across the Olympic area may be in conflict with creating and maintaining good pedestrian and cycle access to the Park and area for all new homes [iii].

It has been suggested that there could be conflicts between a stated desire to create shared surfaces and the intention that cycle facilities must not be created on footways [i]. Another challenge that has been identified is catering for cyclists while trying to detract motorcycles [xiii].

Links with other fringe masterplans: It has been pointed out that the fringe masterplans will generate a substantial residential community adjacent to the Olympic area, and the question asked: at the moment it is not clear what will provide a focus and structure for all this new residential development – could the LMF create a real heart or centre for the surrounding communities? Some have suggested that all of these new homes should have access to the Park and Olympic area in order to develop a cohesive urban fabric [iii].

Consultation has found that masterplanning for the area around Leyton has not progressed as far as the other Olympic fringe masterplans, but that it is hoped that this area will have excellent links to the Olympic village and the new school. A brief is being prepared for a masterplan to ensure this (predominantly residential) area is connected with the Olympic area and its uses, and has a good relationship with Stratford City [iii].

Waterways: The different character of the waterways in the Olympic area (and the surrounding areas) could, some stakeholders have felt, be the 'unique selling point' of the area [iii]. Some stakeholders feel that plans should maximise water features and proximity to River Thames [x], and that waterways need to become active once again; the park should encourage river traffic and boat life, bringing back continuity, biodiversity, refuge points for wildlife and providing a variety of water course types. That this may help on other issues such as security and anti-social behaviour, if people are using the waterways at a variety of times, has also been mentioned [xiii].

Some stakeholders have identified a potential conflict between "waterways integrated with new development to create high value development sites" and the aspiration to "minimise permanent habitat disruption and protect the natural environment" [i].

Consultation has also found a potential discrepancy between intentions that "Olympic bridges across waterways should remain in Legacy" and that "Legacy should have minimal Olympic bridges across waterways" [i].

Particular issues around sewage have been raised in consultation. It has been asked whether (with the river Lea no longer tidal) the river will clean itself, and concerns over the ecological

implications of this have been raised. Concerns, too, have been raised, about what people perceive as the limited consultation before this decision was made [xiii].

Park management: Consultation has found a range of suggested models of ownership and management for parks. Some stakeholders have felt that parks must be managed and cater for all and that this could be achieved with a proactive approach, providing a program of activity (including for volunteers), with a diversity of use and type of park [xiii].

It has been suggested that the park should enable flexibility for change and be adaptable [xiii].

A Park Trust approach for long term funding has been articulated at consultation. The features and benefits of such a model have been seen to be as follows:

- ensures whole life costs are considered [x];
- funding should be allocated now, earning interest for Olympic Legacy Park until the moment comes to draw-down the funds [x];
- endowment for management costs: up-front capital sum to generate life-time income stream; Park trust would allow involvement of multiple stakeholders as trustees [x].

It has been noted that all the land is currently in public ownership, and felt that this is of great benefit for the public. The question has been asked: How will we adapt to new issues in the future of the park and how can we create new groups or facilities to help cater for these? Some stakeholders feel that an established model needs to be set up to generate community engagement and look after both the venues and public realm. Stakeholders have felt it important to ensure developments that cannot generate revenue exist [xiii].

It has been noted that the park should contain toilet and café facilities, and suggested that social and community facilities could link together and help break existing barriers between isolated communities [xiii].

Public art: On a number of occasions during a consultation in Stratford City it was mentioned that the public spaces offer good opportunities for public art. Public art was suggested, for instance, in connection to water features, lighting, street furniture and paving. Stakeholders would also like to have some temporary arts features like community exhibitions, installations, urban interventions or performances. It is felt that public art could generate a strong local identity and community pride as well as potential for involvement. Public art has also been considered a good tool to connect with the area's history [iv]. At the Legacy Launch event many of these themes were repeated, notably the feeling that introducing art within the wider park area can create opportunities in encouraging engagement, unlocking ideas and generating a sense of ownership [xiii].

Examples/comparators: Below are existing places which have been mentioned as useful negative and positive examples for the design team to look to:

- London Fields has been cited as a good example of a successful park, it contains cycle and pedestrian paths, shared and open space, a Lido, children's facilities and it is accessible [xiii];

- Mile End Park – negative: the park is not a destination, it is a throughway [xiii];
- Victoria Park: space [xiii];
- Hackney Marshes – negative: blocked views [xiii];
- A selection of favourite public spaces from a consultation in Stratford City: Stepney Park, Regents Park, Green Park, Hampstead Heath, Lloyds Park, West Ham Park, St James Park, Victoria Park, Greenwich, Hyde Park, Epping Forest, Trafalgar Square, Leicester Square, Covent Garden, Richmond, China Town, Stratford Park, Alexandra Palace, Meridian Square, Newham Park, Borough Market, Camden Market [iv];
- Good waterways examples include Stockley Park, Birmingham, Amsterdam, St. Katherine s Dock [x].

Environmental impacts/biodiversity in the park: Stakeholders have expressed concern that biodiversity and ecology is protected and, indeed, reinstated in the park [i, xiii]. Specific concerns have been registered around park lighting at night destroying the unique habitats of bats [i], and, among young people in Hackney, the loss of trees and animal habitats [vii].

Inclusiveness and accessibility: Key concerns raised about inclusiveness and accessibility at consultations have been around: the provision of play space for all ages, ensuring public transport is provided, and that disabled access to the park as a whole, but particularly green space, is designed into legacy. It has been suggested that it is also important to tell people what they can and can't do in these areas so users feel safe, especially those with disabilities [xiii].

Allotments: It has been claimed that the replacement allotments are proposed to be located next to the busy A12 and under a wind turbine, whereas they were previously located between two rivers in a quiet and pleasant location. There is a desire to have this location reinstated in legacy [xiii].

Relationship with the wider Lower Lee Valley Park: In consultation around the future of the Lower Lea Valley Park, four general themes were frequently identified as being unique attributes of the Park and of already, or having the potential to become unique selling points: biodiversity, sport and recreation, heritage, water (which in many ways is an aspect of the previous three themes) [xii]. The consultation found that strengths of the Lower Lee Valley Park which are based on the legacy were sporting and recreation facilities.

Based in part on consultation, key opportunities identified within the Olympic Park zone include:

- Maintaining and enhancing the quality of offer for the existing Authority operated sports facilities at Lea Bridge Road, namely the Lee Valley Ice Centre, Lee Valley Riding Centre and the WaterWorks Golf Centre;
- Maintaining and enhancing the quality of the football provision on Hackney Marshes, St James Park and Low Hall;

- Incorporating the range of new sport facilities proposed within the Olympic Legacy Park, including the main Olympic Stadium, Aquatics Centre, VeloPark, Arena, Tennis Centre and Hockey Centre [xii].

There was also a worry that the Games would overshadow other areas in the Lee Valley Regional Park where it doesn't have an impact. On the other hand, the One Planet Pavilion in Olympic Park was felt to provide an opportunity to promote the whole Regional Park [xii].

Links with Stratford City: Stakeholders have suggested that links with Stratford City should be maximised [iii, x], and that the relationship between Stratford City and Stratford Town Centre is balanced and complementary [iii].

One identified potential conflict is that key stakeholders would look to remove the three-lane dual carriageway adjacent to Stratford City (which developers would aim to retain) to ensure a more permeable, people-friendly and aesthetic connection with that development [i, iii].

Consultation conducted for Stratford City has identified ideas and preferences regarding specific areas of public realm that will form part of the development: these are not listed in this report, but may wish to be considered as relevant and generically applicable in terms of local aspirations for public realm [iv].

3.2 Local activities

Benefits for businesses: Private sector businesses have identified the parkland, public realm and linkages as aspects of the Olympic site that they see as beneficial to their business. “Quick and easy access to the City, Canary Wharf and West End” was rated the second most important aspect (59%) in an online survey, and “new roads, bridges and pathways” came fifth (37%). “A new large urban park” was the 13th most important (16%), and the “network of canals and water frontage” was 15th (15%) [xiv].

Education Park: It has been suggested that the Olympic Park could be made into “a living piece of the national curriculum”, using archive material about the park to create an education project, possibly London-wide [xiv].

Public art: A desire that public art, and in particular sculptures, should be included in any legacy park was expressed by children aged 5-13 in consultation [xvi].

Bridges: Children have expressed a desire for bridges that are fun for them to walk over, such as a glass bridge or one that makes sounds when crossed [xvi].

Stakeholders have also suggested making an architectural statement through the bridges and connections that will be used to pull together the Lower Lea Valley [xiv].

Waterways: Some stakeholders are keen to use the waterways as the basis for developing a new London character, and as part of a modern transport solution [xiv].

3.3 Pan-London consultations

Green spaces: In a survey of 12-19 yr olds in London, 90.3% felt that green spaces (e.g. parks and gardens) are important to London and 57.1% felt that there are not enough green spaces in their area [xviii].

Public realm: The above survey also asked a range of questions about the public realm. After police (63.2%), young people felt the following design features can make London's spaces and places feel "really safe" for people their age: clear views of what's around you (54.6%), good street lighting (51.1%), CCTV cameras (49.1%), clear paths and pavements (44.5%) [xviii].

They felt the following were "really important" to make a place more comfortable and pleasant for people of their age: play and sports facilities (68.1%), shelters (52.3%), green landscaping (49.2%), public toilets (45.6%), places to sit (44%), performance spaces (43.9%), public art (35.6%), and welcoming signs (23.8%) [xviii].

Whilst "personal safety" received the highest number of "very important" answers (86.3%) as to how important certain things are for making London a good city for young people, the following were also seen as "very important": clean spaces and places (70.8%), a range of facilities (58.8%), and spaces and places that work for you (51.0%) [xviii].

The following issues related to public realm were rated as problems in young people's areas of London: litter (big problem 44.6%, small problem 47.3%), graffiti (big problem 35.0%, small problem 44.2%), dog poo (big problem 38.1%, small problem 41.9%), people urinating (big problem 27.0%, small problem 35.5%), abandoned cars and stuff (big problem 21.2%, small problem 36.9%), dirty pavements (big problem 39.4%, small problem 43.6%), and vandalism (big problem 45.5%, small problem 36.8%) [xviii].

Respondents felt the above problems could be improved by the following: more attractive litter bins (55.5%), more efficient street cleansing (73.0%), more public toilets (57.1%), on the spot fines for littering and people urinating (66.6%), and (the most popular choice) dedicated zones for graffiti (73.7%) [xviii].

Park management: It has been suggested that legacy parkland could be owned by a Community Land Trust [xxiii]. A vested community interest in the management of land going forward is seen as likely to create faith in the legacy process [xiii].

4. Infrastructure, Transport and Renewable Energy

4.1 Formal consultations

Integrated transport connections: There has been excitement expressed about the opportunities to improve transport and connectivity across the site and to the surrounding area [x]. Specifically, stakeholders have suggested that it would be desirable to remove the physical barriers currently perceived to be dividing an affluent City fringe from poorer communities in East London, and to create east-west links within the Olympic Park area and ensure connectivity north/south of the Thames [x, xiii]. Maximising transport links to Central London has also been suggested as important [x]. Further extension of the Docklands Light Railway has been suggested due to its perceived value and environmental benefits [xiii].

On the other hand, concern has also been expressed over the dangers of creating isolated housing developments with inadequate transport links and facilities nearby [x]. In order to help overcome this, it has been proposed that utilities and infrastructure corridors must be intrinsically planned so that no conflicts arise over connections and key interchanges [iii].

In terms of external linkages, stakeholders have suggested that the integration of the fringe masterplans with transport connections, and in particular key interchanges, will be fundamental in knitting together the urban fabric [iii].

It has been stated that roads should have a positive relationship with their surroundings and servicing roads should be carefully considered to reduce the impacts of disruption and to reduce conflicts [iii].

Integrating appropriate modal shares: Several potential challenges concerning provision for appropriate modal shares and accessibility have been identified in consultation. Consultation has identified a desire for improved connectivity and accessibility to be provided in legacy, through measures such as improved cycle and pedestrian routes and links [i].

There are conflicting desires to have no new road infrastructure provided for private cars (with funding diverted to public transport improvements), and for new infrastructure to be provided as required to ensure adequate connectivity [i]. Similarly, the question has been asked: how will large-scale infrastructure connections from key interchanges into and across the Olympic area be provided, alongside ensuring all new homes will have good pedestrian and cycle access to the Park and area, to ensure a cohesive urban fabric? [iii].

Other specific concerns have involved dual carriage-way retention and sporting venues' transport requirements. Key stakeholders would prefer to remove the three-lane dual carriageway adjacent to the Stratford City development (in order to ensure a more permeable, people-friendly and aesthetic connection between Stratford City and the Legacy Park), while the Westfield developers would aim to retain it [i, iii]. In terms of transport infrastructure provision for sporting venues, it has been pointed out that sporting venues and the parkland are likely to create spectator demand

which will need to be met by appropriate transport arrangements. If this requirement is not met sufficiently, it has been suggested, conflicts may arise relating to accessibility of the different venues [iii].

Congestion: In a survey at an event in Newham, attendees were asked what concerns they had about the Olympic and Paralympic regeneration work. The biggest concern was traffic congestion, with three out of five respondents mentioning it. The second highest (with 23%) was the related point of burden on local transport. Around one in five are concerned that not all areas of Newham will benefit equally and one in twelve are concerned that the area will change too much. These concerns do not vary with age, sex, or ethnicity and are the same for both Newham residents and non-residents [v].

Infrastructure demands of the wider area: Stakeholders have raised the potential issue that developments surrounding the LMF area may have assumed access to existing services and facilities; this means that a comprehensive understanding of the extent to which this is the case should be gained to avoid the double counting of existing capacity and a consequent conflict over their use [iii]. Put another way, it has been suggested that the LMF must generate adequate infrastructure for the wider area [x].

Waste infrastructure: 80% of Stratford businesses asked in one survey have said it is important to recycle business waste. Two thirds would be supportive of a voluntary ban on plastic carrier bags, and 80% would consider purchasing more sustainable packaging alternatives and would be prepared to purchase collectively [vi].

A study has found that just under half of waste thrown away in Newham is food waste; over 80% of waste is recyclable or compostable, as long as a simple two-stream method is used; the most important materials to switch are coffee cups, food containers and glass. A pilot public place recycling project in Newham demonstrated that 75% of waste/recycling went in the correct container; 84% of visitors knew that they could recycle and how/what to recycle; and the best way of communicating with people is via information on bins [vi].

Stakeholders are keen to see good waste management and water conservation achieved [i].

4.2 Local activities

Benefits for businesses: In an e-survey, private sector businesses have identified infrastructure and transport themes as the top three most important aspects of the Olympic site they see as beneficial to business [xiv].

Transport and linkages: The most important aspect as rated above by businesses (60%) was “excellent transport links to mainland Europe”, and the second most important aspect (59%) was “quick and easy access to the City, Canary Wharf and West End”. The fifth most important aspect (37%) was “new roads, bridges and pathways” would be beneficial to their business [xiv].

It has been suggested that waterways should be part of a modern transport solution [xiv].

Utility infrastructure: The third most important aspect beneficial to business in the aforementioned survey was “new high quality utility infrastructure” (40%) [xiv].

Energy and sustainability: A desire has been expressed not only to invest in clean energy solutions, but also to promote the area as a centre for green-technology industries and to create and promote an aspirational “eco-lifestyle” [xiv].

4.3 Pan-London consultations

Transport: In an online survey, 12-19 year olds' stated means of getting around their area of London included 91.3% bus, 84.7% walking, 56.8% tube, 33.0% overland train and 28.2% bicycle [xviii].

The London Borough of Hackney wants to see much needed investment in North London Line services and extension of the East London Line [xx].

Transport has been identified as an area which should be “eco-friendly” [xxii] and one in which cross-referencing will be necessary to ensure sustainability is delivered [xxiii].

Waterways: Stakeholders are keen to see revitalised and viable waterway transport, which could transform the Lower Lea Valley into “an Amsterdam of East London” and make the Bow Backwaters accessible [xxii].

Energy and sustainability: The dropping of a small number of specific sustainability commitments made in the Candidate File has caused concern; for example, the capability of future energy self-sufficiency of the Athlete's Village [xxiii].

5. City Form and Types

5.1 Formal consultations

Place-making: Stakeholders have stated that legacy is about place-making: the creation of a new city district that will be a place to live, work, learn and play [xiii]. There have been a range of suggestions as to what a place is and how it should be created.

At the legacy launch, stakeholders in a round-table discussion felt that a sense of a place can relate to sound, smell, scale (e.g. width of streets), density and height relationships, public realm and accessibility (pedestrian or vehicular). They felt that sounds are evocative (for example, Big Ben tolls and it means something different to each person). In summary, People + Activity = Character of place [xiii].

More specifically, other stakeholders have thought that the Olympic area will be a new gateway to the city of London, and a place that will deliver new national treasures. They have asked what role this place will play in the metabolism of the city, and how it is possible to create a place that builds on the character of the area [iii].

Attracting investment has been seen as a benefit of the creation of a place with a variety of destinations and attractions. At the same time, stakeholders have felt it will be important to enhance and celebrate locally historic features and landmarks, ensuring local distinctiveness, and that local businesses should also be safeguarded to retain the historical context and character of the area [xiii].

Some have suggested that key interventions or ‘nuggets’ could be used as catalysts/triggers to establish development after the Games and that these interventions could be a key part of the transition phasing that could be planned over a set time period. However, others feel that to allow organic growth to happen in the area, establishing a unique built, social and cultural form is the best way to establish successful and sustainable legacy communities [iii].

Factors to consider in setting densities: In comments about housing density, stakeholders have suggested a number of different factors to take into account.

Some have suggested that the density and intensity of people living in, working in and visiting the LMF and surrounding area is crucial to its success and attractiveness [iii]. This has been argued from the point of view of attracting both visitors [iii] and residents [i]. On the other hand, it has also been felt that the LMF needs to encourage and ensure a variety of scales, mixes and densities of residential development, so that the Olympic area is not characterised by blanket high density, but rather good design and varying scales which can help meet the needs of all social groups [iii].

The need to take into account development around the site when making assumptions about density requirements has been identified. Specifically, it has been suggested that changes to the proposed housing densities in Stratford City may affect local housing supply. Equally, some have

felt that there is currently incomplete information on the local and regional housing markets and likely housing demand. Therefore, the question has been asked, how can the need for the LMF team to be imminently provided with a housing basis on which to work be reconciled with the importance of working with complete baseline information? [iii] The emerging proposals for the Lower Lea Valley and other surrounding areas, which suggest that the Olympic zone will be surrounded by an environment dominated by high density, predominantly residential large scale developments, has led to consideration of the likely implications for the LMF [iii]. One suggested implication is that there is the potential to create sustainable communities that can limit or reduce the public transport demand, by having housing located within walking or cycling distance to surrounding employment [iii, xiii].

Perceived timetable issues surrounding housing density targets have also been raised, based on the assumption that physical and social Integration of housing to existing areas is crucial to the success of the LMF. The question that has been raised here is: is it more effective for the LMF team to look at suitable building typologies and unit numbers, based in part on evolving developments surrounding the LMF area, before considering housing density targets, or will the time necessary to inform this iterative process conflict with the project timetable? Given the large number of variables that will affect the appropriate density of a particular site, assigning a density target may pre-empt important urban design considerations [iii].

Another view expressed has been that it may be wrong to start by considering housing densities first, and that a design team should instead look at the type of place it wants to create first, and develop approaches which are appropriate for different areas of the site [iii].

Perceiving that there are underlying assumptions of extreme densities and a significant proportion of family housing onsite, some stakeholders have asked how housing can be delivered in a way that satisfies both requirements. They have suggested that, whilst towers and large blocks may satisfy density assumptions, they may cause conflict by not offering the type of housing desired by families [iii].

Work done by the Mayoral office and English Partnerships regarding space standards has been mentioned as possibly having an impact on densities and development for the Olympic area. Concern has been raised that unit sizes should be generous, to support and foster stable communities (and avoid dominance of transient buy-to-let market) [iii].

It has also been suggested that it may be possible to develop a model for the LMF that will ensure requirements for affordable housing and family housing at lower densities are met [iii].

The Host Boroughs and the public sector have expressed concern that high densities may lead to the loss of green space which would otherwise be safeguarded [x].

Permeability: Stakeholders have emphasised the importance of ensuring a cohesive urban fabric, but have acknowledged that delivering it through infrastructure connections from key interchanges into and across the Olympic area may be in conflict with creating and maintaining good pedestrian and cycle access to the Park and area for all new homes [iii].

For example, key stakeholders would look to remove the three-lane dual carriageway adjacent to Stratford City (which developers would aim to retain) to ensure a more permeable, people-friendly and aesthetic connection with that development [i, iii].

Family and affordable housing: The Place Making Working Group has discussed what quantum of family and affordable housing should be provided, especially in light of PPS3: Housing (2004). Provision of these forms of housing may be in conflict with the high-spec quality residential development that is suggested to be situated around the park. Some stakeholders feel quality residential development should surround the key fixes in order to develop a strong sense of enclosure and sense of place [iii].

Adaptability and change over time: A suggestion which has emerged across consultations is that the LMF should establish the parameters for an area which allows for flexibility, reinvention, and adaptation over time [iii, xiii]. There have been several comments about barriers to this, and ways in which it might be achieved.

In terms of barriers, it has been felt that conflict may arise over the provision of adaptable and dual usage buildings versus the development of 'quick and easy' single purpose buildings that will not adapt over time [iii].

Stakeholders have felt it important to understand how places that are now viewed as successful, but which have struggled in the past (e.g. Brick Lane, Borough), have changed over time. Proposed questions have been: what made the difference? Are they really as successful for residents as they are for visitors? [iii]

Another way of making a place which can evolve, it has been suggested, is by responding to existing context. Stakeholders have stated that if developments are built around the existing communities and some existing streets, there will be a gradual transformation. It is desirable that designs should have dual functionality, working on both a functional and social level [xiii].

The creation of urban centres: Some stakeholders have suggested that the LMF could focus on creating a heart or hub of a new urban district for the surrounding communities and wider London [iii]. On the other hand, it has been felt that the LMF is a very large space that can accommodate a range of places and urban forms within it [iii]. Some stakeholders see London as a city of villages, and have said that it is important to look at villages across London and consider how they are constructed and composed: what are the components that make these places successful? [iii]

Some feel that a hub or heart at Stratford City could compete for visitors with a new cultural institution. It is felt to be important that these two are reconciled so they do not have a detrimental effect on each other [iii].

It has been pointed out that other areas such as Bromley by Bow and Sugar House Lane are key development areas, and felt that they must complement the LMF plans for the Olympic area. Some stakeholders have emphasized what they see as the importance of these areas remaining distinct from each other and 'individual' within the valley as a whole [iii].

Fringe masterplan considerations: The importance of several masterplans for areas surrounding the LMF has been suggested:

- Sugarhouse Lane and Three Mills area: a public-sector-led masterplan is now commencing. However, a private developer has already progressed a scheme for comprehensive redevelopment and very high densities, intending to submit as a planning application next year. Some stakeholders see it as essential that the future scenario for this area is well coordinated with LMF and Olympic fringe strategy for wider area, and that it is a highly significant site for the future of this area due to cultural, media and arts industries accommodated, and its very distinctive and valuable industrial heritage character [iii].
- Stratford High Street: many development proposals are already in the planning system, and the masterplan is nearing completion to provide stronger urban design coordination for these. One issue identified is how to ensure that the private sector here contributes to the vision and strategy for the Olympic and fringe area, and does not undermine it [iii].
- Hackney Wick and Fish Island will be a focal area with the development of the central area around the station. The north of this area will be predominantly mixed-use residential with a key relationship with the IBC/MPC. The main Fish Island area will retain its industrial use and will focus on accommodating high quality industrial activities which service London and the surrounding area, including emerging industrial technologies relating to sustainability issues. It has been felt by stakeholders that connections with LMF area must be optimised [iii].

Comparators and examples: The following have been identified as useful negative or positive examples of places which the design team can look to [xiii]:

- Shoreditch, Hoxton. Positives: mix of uses and people, 24 hour activity. Negatives: difficult to replicate, as it has evolved over time.
- Gunwharf Quays, Portsmouth Harbour. Positives: Waterfront Development, bars, restaurants, shops. Negatives: Expensive housing, artificial. Tagged onto existing communities, not integrated.
- Durham and the Isle of Dogs: examples of areas where water can embrace or divide place and communities.
- Canning Town: people leave the doors to their houses open. But Canning Town and A13 is not welcoming.
- Shropshire: quiet, community.
- Sutton: offers a variety of parkland.
- Area near the Reichstag in Berlin: open, safe, clean, bridges, managed urban green space.
- La Défense, Paris: a new office district that has a visual access to the Arc de Triomphe. Large office building linked to residential however the linkages are poor.
- Lyme Regis, Dorset: Limited vehicular access.
- Limehouse: positive juxtaposition of things.

- Edinburgh: when you are looking up at the castle, there are lots of events. However there is a lot of traffic on Princes Street.
- Glasgow: has a sense of soul.
- Munich Garden Festival: carbon neutral, organic, 9000 new homes, employment opportunities.
- North Shields: new urban park but with no budget to maintain.
- Hampton Court Palace: the grounds are used to hold flexible events and functions, visionary.
- London: has a lack of community connections, opinions of London are subjective and dependant on personal experience.
- Clays Lane: example of successful courtyards.

5.2 Local Activities

Private sector aspirations: Consultation with the private sector has identified an aspiration for sustainable communities connected to each other and the rest of London, with adequate social infrastructure, rather than developments that are isolated or defined by the “red line”. This aspiration also includes “eco-advanced” homes that in turn stimulate an “eco-lifestyle” [xiv].

5.3 Pan-London Consultations

Sustainability standards: Concern has been expressed that standards relating to sustainability which have been expressed in plans are not sufficiently challenging, and may not be seen as exemplary by 2012 (for example, the commitment to build domestic homes in line with the Code for Sustainable homes Level 4). It has been recommended that these standards are reviewed on an ongoing basis to see if they can be raised [xxiii].

Safety: A survey of 12-19 yr olds in London asked them a range of questions about the built environment and their local area. After police (63.2%), young people felt the following design features can make London's spaces and places feel “really safe” for people their age: clear views of what's around you (54.6%), good street lighting (51.1%), CCTV cameras (49.1%), clear paths and pavements (44.5%) [xviii].

Hackney Wick: The London Borough of Hackney envisages the creation of a new mixed-use urban neighbourhood at Hackney Wick, integrated with Canary Wharf and Stratford City and incorporating the IBC/MPC and the new river park [xx].

6. Planning Program

6.1 Formal consultations

Legacy Vision: There has been a repeated demand for a clearer shared vision and common identity for the development of legacy [ii, x]. This is seen as essential to deliver a smooth transition [ii] and to involve the private sector [x].

Consultation and Engagement: The need for genuine consultation and engagement, with the local community and at all phases of the LMF, has been a strong emergent theme of much consultation to date. This has been repeatedly identified as crucial to the success of legacy [i, ii, vii, ix, x, xiii].

This involvement should extend beyond standard community consultation processes to include direct engagement, practical participation and continual collaboration during the development of the LMF and beyond. In addition, this workstream needs to consider private sector involvement alongside political engagement so that the resulting engagement strategy is not exclusive to people and communities alone [ii].

It has been suggested that the community could be asked to define the ‘nuggets’ or special places that are already surrounding the site [iii].

The active involvement of young people has been stressed as a priority, both by young people themselves and by others [ii, vii].

It is seen as important that illustrative outcomes (tangible statements and milestones) are provided at all key stages to ensure the community feel involved in the ongoing process and to demonstrate their views have been taken into account [xiii].

Communicating and providing information: Transparency and openness are seen as essential, particularly keeping open avenues of communication with local communities [ii, xiii].

Greater access to information about the bidding process and opportunities for small businesses has been requested [x].

Transition, phasing and timetable: The need to keep momentum after the Games has been identified [ii, x], but it has also been acknowledged that a successful legacy will not be achieved instantly. Transition phasing is therefore seen as highly important, and options for phasing land release, temporary venues and development platforms need to be explored [ii, iii].

One suggestion is that key interventions or ‘nuggets’ could be used as catalysts to establish development after the Games, playing a key role in the transition phasing that could be planned over a set time period. However, some people feel the ability to allow organic growth to happen in

the area, establishing a unique built, social and cultural form is the best way to establish successful and sustainable legacy communities [iii].

Engagement, communication, and management of access to the park during this transition phase are also seen as crucial [ii], as is the need to consider the timescale of delivery both socially and physically [xiii], and the phasing of employment to avoid the market being saturated [iii].

Timing with fringe masterplans: The timing of the LMF with the Olympic fringe masterplans is seen as key to ensure potential opportunities and synergies are not lost and conflicts between key development platforms are avoided. In particular, moves should be made to establish Stratford Town Centre before Stratford City [iii].

Partnerships and Collaboration: For the delivery of a successful legacy, effective partnerships and collaboration are seen as crucial. The partner forum has been seen as a positive step forward in maintaining and forging stronger team working for the development and implementation of the LMF and beyond [ii].

It has been proposed that innovative ways need to be found to involve all stakeholders [xiii], including the private sector [ii], public sector [x], Social Enterprises [x] and relevant authorities [iii].

Delivery Programme and Governance: A combination of an organic and flexible approach to planning, strong leadership and robust delivery mechanisms is seen as necessary [ii, iii, xiii]. It is felt that governance arrangements need to be discussed and debated now with an agreed vehicle for delivery put in place in the short term, after engagement with all partners [ii].

Some private sector stakeholders feel that a single body needs to be responsible, providing a strong lead to deliver the Legacy [x].

Single delivery structure for sporting venues: Some stakeholders felt that the sporting venues need to work together within a single delivery structure in order to create a visitor destination. This should, stakeholders felt, be achieved as part of the LMF and business planning process, establishing a cohesive vision and strategy for the venues and Park to work together as a well connected single attraction. If a single delivery structure is not created, conflict may arise and the venues may work against each other which will fail to create a viable and commanding visitor destination [iii].

Maximising value: Land disposal and planning framework issues are seen as key to maximise the value of the area [x].

A need has also been identified to understand of how much 'white' land is going to be available, since this land will be remediated and will deliver development platforms that are far more valuable than brownfield sites across London. These sites will need to be taken forward by key development partners [iii].

Funding: Host Boroughs have expressed concerns about lack of funding for Legacy [x], but it has been suggested that a revenue stream (that involves local communities) could be installed in order to fund community facilities and social infrastructure [xiii]. There is also a perceived need to work with funding institutes to allow flexible and versatile buildings for investment [iii], and to choose investment partners wisely [xiii].

6.2 Local activities

Private sector involvement and investment: The following key barriers to private sector involvement and investment, which need to be overcome if the vision for legacy is to be delivered, have been identified in an e-survey of private sector businesses [xiv]:

- “lack of information” (57%)
- “lack of influence” (37%)
- “site unsuitable” (25%)
- “internal factors” (16%)
- “poor RDI” (15%)
- “challenge of area” (9%)
- “negative media” (4%)

Amongst business an overall perception that decision-makers are currently removed from corporate agendas has been identified [xiv].

To build dialogue and collaboration, the private sector has been identified as looking for the following [xiv]:

- “an understandable process”
- “one leader or leadership group”
- “one first point of contact/one source for information”
- “clarity on roles and responsibilities of public bodies”
- “explanation of the financial opportunities/incentives”

Consultation and Engagement: Fundamental Architectural Inclusion’s *Bridging the Gap* has been identified as a successful means of educating and engaging with pupils in Key Stages 2 and 3 regarding their local area and the built environment, which may offer opportunities for future LMF consultation and engagement [xv].

6.3 Pan-London consultations

Consultation and Engagement: The need to learn from criticisms of previous consultations has been stressed: these criticisms have included timing (such as over the summer holiday period), short notice and consultation at a late stage in the development of plans, all of which can be barriers to meaningful engagement. It has been recommended that stakeholders are engaged at an early stage, that consultation processes be more open, transparent and inclusive, and that careful thought is given to how future engagement can include those at the margins such as homeless people, etc. [xxiii].

A 'Joint Community Engagement Strategy' operating across the ODA, LDA, LOCOG, GLA and Local Authorities has been proposed [xxi].

The London Borough of Newham has expressed concern that without stakeholder and end-user involvement from the earliest stages, the facilities could either preclude or make prohibitively expensive desirable legacy uses [xx].

Interlinking of themes and work programmes: Given the complexity of, for example, sustainability, many themes are interlinked and require judicious cross-referencing across work programmes to deliver [xxiii].

Partnerships and Collaboration: The London Borough of Waltham Forest aspires to work with the other host boroughs and the London Development Agency to help local people and businesses access Games-related opportunities [xx].

It has been suggested that a body should be formed comprising industry, commerce and the community sector to develop the land for long-term benefit and prove that Olympics can create long term wealth [xxii].

External agencies are seen as crucial to delivering a sustainable legacy. A need has been identified to involve the work of such agencies, which are outside the group of 2012 Key Stakeholder organisations, in contributing to future milestones [xxiii].

Appendix: list of sources

Formal consultations

i. Evolution Phase Task C – Issues Report, 2008

This report produced by the EDAW Consortium collates issues raised by stakeholders both throughout the LMF Evolution Phase (including the Vision Day held 20 September 2007 and the Place Making Working Group Sessions), and in previous consultation undertaken for the 2004 Olympic and Legacy planning permission, the 2007 Olympic, Paralympic and Legacy Transformation planning permission and the Lower Lea Valley (LLV) Opportunity Area Framework (OAPF).

This Consultation Baseline Findings report draws on those parts of the Issues Report which were based on previous consultation and stakeholder engagement: Issues List (Part 1), Initial analysis of previous consultation (part of Appendix 1), Vision Day Summary (Appendix 2) and Place Making Working Group – summary notes (Appendix 3).

ii. After the Games – Vision Day Summary, 2007

In summer 2007, during the preparation of the 'After the Games' Joint Position Statement, the LDA and ODA held a visioning event with legacy partners, to focus on the Legacy Masterplan Framework (LMF) and associated activities. A Vision Day was planned for the 20 September 2007, and was preceded by three pre-briefing sessions that brought partners together to share knowledge and discuss issues beforehand. On the Vision Day itself, over 100 people participated in discussion groups. An overview of the key themes that emerged in the three pre-briefing sessions and on the Vision Day itself is provided as an Appendix to the Evolution Phase Task C – Issues Report.

iii. Place Making Working Group summary notes, 2007

The Place Making Working Group formed one of three theme groups (the other two groups being Delivery and Community Engagement). In total four Place Making Working Group sessions were facilitated. These were attended by representatives from the host boroughs, key stakeholders and legacy partners. The sessions addressed creating a 'place for people' and communities, providing a sense of place and belonging. The scale and mix of residential development were debated, as well as issues surrounding the type and location of employment uses. Alongside these employment uses the type of retail offer that could be located in the area was discussed.

iv. Stratford City Fit for You? Project Report, Soundings, 2008

A community engagement project on public spaces in Stratford City was conducted in December 2007. Soundings was appointed by Westfield to carry out the project with the aim of engaging with a range of different age groups in order to understand different needs and demands with regard to public spaces and to come up with specific aspirations for the use and design of four public spaces within Zone 1 of Stratford City.

The consultation consisted of two workshop sessions with children aged between 6-12 from Discover Children Centre (27 participants), teenagers aged between 13-16 from Forestgate School (20 participants) and with people aged over 50 from St John's Church and the African Caribbean Voices Association (11 participants). A drop-in workshop (17 participants) was organised for adults and parents at the East London Childcare Centre "New Tec". In addition to the workshop sessions 172 people were involved in a "Canvass Card" consultation held over 2 days in Meridian Square. The respondents were asked about their favourite public spaces, what they use public spaces for and what makes a good public space for them.

v. Big Sunday Event, Survey of Participants, The London Borough of Newham, 2006

The Big Sunday event was primarily a large scale public consultation with the local population to both inform on the potential benefits the 2012 Games will bring to the borough and consult on various community initiatives and strategies. It was held on Sunday 5th February 2006 in Newham.

The event was attended by over 30,000 visitors, of these 25,735 registered for the event; 12,534 visitors aged 12 or over and 13,202 children aged under 12.

The survey contains registration data and registration questionnaires completed by over 12,000 people aged 12 or over, 3,058 shorter surveys were conducted on the day. The report's authors note that although the sample was not entirely representative of those who live in Newham the very large response gave a useful insight into the viewpoints of Newham residents on the Olympics.

vi. Measuring Our Success: Summary on Presentations of Commissioned Research 2007-2008, The NRF-2012 Research and Evaluation programme, 2008

This report summarises a range of studies commissioned by the London Borough of Newham's Corporate Research Unit. It also includes commissioned research which provided information from academic and applied research experts; and from residents of Newham.

It aimed to provide a robust evidence base of reliable data on which to build future 2012 Legacy research and evaluation, to support and translate into policy and operational decision-making in Newham, across a wide range of its service areas, on an ongoing basis.

The following individual reports from this summary contain consultation findings pertinent to legacy:

- *Local People's Engagement with Olympic Opportunities: Aspirations, Concerns and Barriers*, Dr Marie-Claude Gervais, Ethnos Research & Consultancy

- *Communications & Taking Park in Events & Activities: Survey*, Jacqui Banerjee / Anwen Page, Continental Research
- *Image of Newham: National Statistics Omnibus Survey*, November 2007
- *Stratford Town Centre: Pilot study on Recycling & Food Packaging Waste Management*, John Twitchen, Sauce Consultancy

vii. Hackney Schools at the Heart Programme, The Learning Trust, 2007-2008

The Learning Trust has summarised outputs relevant to legacy from the following series of events with young people:

1. 20 secondary school age young people went on an ODA Tour of the Olympics Site and then attended a workshop about Legacy Park (2007).
2. Gainsborough Legacy Planning. Two hour sessions for four weeks with two groups of six primary age pupils. Pupils learnt about basic geography of the Olympic area and their own area, and considered wider regeneration issues pertinent to Hackney and East London. They considered their own priorities within a regeneration context. They then planned uses for the Legacy Park and built two models. Models were not to scale and they did not work within existing plans. They were given local infrastructure as a given but the park area was presented, apart from waterways and transport, as a 'blank canvass'. Models were made from waste materials.
3. Geography Fieldwork. 80 secondary pupils have undertaken two years of fieldwork and studies related to the 2012 Games and Legacy, incorporated into their Year 8 geography studies.
4. Cardinal Pole research and film making. 30 Year 10 Pupils made a film about the Olympics and its Legacy called 'Our Future'.
5. Our Lady's Convent Secondary School has a link with a Science college in Beijing. 150 pupils are involved in this cross-curricular project which aims to improve language learning, international understanding and allow pupils to exchange information regarding how the Games is changing their respective cities.

viii. Consultation Report, London Borough of Waltham Forest, 2006

This report summarises the findings from a number of Olympic-themed events and conferences held by the London Borough of Waltham Forest. These targeted members of the general public, the business community, young people and the voluntary and community sector.

ix. London Borough of Tower Hamlets Community Plan and Budget Consultations, 2007/8

Quotes were collected from four borough wide workshops that attracted over 100 people to each. Statements in the form of fictional newspaper headings were presented to small groups. Once presented with the aspirational headline, residents were asked to say if the headline was important to them when thinking about a future Tower Hamlets, and what might need to happen for the community to reach that goal.

Further consultations also took place with WITHIN and the inter-faith forum. These were conducted differently to the Community Plan workshops. Both WITHIN and the Inter-faith forum were asked to comment on their aspirations for the future of Tower Hamlets.

The budget consultation was conducted by a short survey which was available to answer online and in East End Life in January 2008.

x. Annex 5: Stakeholder consultation and engagement, Olympic Legacy Park: Towards and Outline Business Plan, Grant Thornton Business Planning Consultation, 2007

Dialogue and Grant Thornton have held a number of consultations to support the outline business planning for the Park. As part of the business-planning process they completed a number of information gathering discussions, and have also collected views on the vision for the Park, from other organisations. The organisations canvassed were those assessed to be under-represented in the consultation process carried out in advance of the Olympic Park planning applications in January 2007. These were the business community, particularly Asian businesses and local SMEs, elderly people and social enterprises.

xi. Aquatics Centre Submission of Details, Technical Report – Statement of Participation, 2008

Prepared in support of a Reserved Matters submission for the London Aquatics Centre, this document sets out the ongoing consultation and communications programme and builds on that performed prior to the Outline Application.

A broad range of statutory and non-statutory stakeholders were consulted at a number of different events.

xii. Scenario Report, Lee Valley Regional Park Development Framework, 2007

This report provides a summary of the second stage of a wider (three stage) review of the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority's aspirations for the future management and development of the Lee Valley Regional Park.

It contains the outputs of a number of workshops held during the summer of 2007. Target stakeholders included: Members of the Authority; Officer representatives of riparian local authorities; Representatives of key stakeholder organizations; Employees of the Authority and landowners with significant land holding within the Park boundaries.

xiii. EDAW report and Beyond Green notes from Legacy Now Launch event, 2008

A one-day event held by London Development Agency, in close conjunction with legacy partners on 29th February 2008. The event's objective was to introduce key stakeholders to the then recently appointed masterplanning team. The round table discussion themes were Legacy Opportunities, Conceptualising a New Urban District and Venues and Public Realm.

Over 280 partners and stakeholders attended to engage in debate, to provide information on local events, activities and ideas or to find out more about the process.

Local activities

xiv. London Legacy 2020, East London Business Alliance, 2007

East London Business Alliance (ELBA) seeks to create possibilities in East London by connecting business to local people, alongside public and community partners, to enable social, economic and infrastructure change.

ELBA is working with local, city and national Government to help imagine and plan a "new generation London" on the site that will have hosted the 2012 Games.

This consultation findings are based on:

- In-depth interviews with 14 individuals from local public and private sector organisations (LB Newham; 5 Host Boroughs; TGLP; UEL; BioRegional; Sport England; LTGDC; LDA; Macquarie; UBS; Merlin Entertainment; British Property Federation);
- On-going dialogue with 5 Host Boroughs; ODA; LDA; BOA; LTGDC; TGLP; UEL; ALGS; sport England; LOCOG;
- An e-survey of 700 private sector contacts (84 questionnaires returned);
- Desk research (documents from GLA; LB Hackney; OPSRG; Water City Group; LTGDC; ODA; UBS; Demos);
- "Vox pops" amongst members of the public;
- A stakeholder workshop to receive feedback on the draft report.

xv. Bridging the Gap and Architecture Crew, Fundamental Architectural Inclusion, 2006-2007

Fundamental Architectural Inclusion is a CABE-endorsed Architecture Centre based in the London Borough of Newham that seeks new ways for people to genuinely participate in the transformation of their neighbourhoods. Our work responds directly to the Government's key aim to create thriving, vibrant, sustainable communities which will improve the quality of life of everyone.

Fundamental was commissioned by the London Borough of Newham in 2006 to devise and deliver the first 2012 Games Architecture and Built Environment Schools Programme *Bridging the Gap*. Their *Architecture Crew* youth engagement in the built environment project was a Youth Architecture Forum for 13 – 19 year olds in the Borough.

The package comprised the *Bridging the Gap* roadshow plus a series of measures to further embed learning including presentations to assemblies, mounting displays of work from the roadshow and training for the teachers involved.

Over 1400 pupils in Key Stages 2 and 3 had the chance to take part in a *Bridging the Gap* roadshow or wider school activities such as assemblies and presentation of results in each school. From the pilot schools, 17 teachers received training, support or access to resources

from the *Bridging the Gap* website to equip them to deliver built environment education in the classroom.

The Architecture Crew, aged 13-19 years, have taken part in a number of Olympic related projects as follows:

1. Aquatics Centre Architectural Competition

Between November '05 – January '06 members followed the same design brief and timetable as the six architectural practices entering the formal Aquatics Competition and presented their design to the team at London 2012.

2. The Word from Manchester

Members of the Architecture Crew travelled to Manchester in the run up to the host city decision to find out for themselves what it would be like in Newham if London won the Olympics bid.

3. Big Sunday

The Architecture crew carried out a short survey of 13 – 19 year olds at Newham's Big Sunday Community Event in February 2006 which focussed on the 2012 Games.

4. Regeneration Tour & Podcast

In June 2006, as part of an investigative tour of their locality, Crew members met with residents at Holden Point and viewed the 2012 site from the top of the Stratford tower block.

5. My Space Exhibition

In August 2007 Crew members went out to witness for themselves the pace of development in Newham and how the Olympics is acting as a catalyst for this massive change to the urban landscape, focussing on the developments on the fringes of the Olympic Park along Stratford High Street.

6. Architecture Crew Promo film

In October 2007 the Architecture Crew produced their new promo film which explores the different regeneration projects in Newham, including the 2012 Games.

xvi. *The Forum News* (January, April, July, November 2007; March 2008), Discover

Discover is a registered charity, established in 1998 to provide creative, play and learning opportunities to enable children and their carers to develop their potential. It particularly targets families in circumstances of social and economic disadvantage and ensures that children are listened to and can participate in decisions that affect their lives

The consultation findings are from ongoing arts- and story-based work with young people at the Discover centre, in schools and through the Children's Forum. The Children's Forum consists of a group of local children between the ages of 5-13 years who meet at Discover to express their views through open discussion and various arts based methods such as film making, drama and art workshops.

The Children's Forum is currently producing a quarterly newspaper entitled 'Forum News'. The newspaper concentrates primarily, though not exclusively on the Stratford City development and

the Olympics. It aims to chart how the regeneration programme will affect Stratford and members of the Children's Forum over the next few years.

xvii. A Feasibility Study for the London Education Centre at the Olympic Park, London East Research Institute, University of East London, 2008

The Olympic and Paralympic Park is central to thinking about legacy more broadly and University of East London (UEL) is committed to contributing in various ways to a successful legacy-oriented development of the Park and its environs. UEL wishes to operate and use facilities in the Park after the Games.

UEL has not undertaken direct consultation focusing exclusively on the Olympic Park as a whole. However it has undertaken research on the Park as well as on legacy more generally. It has consulted on the feasibility of a London Education Centre in the Olympic Park in relation to the aspirations of partners and stakeholders involved in London 2012 and its legacy.

Pan-London consultations

xviii. My City Too online survey results, Open House, 2008

My City Too is a campaign created by the architecture education organisation Open House. It works with young people across the capital to inspire them to take an active role in making better places and spaces in London.

This consultation was a web-based self completion survey for Londoners aged 12-19 years old. The survey focuses mainly on public spaces, facilities and safety; but also gives information on transport links.

xix. Stakeholder Responses to 'Towards a One Planet 2012', London Sustainability Exchange, 2007

London Sustainability Exchange aims to accelerate the transition to a sustainable London by connecting and motivating people. Working in partnership with business, government and the voluntary sector to: reduce London's environmental footprint; improve the lives of London's disadvantaged communities; improve the health of Londoners and improve the knowledge and skills of communities to achieve these goals.

London Sustainability Exchange was appointed by the Olympic Programme Support Unit to conduct an informal consultation on version 5 of *Towards a One Planet 2012*, the draft London 2012 Sustainability Plan, at the beginning of July 2007.

xx. Briefing report on borough legacy aspirations and potential barriers, London Assembly Liberal Democrat Group, Department of Communities and Local Government, 2007

The London Assembly put questions to the following representatives of the 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Host Boroughs on 15 February 2007:

Councillor Denise Jones (Leader, London Borough of Tower Hamlets)

Councillor Clyde Loakes (Leader, London Borough of Waltham Forest)

Mr Jules Pipe (Mayor, London Borough of Hackney)

Councillor Chris Roberts (Leader, London Borough of Greenwich)

Sir Robin Wales (Mayor, London Borough of Newham)

The report summarises responses to those questions.

xxi. Voluntary and Community Sector consultation on the Mayor's plans for the 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games, London Civic Forum, 2006

In October 2006 a conference for 150 groups was organised to consult on the Mayor's delivery plans. Over one hundred Voluntary and Community Sector organisations attended stretching

from front line groups to second and third tier organisations and service providers. Also at the event were representatives from the Cabinet Office for the third sector, London Councils, Learning and Skills Council, London Development Agency and London Organising Committee for the Olympic Games.

xxii. Olympics Survey Evaluation, London Thames Gateway Forum, 2005

London Thames Gateway Forum (LTGF) emerged in May 2000 to further the work of the Docklands Forum which had been operating since 1974. Its goal is to provide the means and support for the community and voluntary sector to participate in the strategic regeneration and governance of Greater London. As a resource of the community, it helps people of the Thames Gateway to have an effective voice.

LTGF conducted a survey in October 2005 of members and associates to collect data on how the games were perceived in the community; this included one specific question on legacy.

xxiii. Stakeholder Responses to *Towards a One Planet 2012*, London Sustainability Exchange, 2007

London Sustainability Exchange was appointed by the Olympic Programme Support Unit (OPSU) to conduct an informal consultation on version 5 of *Towards a One Planet 2012*, the draft London 2012 Sustainability Plan, at the beginning of July, 2007.

The main form of consultation used was three workshops. 30 to 40 people were invited to each workshop; additional comments were received from 16 organisations.