

LMF Issue Workshop Sessions – October 2008

Table of Content	Page
Executive Summary	2
Introduction	4
Latest Legacy Masterplan Framework (Output B)	5
Session Notes:	7
Transport 15 th October 2008	8
Environment 15 th October 2008	17
Housing 16 th October 2008	23
Sports 16 th October 2008	28
Arts and Culture 17 th October 2008	30
Social Infrastructure 17 th October 2008	37
Employment and Economy 20 th October 2008	40
Conclusions and next steps	43

Executive Summary

The Legacy Masterplan Framework (LMF) will set out a spatial masterplan, strategy and action plan for the transformation of the Olympic Park post-2012. The masterplan is being led by the London Development Agency (LDA) in partnership with Legacy partners¹.

To this end, a series of workshops to discuss specific issues of the LMF process took place at the Hackney Wick Community Centre between the 15th -20th of October 2008. These workshops were aimed at local organisations and residents based in the four fringe Olympic boroughs but also open to any London based organisations with an interest in Legacy issues.

This document provides an overview of what was discussed during the seven workshops which covered the following topics:

- Transport
- Environment (this included parklands, public realm, energy waste and climate change)
- Social Infrastructure
- Housing
- Sports
- Arts and Cultural Infrastructure
- Employment and Economic Renewal

Over 300 organisations were invited to participate in this round of consultation. These included representatives from the relevant departments and teams from Legacy partner organisations and representatives from external technical and community stakeholder organisations.

All sessions included a presentation on the key elements of work included in the latest masterplanning stage - Output B and then specific information on each topic.

Discussion was facilitated on a focused set of issues or questions that were considered relevant to the work going forward. This enabled filling gaps in information, considering appropriate approaches, standards, targets or options.

Key discussion points throughout the sessions included:

- **Process of consultation and engagement:** a lot of interest about consultation carried out to date with borough staff, residents and members of particular interest groups (disabilities, women, older people, faith communities, businesses). Participants brought ideas on

¹ The Olympic Legacy partners are: LB Newham, LB Hackney, LB Waltham Forest, LB Tower Hamlets, London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC), Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA), Greater London Authority (GLA)

how to continue dialogue with each interest group, particularly in discussing the Special Purpose Vehicle for LMF delivery and the need to create local ownership about Legacy through this process.

- **IBC/MPC plans:** concern over the perceived uncertainty of this Legacy venue and the impact it would have on local aspirations for employment opportunities, attractiveness for the media and creative industries and place making.
- **Environmental sustainability aspirations:** support for the strategies outlined and request for high standards and quality to be delivered.
- **Affordable housing requirements:** concerns about the approach to the provision of affordable housing to ensure a diverse community in the long term based on recent development's less than successful track record (eg: provision of adequate and relevant community infrastructure, management, affordability for local residents).
- **Allotment provision:** widespread support for including allotments in the LMF plans as an opportunity for biodiversity, recreation, healthy lifestyles and community cohesion but more detailed plans needed going forward.
- **Delivery approach:** recognition that this is a crucial element for regeneration and a lot of interest in the detailed approach and mechanisms proposed for delivery and long term management of housing, social infrastructure and public spaces in the LMF area and for tackling deprivation in the surrounding communities.

Next steps:

The next step for the project will be the submission of Output C in December which will be informed by comments and suggestions raised at this round of community consultation workshops and with the LDA and other Legacy partners.

Output C will include detailed proposals for the masterplan and specifically for each character area and strategies for socioeconomic aspects, town planning, sustainability and transport and infrastructure. After submission there will be another round of public consultation to continue the valuable dialogue and help inform the latest design work.

Introduction

The Legacy Masterplan Framework (LMF) will set out the spatial design, supporting strategies and action plan for the transformation of the Olympic Park post-2012.

Work started on the masterplan at the beginning of 2008. The masterplan is being led by the London Development Agency (LDA) in partnership with Legacy partners². It can only be successful through meaningful consultation and engagement with these partners, and other stakeholders (both technical and broader community representatives) and local residents.

To this end, as part of a comprehensive consultation and engagement programme helping to inform the development of the masterplanning work, a series of workshops to discuss specific issues of the LMF process took place at the Hackney Wick Community Centre between the 15th -20th of October 2008. These workshops were aimed at local organisations and residents based in the four fringe Olympic boroughs but also open to any London based organisations and individuals with an interest in Legacy issues.

This document provides an overview of what was discussed during the seven workshops which covered the following topics:

- Transport
- Environment (this included parklands, public realm, energy waste and climate change)
- Social Infrastructure
- Housing
- Sports
- Arts and Cultural Infrastructure
- Employment and Economic Renewal

Over 1000 organisations and individuals were invited to participate in this round of consultation. The workshops were also advertised on www.legacynow.co.uk and via various partner information channels. Attendees included representatives from external technical and community stakeholder organisations as well as local residents along with representatives from the relevant departments and teams from Legacy partner organisations.

Appendix 1 provides further detail on the organisations invited to participate. The LMF team remains committed to continuing liaison with these groups and individuals, as part of the on-going masterplanning process.

² The Olympic Legacy partners are: LB Newham, LB Hackney, LB Waltham Forest, LB Tower Hamlets, London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC), Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA), Greater London Authority (GLA) and central government.

Legacy Masterplan Framework (Output B)

This section outlines the information in Output B which was shared at the start of each workshop by members of the LMF design team. It allowed them to explain the ideas behind the emerging masterplan.

The process of developing the LMF is part of a journey which started with the 2004 Olympic and Legacy Planning permissions. This included consideration of the infrastructure needs for the long term regeneration of East London.

The final LMF will form a planning permission application that is due for submission in late 2009 and will be based on the ideas and concepts presented in Output B.

The presentation of Output B (Possibilities and Flexibility) covered the following areas:

- The role of the Legacy Masterplan Framework
- The key aims of the masterplan.
- The social and economic context for regeneration and how this has to work hand-in-hand with the physical regeneration plans to achieve lasting beneficial change for the area.
- The central drivers behind the emerging masterplan such as improving connectivity in and around the Park site. Through a series of new roads, routes and bridges we will create many more safe and attractive linkages for pedestrians, cyclists and for public transport routes. The team are also exploring the idea of an internal bus loop route that would enable quick journeys between all the key centres of activity within the site and the key transport hubs in the surrounding areas (Hackney Wick, Stratford International) etc.
- The 6 key design concepts:
 - **Maximising the inheritance** from the 2012 Games, which includes roads and bridges, utilities, transport infrastructure, parklands and sporting venues
 - Improving and **maximising connections** between Hackney Wick and Stratford but also between the main Legacy sports venues and to other communities
 - Utilising the **concept and scale of fields** (prevalent in the Lee Valley) to propose different uses and activities throughout the site as temporary or permanent in character
 - Creating **neighbourhoods that overspill and integrate** with the existing neighbourhoods through centres of activity. Thinking about the site as a mosaic of areas, rather than one single site limited by the planning or land ownership boundaries
 - **Two distinct characters for the main parkland space** in the middle of the site. To the north a more natural feel, to the south a civic space surrounded by iconic sports venues (Olympic

Stadium, Aquatics Centre) and in the middle, a centre of activity enhanced by a high point and excellent views.

- **Maximising the value of the waterways** that run through the site and linking possible uses with the wider strategic network or “Water City” concept for the Lower Lea Valley.
- Explaining the long timescales (20-30 years) involved in achieving the ultimate legacy vision. Within this, the importance of phasing (staggering which areas of work are done when) to ensure market compatibility and that parts of the Legacy Park are available to be used and enjoyed even while the overall Park vision is still being created.
- Exploring the role of temporary venues and temporary uses across the Park site, creating an active site during the transformation phase (the first 3-5 years after 2012). There are a lot of opportunities to use and manage these spaces creatively and for different uses.
- The importance of social infrastructure as one of the key elements for successful neighbourhoods and place making. How co-location of facilities can improve the way they work and the contribution they make to the surrounding areas.
- The nature of character areas or neighbourhood design briefs³. This entails understanding and defining each area in relation to its location and potential relationship with existing neighbourhoods adjacent to the site, the nearest Legacy venue and parklands. This work will then influence the different uses, housing numbers and typologies that can be accommodated in each area. The number of residential units has not been fixed at this stage and the design team are testing different options using a range of housing numbers for each character area and their work is also being influenced by stakeholder input through the consultation process

The baseline presentation, covering the above information is also available from the Legacy Now website www.legacynow.co.uk. The specific content related to each topic presented by the LMF team is summarised in the following sections.

³ The proposed character areas are six (6) and have been given indicative names for this stage of the process: Media Quarter (around the IBC/MPC area), Old Ford (below Carpenter’s Road and next to Hackney Wick and Fish Island), Games Quarter (around Olympic Stadium), Carpenter’s Waterfront (south west side of Stratford City development area), Stratford Village (north of the Olympic Athletes Village) and Pudding Mill (south of the site below the Greenway) – can we insert the character area image here for reference instead of just listing the names?

Session Notes

This section provides a summary of the key issues or concerns, questions, recommendations and general comments that were expressed by participants who attended the different workshops.

All sessions included a presentation on the key elements of work included in Output B (see previous section) followed by specific information on the work done to date by each topic team and discussion was facilitated around a key set of issues or questions relating to the work of each team going forward. All sessions had at least one lead from the masterplanning consortium and the LDA present.

The notes are arranged in chronological order.

For guidance, the notes present the comments and questions raised by stakeholders in [Blue](#) whilst the information provided by the LMF team as part of their presentation and responses to specific issues or questions in Black text.

Collated Session Notes

LMF Issue Workshop: Transport

Date: 15th October 2008

Facilitators: Bob Tong, Melissa Abache

Summary of key discussion points

Accessibility and planning for the transport needs of different people: need to consider early on statutory and community transport requirements (particularly bus operations) and accessibility conditions for walking in the fringe areas.

Stratford High Street and Carpenter's Road function: using these roads as main routes into the park could present issues given consented development (increased traffic) and a planned reduction in width respectively.

Bus loop proposal: should connect to Stratford Regional Station, Pudding Mill DLR, consider bus stop and bus route design (distance between stops, integration with land uses, traffic calming measures) and questions over providing a bus station on site.

Balance between local and strategic connectivity: participants felt that to create a community walking and cycling links should be well designed but also transport options for a destination (further than 5 mile radius)

Level of detail: the group would like plans in greater detail to enable better scrutiny and therefore, more informed discussion.

1) Strategic transport overview

After the Output B briefing (see previous section) the team presented an overview of the strategic transport issues raised by the project and the work done to date.

Key points included:

- **Infrastructure context:** the LMF site is located within the Lee Valley where there are already a large number of transport projects and schemes (e.g. Cross Rail in 2017, additional money committed towards bus operations) helping to ensure excellent levels of connectivity in the long term.
- **Planning context:** sustainable transport has been a consistent commitment for Games time, transformation period and Legacy as consented in the 2007 planning application. For example, this includes

ensuring that sustainable modes of transport are prioritised over private car use.

- **Legacy considerations:** have had an influence on all areas related to transport including infrastructure and transport plans.
- Current work includes a **strategic modelling exercise** with 2021 as a future year baseline.

Below are the key issues or interrogation raised by participants and the responses given by the LMF team.

2) Accessibility and planning for the transport needs of different people:

- What are the demographic profiles of the new residents and expected modes of transport to serve their needs? Proposed modes of transport should reference statutory and community transport requirements? Issues to consider include:
 - Walking and cycling as the only option for older people and disabled people might not be appropriate
 - Bus accessibility should be improved but buses can only take one wheelchair and one buggy, what if disabled people want to travel on the same bus with people with buggies or shopping.
 - Similarly, the bus network has low or no access into very narrow residential streets and this presents barriers for older people to travel independently. Overall, buses are not suitable for some people for safety reasons.
- Need to propose transport hubs and services in a holistic way (e.g. as educational vehicles that can be used for and by the community linked to transport activity) and this should be thought of in detail early in the process so that the transport system is able to really penetrate the Park.
- Need to consider other technologies other than standard buses for a more tailored, personalised experience of travel. There are plenty of examples of how this is delivered through Community Transport services.
- Concern about leaving access considerations too late in the process. There are lessons to be learnt from Wembley Stadium. Concern that transport accessibility in Legacy is seen as a detailed level consideration rather than an integral element.
- Opening up the area is welcomed but have you looked at accessibility of the walking areas outside the Park (fringes)?
- Have you been getting ideas on design from disabled people? What about disability access and older people?
- Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) accessible transport plan should be used as reference.

Work is being progressed to develop a detailed demographic profile for this area and social inclusion is one of the key ambitions being taken forward; however this is still in its early stages.

The treatment of the site's topography, parklands, design of Legacy venues and the transport system infrastructure provided for Games time considers accessibility as part of its commitment to the highest possible standards to also benefit Legacy. To improve local access into and across the site, the team is exploring options for bus services to be standard access and also how bus routes and bus stops are integral to the process, not a bolt on.

The team has also been in discussion with Transport for London (TfL) on a wider walking strategy to integrate the surrounding areas into the site. The green routes become a crucial element to link the different parks along the Lee Valley. The main issue is that to make short walks attractive, and achieve the desired accessibility and linkages to other parks and communities across the site, a review of road crossings (including the A12) and the design of 30 new bridges around the site will be necessary.

Specifically, the masterplanning team has been looking at not just roads, but land bridges, foot and cycle bridges and their use over a longer period of time. It was proposed that the focus for this group's consultation at the next topic session should be public transport connections - once the team has more detail to discuss on distribution of trips and specific land uses proposed. Community Transport (dial-a-ride etc) will be needed, but it is a localised topic that the team will consider in more detail going forward. A bus loop will need to be linked to event management plans for the key Legacy venues. This should include provision of sustainable and appropriate travel options from the key transport hubs to the Legacy venues.

In terms of transport systems the key consideration is the stages of development across the LMF site. For example in the later stages it could be appropriate to provide a guided system through the site but in the immediate transformation period (2013-2015) it may have to be a conventional bus system, however, these ideas are still emerging and are being evaluated in terms of costs.

A series of focus groups between January and February are planned with specific equalities interest groups. These will include discussion on transport and accessibility issues for specific users such as disabled people and older people among others. We are also working close with an established Built Environment and Access Panel to test and challenge the masterplan.

3) Links with the surrounding areas and green spaces:

- [What are the plans for intra-site movement? Are the fringe masterplans extensive enough to consider links with other parks in the area \(eg: Victoria Park\)?](#)

- It is recognised that integration with the fringe masterplans is a key issue for the LMF. Is the team considering how green spaces could link together?
- At the moment Newham has the least amount of Metropolitan Open Land (in London) and its green space is fragmented. The LMF provides a great opportunity to enable people to go for longer walks by providing better linkages.

As stated before green space links are also being considered and connectivity through new and existing corridors such as the “Greenway” and the proposed “Fatwalk”.

4) Development mix and scale:

- The presentation outlines a fantastic development, but we haven't heard anything in terms of scale, residential mix or car-based land uses. Without any real detail it is not possible to comment meaningfully on the proposed road network and transport strategies. Local transport authorities need this information to assess and plan for more or new transport routes.

The current stage of work is about testing ranges and usages to see how sensitive they are and this will guide the standard and quality of access points proposed. The other element being explored is the phasing of development for this site and until there is an integrated assessment of phasing it may be misleading to give figures. Therefore the team is not able to offer a greater level of detail at this stage as the masterplanning process has not yet reached firm plans on land uses and densities.

The overall quantum that has been tested for transport planning purposes is from the Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) which proposes a range of between 6,000 to 12,000 residential units on the site.

The transport ideas are in line with the 2007 planning consent and include the need to achieve 10-20% reduction in private car use and so outlines proposals for travel and event management plans for those places within the site that will have a strong public transport service. Similarly, there has to be a road hierarchy in site that gives priority to sustainable transport modes (walking, cycling, and public transport). However we have to acknowledge and respect as part of the 2007 planning condition that within the LMF impact area is the Stratford City development which has 5000 car parking spaces planned.

The facilitator reminded participants that this was the initial transport meeting and reiterated the continuing dialogue. It was acknowledged that more information would be provided, as and when it becomes available, for future

sessions. It was also noted that parallel discussions at a strategic level with statutory stakeholders such as local highways authorities have been held since June.

5) Street hierarchy and key linkages:

The team presented the following principles for the proposed street hierarchy across the site:

- Maximise connectivity.
- Improve and reconcile vehicle access from the north through the A12 road and south onto Stratford High Street.
- Develop a range of streets, from distributor roads and main vehicular accesses; the intention at this stage is to design them to be 7.3m wide carriageways that are widened near junctions (to allow for bus movement). Access to key locations would be permitted from these roads.
- Make secondary roads *shared space* streets, with speed restricted to lower than 20 mph and even lower in residential or local streets.
- Create attractive streets which encourage activities and enable people to walk and cycle freely.

The group was asked to provide feedback or raise questions about how the proposed street hierarchy could work for the site and the wider area.

Comments made by participants included:

- Fast east-west routes were mentioned in previous plans but don't seem to be shown on this latest version. The hierarchy principles mentioned are about public realm not connectivity. For example, are the plans going to include the Bow fly-over?
- The Legacy plans will be much improved from the current state of the site, but who will maintain it?
- How will people travelling from a 5 mile radius cope with the heavy traffic?
- Stratford High Street in Newham will see an increase of 5,500+ residents in the next 10 years, maybe more. Currently the council is exploring options to improve the conditions of this urban highway particularly the junction with Stratford City. The plans are showing this as a (the) main route into the park. The strategy should not rely on this key access route to the site as there will already be traffic created by new High Street development and the existing heavy traffic in the area.
- Concern that connections back to the A102 are missing in the plans and seems as if there is no plugging into the west.
- The plan shows Carpenter's Road as the main access point. Newham Council is looking at reducing the carriageway width of Carpenter's Road to knit communities back together so would suggest that if it goes

back to being a primary access route, measures are taken to reduce the impact of this on the community.

- Suggestion to include a priority network for statutory vehicles since these services encounter problems with buses red routes.

There are early discussions taking place about the feasibility of 30 mph distributor roads. But overall, the plans are not looking at introducing *rat runs*; the principle is for improving existing local roads.

The main North-South connection (not present for Games time) will be reopened in Legacy, whilst the other access points are opened mainly on the western side of the park. The plans for connections on the western side are through new bridges but this needs to be treated with caution so it does not result in more traffic to the western edge of the park but actually improves cycling and walking activity. These will be open to vehicle access and will not rely on just two connections.

Early assessments estimate that 40-45% of trips into the site will come from Stratford City (the north side of the site) and 35% of trips from Hackney Wick (the western side). The team is currently looking in detail at the same figures for localised trips to public transport hubs.

One of the remaining issues that will need to be resolved in the next stage of the LMF process is the treatment of infrastructure and new bridges in the centre of the Park to improve linkages East-West and also the feasibility of a new bridge on the North West corner of the site towards Leyton.

Regarding maintenance of new and improved road infrastructure the team is unable to respond at this stage as delivery and long-term management mechanisms are currently being considered by Legacy partners.

Improvements offsite will be made for Games time and these are being managed by each of the fringe boroughs. These might not improve capacity of the road network. As part of the LMF transport assessment the team has carried out an analysis of the road network in and around the site to identify possible capacity issues in coordination with the fringe masterplan teams (to identify the worst case scenario) but the response will not be to enhance roads but instead it will be about improving public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure.

The funding provided by the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) and the Westfield development in Stratford City for offsite improvements is estimated at £19-20million and covers 5 miles around the LMF site. This emphasis on public transport is also in line with the London wide transport vision (Transport 2020) and fringe boroughs' policies whose guidance is not to promote expansion of highways and therefore an increase in car trips.

Whilst the LMF needs to acknowledge that there will be an increase in congestion at certain points in the road network, the approach to reduce congestion will not be major capacity increases for roads. Instead the ambition will be for new and existing residents to use public transport services available.

One of the key elements for achieving this ambition is the proposed new bus network through the site and the idea is that in Legacy both the site and Stratford City are linked and integrated through bus routes that also serve key facilities and new development areas. It is important to note that two new bus stations will be operating during Legacy. There will also be an increase in the number and frequency of buses in and around Stratford International and the Westfield site to encourage an increase in bus use.

With regards to Stratford High Street and Carpenters' Road, the plans are for Carpenter's Road to be designed as a 9.5m two-lane plus cycle lanes road.

6) Public transport, walking and cycling facilities and operations:

The following comments were made by participants in relation to the proposed plans for public transport, walking and cycling improvements in the area:

- What is the level of confidence in this connectivity strategy with its strong reliance on bus services? Taking into account all the rail schemes proposed around the LMF which are now being cut back (even before they are developed) and TfL not having experience of a strategic approach to bus services. I have no real confidence in TfL or Network Rail being able to deliver an effective strategy for Games time or in the future in terms of putting the LMF area and East London in general back in the map. Plans so far are acceptable for the immediate local area but we want to bring people in for commercial development and leisure uses from further than a five mile radius (consider the example of Westfield Shopping Centre in Shepherd's Bush which has railway, taxi, underground services).
- Are there plans for a bus station on site and what are the cycling facilities proposed? How will walking and cycling connections be

developed? What would be the key links with Stratford City and links into the strategic walking routes, and Sustrans routes? Are there any issues?

- The challenge is about turning something from an industrial district into a community. It might be worth looking at a Newham pilot which looked at integrating transport nodes. Also look at Brent example of major roads and people not being able to get to the schools and other built environment obstacles.
- There are currently problems in London for bus access due to ownership issues (e.g. low floor access, where bus stops can go and street furniture). I would recommend a real reassessment over design of bus stops on the priority network.
- If the IBC/MPC is developed there will be a need for lots of capacity from Stratford to the Media Centre during peak times. The proposed bus loop route should connect to Stratford Regional station.
- Are there plans to connect the bus loop route to Pudding Mill DLR? The overall principle for this route should be to connect the main transport stations around the Park.

The presenter asked the group to consider that a commitment has been made to ensure the regeneration of the LMF impact area and that the ODA will provide a level of opportunity and infrastructure for the Games that wouldn't have existed otherwise, particularly transport infrastructure investment. The LMF team has discussed the need for increased capacity with London Buses and this has informed the plans so far.

With regards to the internal transit system the current thinking behind it is to create a figure-of-eight, or loop, and integrate this service into other services around the site. It would be a non-timetabled constant bus service that reaches the main venues/site centres within 10 minutes. In the future the route could be expanded during peak times or particular events to reduce short distance car use.

Car clubs and bike hire schemes need to be part of the offer, with appropriate links inside and outside the park. The desire to link the internal bus system to Stratford Regional station has been acknowledged and the team is working on how to achieve this.

One participant asked whether congestion charging in an East London wide context would be considered as part of the LMF plans but the team informed the group that congestion charging has never been considered as part of these plans.

7) Street design principles:

Participants offered the following suggestions as to possible benchmarks and principles for street design:

- Living Streets can offer further and more specific guidance from work done to date.
- Camden Council has done work on street design in relation to uses around bus stops and access, materials used etc. This document tries to provide consistency for boroughs and minimise the street furniture clutter.
- The Olympics should be a catalyst for improvement in the quality of design of residential streets by making them accessible to mini buses (e.g. considering the impact of on street parking on community transport services).
- What is the quality of the experience for walking and cycling into the park, at different times, on a typical route from key locations outside the site? What tools are you going to use to evaluate the qualitative aspects, audits with local community groups?
- Access issues on public transport with regards to distances and integration of bus stops should be considered in detail. I am concerned about bus route map as there are a number of gaps that look more than 400m away. Access routes need appropriate surfaces and then you need to think about maintenance.
- I urge caution with low floor buses and traffic calming measures, as boroughs have three different measures in one street which is not suitable for buses. Need for a common set of standards for traffic calming in each type of street.
- The LMF transport hierarchy approach is to put walking as the top priority. How does this fit with new administration's approach of no hierarchy for road networks?

The team explained that it was too early to be conducting street audits but agreed that estimated times for walking are important. To date the tools used to assess walking conditions have included GIS and density data but the team, is open to receiving other recommendations.

The LMF will have the ability to design roads to restrict speed eliminating the need for bolt-on speed humps.

In relation to the question no hierarchy for road networks, the team's concepts are aligned to benefit walking and cycling – and this is forming part of the on-going dialogue with senior politicians. If the approach is reviewed then the basis of the LMF hierarchy argument is that it builds on the Games time approach to transport.

LMF Issue Workshop: Environment

Date: 15th October 2008

Facilitator: Bob Tong, Melissa Abache

Summary of key discussion points

Parklands safety and maintenance considerations: ideas included leasehold management to finance maintenance, lighting to promote safety and recognition that this will be more important in the transformation period.

Character of the parklands: more information was requested on the character, mix of residential and other uses (particularly transport and community infrastructure), density and the place making plans of the fringe masterplans.

Energy: setting high targets for built environment carbon emissions within a flexible approach, mixed views about offsite renewables and the need to start planning biomass facilities now.

Behavioural change: bigger challenge than design issues, although development needs to make it easier for people to reduce consumption (energy, waste and water) it also needs to work with LMF communities through the process (eg: targeted campaigns)

After the presentation on the LMF process and latest work (Output B) participants raised the comments, questions and concerns below. These have been broadly grouped into process, parklands, energy, waste and climate change related issues.

1) Process:

- How are you communicating with the host boroughs' staff most of whom live in the boroughs?
- What have the results of your consultation been so far, and how do you propose to get over the ownership difficulties and bridging the gap between now and 30 years time?
- Are there mothers or women on the LMF planning teams? We can provide details of mothers you could speak to if you would like?
- Are Olympic sponsors engaged in the Legacy process? For example EDF as a sustainability partner (renewable energy) and GE are helping to fund two projects to build homes beyond Code Level 6 and a hospital for Newham.

- There is a sub-group on Thames Gateway as a sustainable region. May be some link up with the wider LMF proposals in heat generation for Thames Gateway region.

The LMF consultation and engagement process communicates with host borough staff through existing channels (governance structures). But, if it would be of interest to a wider group of staff, the team could set up partner briefing sessions at relevant points in the project.

A consultation report that was submitted as part of the first phase of work on the LMF (this is available for download at www.legacynow.co.uk). In general there was widespread desire for a large open space or park to be left as part of the Olympic Legacy.

As part of the consultation process the team will be running focus groups for equalities groups, and we would welcome collaboration on contacts and increasing participation of specific groups such as gender. The facilitator estimated that approximately half of the LMF team were women but didn't know the exact proportion of those who had children.

2) Parklands:

The discussion on open space focussed first on inclusion of safety and maintenance considerations in the landscape plans. Below are some of the comments and suggestions:

- Concern about how relevant powers can and will ensure that the new open space provided is safe and clean after the Games. There are positive and negative examples like Central Park (NY) in the 1970s.
- I don't have the answer but with gunfights and gangs, hope that you are thinking about these issues.
- Mile End Park invited the police horses to practise there which created not only a spectacle but also an increase sense of safety.
- There are thousands of cameras on the Stratford City estate and a control centre; would it not make sense to link up with that?
- Crime perception is a problem. Newham Council is looking at how it can improve the perception of crime amongst residents, which is not as high as people think. Newham Council is concerned that in Legacy the Park will not be safe. The team should look at Greenwich and the levels of housing and deprivation.
- In peoples' minds the Olympic park is a large open space, due to the promotion and PR done so far about Legacy describing it as the biggest park created in 100 years. But this also raises safety and cost fears. Let people know you are addressing it. It is great to build things

but who maintains them? Don't give freehold but leasehold with profit going to maintenance for CCTV or litter pickers (litter has a big impact).

- How are you planning to use lighting to promote safety? Should you be encouraging some people into some spaces like the Greenway? Some routes maybe you shouldn't use at certain times. Boris Johnson has a plan of lighting key networks through parks; do you want to do that as part of the LMF? I am not convinced it is a good idea.

The team is less worried about safety when the full build out is complete as the site will have multiple uses and will be busy with lots going on day and night. But in the interim, or during the transformation period, it may not have the required intensity of use and therefore the natural surveillance over open space that can help in ensuring its safety. The Cultural Olympiad could be used to reinvigorate these spaces and get people to own and use the Park.

Currently the team is starting to think about the phasing of development and connectivity issues in order to avoid creating unsafe routes. There are contentious issues on gating the Park and closing the Park at night but the purpose of this session is to start hearing different views on this, and other subjects. The plans are to design public space so that there would be minimal need for camera surveillance mechanisms to ensure safety.

3) Character of the parklands:

Participants were keen to know more information about the character, mix of residential and other uses and whether the model to be followed would be of a London park or more akin to the character of the Lee Valley Park. One participant specifically asked whether the plans were linked to the strategic Thames Gateway plans and raised the concern that plans seem to assume that open space can be a negative condition for a city.

The facilitator explained that the purpose of the masterplan framework is to provide the blueprint for neighbourhoods. Allowing them to evolve over time but setting out the right connectivity, access to open space and other important considerations for creating a community. The blueprints will provide the right level of flexibility to facilitate mixed use and appropriate density levels, as set by regional policy.

Participants also raised points about the communities that would be using the park and how this fits with the proposed densities and architectural styles:

- Talking about what creates a neighbourhood it is difficult to assess in London; how different types of people fit together and how you use the local shop, there are no definite answers.
- We expect Georgian architecture, but sheds do look strange. It would be good to see you use a mix of older and new buildings in your presentation. Show the edge as well as the picture. Nice to see older buildings and landmarks not only across the park but in existing areas.

- Housing density and demographics should be a key consideration. We are quite clear that if you put high density housing there will be high crime or high perception of crime if there is not enough infrastructure.
- Density should be driven by place making not profit.
- Fringe masterplans seem to be key to this and have you had any thoughts on how you can maximise them? Key to place making is the fringe masterplans as they will create sense of place.

Other participants were concerned about the treatment of open space in the middle area of the site:

- Parks will connect the communities, not large scale development so it needs to go together. A high street across the Park is the last thing we want, we don't want more consumerism.

The idea of unlocking the Park is great but there are serious challenges as to how you can connect it effectively. There are examples in Victoria Park which has dead spaces which feel unsafe where you cut across it to access transport links. A lot of people will walk through the Park through the West-East connection so plans will have to promote this link. Currently the plans are for the urban link across the Park to be turned into a place with an interesting cultural building or activity.

4) Green infrastructure:

Specific ideas were proposed with regards to creating views across the park:

- Crossrail rubble is being used to create viewing platforms, this could be done on the Park to create views?
- Apart from the viewing point in the middle area is it a flat landscape?

Like the Games time the Legacy parklands has an undulating landscape with varying heights. The majority of the Park is around 10-12 m above sea level with some lower, flatter edges near the rivers at around 3m above sea level. So there are likely to be large variations in height which needs to be considered.

Overall, there is a two-tier landscape in the Park where all bridges are accessible in terms of gradient but there are also ramps to the lower water level. In the southern area all canals have tow paths, some in the north do not.

Other comments raised by participants included:

- Give the current economic downturn how is this affecting the proposals for the IBC/MPC and temporary venues? What will happen to that land if it is not used?
- If you are planning to use the temporary venues over a longer time then this needs consideration. The Velodrome in Manchester is hard to

use because it is very popular and therefore they will have to replace the track sooner than planned.

The Park has a commitment to a minimum of 102 hectares. If the IBC/MPC changes in scale or location the LMF team would then need to reassess the character of the surrounding area. The principle is to think sensibly about uses for the Legacy venues.

Comments related to uses and facilities within the park and the wider LMF site included:

- Is consideration being given for infrastructure for developments, like reed beds and biomass needs?
- Allotments need careful consideration for food production due to quality of soil.

Olympic Park waterways use reed beds for habitat creating and water quality, biomass needs to be considered in the context of LVRP. The LDA are looking at a study by LVRPA.

5) Sustainability:

There was a very useful debate amongst participants about the different standards for environmental sustainability and the approach to climate change adaptation and mitigation. Below are some of the questions recorded:

- Do the Passive Haus standards described apply to flats?
- How noisy are the wind turbines?
- Are you looking at Three Mills Tidal for energy creation?
- What will you do before 2012 on biomass, we should make changes now. What are the management mechanisms for local residents and businesses to access biomass now?
- What is the LMF target for built environment carbon emissions? For targets to be met the built environment target needs to be minimal as other aspects take up more.

Passive Haus can also be applied to flats. The EIA will provide more detail on the noise levels produced by the wind turbine. The Three Mills Tidal centre is being considered as part of the plans but only for educational purposes as it has minimal capacity for energy generation. There is a London-wide carbon reduction target that the LMF site will contribute to, but the project hasn't arrived at setting a target yet.

The group offered the following suggestions for the approach to energy standards:

- It is good to have aspirations - even if you set the target too high. You don't want to set it too low and succeed. Need a flexible approach.
- Focus more on adaptation than aspiration. If we are talking about 30 years' time, too much focus on mitigation would be a mistake - when

you get into carbon offsetting it is not merited by the cost. We should be concentrating on adaptation rather than mitigation.

- Offsite production doesn't sound convincing to me. Things work better at a bigger scale and could be located in a better location for maximum benefit.

Finally the last part of the workshop discussion revolved around the behavioural change challenge that needs to be considered for this project.

Comments included:

- One of biggest challenges is if people decide not to listen, the consumption messages need to be adopted by people (reducing waste, water and energy use)
- You need to make it easier for people. For example we build the smallest homes in EU so we need to talk about the size of dwellings so people can store waste as it is not picked up for two weeks at times. If we build high density as a legacy we need to make it easy for people to recycle.
- On energy, waste and water you guys should be congratulated on some of these solutions, but we do need to think about people through the LMF process. You can create the right buildings but if you don't think about how things join up they won't work, so need to make local connections to enable results. Put people first and make sure what you are doing is rolled out into the Thames Gateway.
- One issue in Newham is that you can put out one message but hit people in different ways. Some communities don't take them on. Targeting the message properly is key.

LMF Issue Workshop: Housing

Date: 16th October 2008

Facilitator: Helen Inman, Angela Bryant

Summary of key discussion points

Principles for successful neighbourhoods: independent facilities, affordability (incl. workspace and retail), management structures, whole-life costing, streets with housing on the sides of it.

Housing needs: aspirations of the majority are for a house with a back garden but the size of homes should balance outdoor and storage space to provide a diversity of options and tenures in an organic process. Need to avoid repeating typologies of blocks that haven't worked.

Live work units: the East End tradition fits with this aspiration but affordable workspace seems to be more feasible in terms of demand and the low skilled employment context of the area.

Affordable housing: driver should be sustainability by retaining a diversity of people in quality housing, considering the private rental market, management and support services and participants requested more detail on the tenure split being considered for each area.

1) What makes a great neighbourhood?

The first part of the workshop discussion focussed on trying to define some of the key elements or principles that make great neighbourhoods and how this fits with the LMF housing ambitions.

Comments offered by participants included recommendations to consider:

- Facilities, particularly independent shops (eg: Peckham) and specialist amenities for attracting businesses (particularly around the IBC/MPC venue and media/graphic design companies).
- Affordability of space and how the financial models allow for this to happen and avoid sterile places (eg: ownership models in France, Spain, Tribeca New York of rent protection and long leases) not just for housing but also for shops and workspace.
- Management structures and how to establish mechanisms for different types of residents and different boroughs (eg: collection of rubbish, etc).
- Whole-life costing to ensure that quality is not compromised under timescale pressures.

The team has been looking at recent Shelter research findings on the Thames Gateway developments and these issues came up when starting communities from scratch. The report highlights the importance of soft social infrastructure

and the quality of the public realm, but also shows the challenges in delivery at the appropriate times of a development's lifetime.

The facilitators asked participants to feedback in terms of precedents of best practice examples of new developments that have integrated these principles successfully. Examples mentioned included Accordia and Coin Street. However, some participants felt that there wouldn't be many successful examples given the scale of the LMF ambitions with up to 10,000. Which is much larger than other examples available. There was also concern that not too many homes are squeezed into relatively small spaces for financial reasons.

2) Housing needs:

The following comments were made by the group about the needs and type of housing demand that would have to be fulfilled in Legacy:

- Transient population issues. Legacy should provide housing, not just flats. All new development are apartments, if you listen to people they want a house with a back garden and it's unrealistic to change this.
- Size of homes: if the LMF wants to propose a more European model of family housing in flats then it should consider that this model is based on families having second homes with open space or gardens. The size of homes depends on having outdoor and storage space and this is key in making it a place people choose to live in. However, need to acknowledge that the LDA will have a concern about the land values of Legacy development.
- Diverse range of homes: you need a range of products, formation and timescales. If you look at the established areas of London there is an organic process where you get a whole range of people and a balanced community. There is a small element of people moving in for a couple of years but you don't want too much of that.
- Housing typologies and tenures: I think the LMF team should listen to the experiences of people who have lived in bad housing and listen to their housing expectations. They have good insights into which units don't work (eg: single aspect scissor blocks, affordable housing which ends up being north-facing with no sunshine).
- Pleased to see lots of streets, housing in new developments does not always have streets. London is set on streets and people like them.

Questions raised by participants to the team covered the following issues:

- The Tower Hamlets trend is towards family housing, in terms of numbers how is the planning application being submitted?
- Can I ask what sustainability lines are in place? What's in place with flexibility for sustainability? In the Thurrock masterplan it is Code Level 4 for homes and they are struggling to meet this standard.
- In terms of the fine grain, what's the current thinking? Have there been any conversations about the splits of tenures?

The LMF team's approach to tenures is for *pepper-potting* affordable housing units within developments, but the bigger debate is about the proportion of affordable and full buying percentages.

It is not unreasonable to surmise that if a flat is built as x (i.e. one bed affordable flat), it may become something else in the future. A buyer or tenant will make an initial choice but their circumstances may change so the model should have the flexibility to change tenures. The RSL/Local Borough restrictions in place at the moment mean the team accepts there should be different models.

At the moment Newham remains one of the more affordable boroughs in London. In Newham, outright ownership is not possible for local residents so the LMF needs to ensure there is a mechanism for local people to afford ownership.

The discussion then moved towards assessing the conditions or drivers for the area to ensure the housing offered is attractive:

- Barcelona stadium happened. Will Premiership football actually come to the Park? What is going to happen here that will draw people in and energise them? In terms of the waterfront, what are the good and bad examples? Examples offered of what not to do include Cardiff waterfront.
- Need affordable commercial space and it should be factored into agreements early on.
- Examples: tenement flats in Glasgow, Barking redevelopment, Brentford towers (quality, size and management).
- Part of the consultation process is that you are engaging with local people and in doing so build local ownership and pride making them want to live here in the future and visit the Park from where they live.

3) Mix of residential and employment space:

There was some discussion about the benefits of employment and residential uses being mixed in the new neighbourhoods and the key consideration was affordability of workspace.

- EastEnd tradition of work and production of goods close to where people live and this relates to 'popping into work'.
- Live Work units are residential really and don't work, affordable workspace is better. Hackney studios provide workspace for artists and that works but it is affordable. There is an unmet demand for affordable workspaces. Too many are not working at the moment (e.g. Newham scheme on Burford Road).
- In terms of retail, that's taken by Westfield. For residents who live in affordable housing, need to look at childcare, what can a housing association provide? Training and flexible employment is still needed.

- In general, statistically speaking host boroughs residents are low skilled so would need low skilled employment which might not fit into the live work or workspace model discussed.

4) Supported housing offer:

One participant asked to know more details for LMF plans at this stage for housing provision for people needing support (eg: older people, special needs, social and supported housing tenants).

There will be a distinction in terms of people who get ordinary social accommodation but there will be requirements where you need bespoke care with onsite care. Extra care is the model that local authorities are using.

Some participants felt that affordable housing provision will be driven by financial considerations or be unrealistic in terms of achieving a high target. However, the facilitator clarified that whereas the financial model of this project was driven by offsite provision, current plans might provide more social housing and the ambition is for people not to be able to tell which one is affordable and which is private ownership.

On this issue other participants felt that “What needs to drive the discussion is not % but what will create sustainability on site is about diversity of people living there. Rather than finances dictating (...) there are examples of sustainable schemes and there is a sense that a certain amount works”.

The private rental market also plays an important role and purpose for people at a certain life stage. Within the LMF we take account of this and not ignore it but plan for it as a tenure that should be considered in the debate.

5) Final recommendations:

- Don't make the mistakes of the past, I've seen the stuff and I have knocked them down and rebuilt them.
- Make it somewhere that people want to stay.
- Flexibility, it's nice to see IBC/MPC with more uses, not typical application and you are being flexible with it. It needs to be viable.
- Community facilities like doctors' clinics and surgeries are part of your character areas. Its interesting because you are developing the site to bring more people so more infrastructure is needed.
- Management and relevant support services are critical.

6) Process:

The following ideas were provided or emphasised by participants as to how to engage with the group for the next stage of work:

- Establish a mechanism where expertise around this table can continue to feed into this SPV vehicle.
- Hope that it is not the last time you come back to us. There needs to be opportunities to feed into the work.
- Are housing professions inputting into the delivery model? Need have the housing issues brought into how this body is set up. [This will be taken back to Tom Russell to follow up].

LMF Issue Workshop: Sports

Date: 16th October 2008

Facilitator: Mark Abberley, Angela Bryant

Summary of key discussion points

Ownership and management of sports venues: more certainty or information was requested for the plans on each venue and in light of the current economic climate and possible voluntary or community use.

Accessibility to sports venues: particularly critical for Waltham Forest and with regard to car parking strategy but also many examples offered on the nuances on the barriers presented by affordability and regional remits of each sport.

Co-location of sports approach: within each sport there is a link to another sport(s) that needs to be considered (eg: gymnastics using swimming facilities for training)

1) Venue plans in Legacy:

After the LMF Masterplan progress presentation (Output B), participants had a lot of questions for the team in relation to proposed plans for specific venues bridges and uses within the parklands. These included:

- What are the plans for the Legacy sports venues in the current credit crunch context? Who retains the ownership of the venues?
- What is happening with regards to the reinstatement of Hackney Marshes?
- The land bridge is going to be installed by 2013, how is that going to happen? The timescales are very tight.
- I understand allotments have been moved what is the future plan for them?
- Sports groups and users will want to see an immediate response against the facilities being mothballed. The accessibility factor is key, if Waltham Forest is an Olympic borough they want to feel the benefits of having these facilities (Velodrome, Eton Manor).

Representatives and residents from Waltham Forest had specific questions about the connections that would be built in Legacy:

- Accessibility is the main issue for Waltham Forest; we have nothing in the centre which connects us. What capacity is going to be addressed for the north to access the venues?
- From the transport workshop what came out of it was that they (the LMF team) haven't solved the north access problem, and the only additional transport capacity proposed is by buses. But do you want

people with sports kit on the buses? The bus infrastructure from Waltham Forest isn't there.

- The fringe masterplans have to be looked at as to how they are expanding the impact of the Olympic park. Rather than thinking it is solved by 2013 we can keep improving it.

2) Sports context:

Participants were informed that business plans for the venues are now being shared and discussed with Legacy Partners and other statutory stakeholders. Those plans include a commitment to 90% of each venue in community use.

Some participant expressed that they are directly involved in local and regional structures and are now writing their own plans by Sports England and these plans will reflect the venues and the approach for how each venue will work with different groups.

Specific comments about the proposed use of sports legacy venues included:

- Arena 3: this will have 7,000 seats for Olympics is that still in Legacy? We have no facilities for trampoline competitions (Gymnastics), and Arena 3 would be ideal for us to bring events back to London. A dedicated centre would be great but it is more for competition level where there is demand (clubs in London have approximately 25,000 members/viewers). The critical point is that this is now at design stage and it would be a shame if you make mistakes like not having a trampoline that requires an 11m ceiling height.
- Aquatics Centre and its transition to Legacy use, will there be temporary facilities to build on the momentum from the Olympics?
- Olympic Stadium, are there any plans to utilise what we have got for future competitions, what is the lifespan for this venue?
- Use NK2 (explain what this is) as an example of best practice of how to create impact on many sports.
- In Legacy for multi use venues, what facilities are being considered for voluntary or community use, like storage or administrative space for a club?

As designs for the Legacy venues emerge with supporting business plans the LDA with input from Sport England and other key stakeholders will start to look at the programmes of events to maximise and maintain momentum.

One participant was concerned that the sports voluntary sector wasn't being consulted on the LMF plans in relation to sport. The venues team is consulting with sports communities on all of its work. Checks will be made to ensure the sports voluntary sector is represented. It is early days on some of this work and more engagement on these topics will follow in 2009.

- The car parks planned for Legacy seem to be located a long way from the venues. Also interested in the how car parking strategy evolves for multiuse venues rather than just sports.

3) Demand for different sport uses

The group was then asked to provide information about how much or what voluntary sector use could be placed in the Legacy venues and/or parklands so that it can inform the transformation and Legacy planning process.

Participants considered that there were some issues that needed more certainty before being able to assess needs. Overall one participant considered that “there is not one area of voluntary sport that isn’t crying out for facilities” whilst another added that management model for the venues is the important consideration given that it will need to “work with 1000 of bodies, to facilitate development”.

The LDA considers that offering space to every group doesn’t necessary reflect positively the aspirations of the local clubs, therefore the aim of these investigations is to process all the information provided by stakeholders into a timeline of demand for sport sectors rather than individual club needs.

Suggestions in terms of sports content for the site included:

- A visitor’s centre is a good idea, as it can bridge the distance between people that are not into sport and less formal ways into sport through an interactive experience.
- There are benefits for local residents to having a place to go once the Games are finished and see what’s happening in terms of sports and other activities.
- Interest in project recording the site industrial and waterways history.

A participant expressed that in his opinion there was not a problem with the Legacy use of facilities as all sports are mentioned as potential occupiers. People will be *fighting for them*; if there is only one indoor centre it is not going to be enough.

As an example the tennis centre we use is fully used, we use SCORE at Leyton but it is so well subscribed that people are fighting to get into. In a few years time this venue will not be enough to provide performance sports, and although there are outside courts these are limited Hackney courts and are full on weekends.

4) Affordability of community sports venues:

With regards to community uses the LDA are working with Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL) and have questions about the cross over between boroughs in terms of costs for local residents and timetable for hire and how this changes for different sports.

Participants felt that “within each sport the range of hire charges is completely different, so pricing is hard to comment on” but agreed that a mid-point is maybe the most realistic and sensible indicator given that some facilities are subsidised and it also depends on time of usage. Some examples offered by participants on the nuances on the affordability issues as barriers included:

- Tennis: at recreational level is affordable, when you reach a higher level it becomes less so. We (London Tennis Association) seek sponsorship to fund that process of getting players to the next level (eg: good experience in Hackney) however the issues are that Pro-active regions are disjointed from boroughs and it is done by county. It can be a barrier to produce a cohesive plan.
- Issues about the way Sports England split London into regions and how this was the end of creating cohesive culture, until the system goes back to a pan-London structure (eg: Kent, Essex, Middlesex) and whether the LMF or the SRF might be the driver needed for change. However, different sports have different regional barriers (eg: triathlon)
- Other barriers are the London boroughs because they work within tight boundaries and if the Park can help to pull them together it should be advocated and similarly for strategic partnerships (mythical boundaries).
- Need to future proof venues especially for sport as rules change. Need to avoid private management groups dictating prices as this often end up with higher evening costs for example. Also there are examples of facilities not being used (eg: swimming pools go unused to protect their provision of swimming lessons)
- Are the reasons for designating venues as multiuse, not really knowing what will go on in each? Surely key work should be about packing venues with specific uses?

5) Co-location of facilities:

The team shared their current thinking about the principle of co-location of different complementary uses in Legacy for the main sports venues, some key social infrastructure and the Park itself. Examples of good practice suggested by participants included:

- Multiuse facilities like **K2 explain what this is**: you walk in and see a climbing wall with kids using it, swimming pool dance courts etc.
- Something similar in Birmingham, Telford and Holland.
- Within each sport there is a link to another sport(s) that needs to be considered, for example gymnastics using swimming facilities for training.

- Elton: a gym that also holds a library, doctors surgery, school and local shopping
- The Schools for the Future programme hasn't worked very well.
- Crystal Palace is 50 years old can you look at that as an example?

Continuing on the topic of barriers, conversation then followed on how to increase sports participation for different groups and what would make competition level athletes use the sports venues in Legacy.

- Also aim should be about exposing people to sports. East London communities don't necessarily know about the benefits and opportunities available. How do you deal with cultural attitudes? It would be nice to do something that looks at disability participation.
- Hackney has a goal ball club and does lots of work around disability sport and ran a festival on this.
- Need to look at why and how people travel for competition and how much time they would travel. For training > 30 min? For community activity it could be 10-20 min from work or home? This also depends on the quality of the venue and if it's the Olympic venue I would and pay more.

6) Process:

It was felt that the group needed more clarity and up to date information (mainly on a timeframe for the use of Legacy venues). Word of mouth seemed to work well in helping to generate attendance at workshops like this one.

Participants recommended:

- Imaginative ways of reaching communities especially those cultures traditionally less involved.
- Keep communication going, keep them simple and straightforward.

LMF Issue Workshop: Arts and Culture

Date: 17th October 2008

Facilitator: Melissa Abache

Summary of key discussion points

Emulating the Southbank success story: a complex or hub of different cultural spaces concentrated in one area but spread in the street layout and offering complementary activities rather than being dominated by any particular one (eg: sport or retail).

Transformation period: low cost structures or “pavilions” populating the park, but on a massive scale and using development funds to roll out small, local, grassroots arts and cultural offers allowing communities to mix together.

Communications about opportunities: more effort is needed by London 2012 and the LDA to engage with local communities including artists and the media about opportunities (for projects, governance, funding, etc.)

After the presentation on the latest LMF work (Output B) the following key points were raised within the group:

1) Connectivity:

- Need to ensure connectivity around the Park i.e. ensure that once people arrive at the Olympic Park from Stratford station elsewhere there are routes through the Park.

2) Use of waterways:

- Need to invest in infrastructure for and make use of the waterways.

3) Mix of uses:

- Non-commercial as well as commercial activities need to be given space and investment to grow in Legacy in “a more organic process”.
- What’s really needed is not one complex trying to be all things in the middle of the Park; it would concentrate too much in one place. The success of Southbank is that you have lots of different spaces and venues to use and visit.
- Concerns about the cultural offer in the Park being dominated by sport and retail (because of Stratford City) and that this will not necessarily deliver a culturally diverse place - need for principles to be set down to enrich the culture in the Park and prevent sprawl.
 - By centres do you mean shopping centres?
 - If you take Stratford upon Avon it has lost, since the 1980s its identity, suddenly it has been taken over.

- Unless you can integrate with areas you will be left with white elephants, you will be left with artificial land with big business. If you talk to the wider community they want to see direct improvements whilst protecting their neighbourhoods.
- You talked about the Olympic Park making an impact on the surrounding area, but it should be the other way around.

One participant suggested that the transformation period is about low cost structures populating the park but on a massive scale and offered the example of a “*Festival of Britain*” or an extended “*Lea Valley Park Festival*”.

4) Arts and Cultural opportunities:

The following are some of the key ideas that were discussed around possibilities for arts and cultural activities on the site and the principles that should underpin that activity:

- S106 money from Olympic Park developers should be used to deliver small, local, grassroots arts and cultural offers. Local people and networks at the grassroots level need to help animate the Park. LDA should identify *local champions* to look at different arts and cultural offers to help do the market research for different target audiences eg: young people, older people, BAME groups etc.
- Need to create opportunities for people from different communities to work together
 - Mixed groups to work together rather than from individual communities, this is happening quite a lot now.
- Need to allow things to have rough edges so that artists/creative practitioners can come in and create their own 'look' and 'feel' in the Park.
- Need to create hubs of cultural activity - South Bank as a successful model that has evolved over time and that supports a range of free activities. Shops/businesses should be encouraged to sponsor/promote free arts and cultural events.
- The LMF is seen as having a big scope for moving existing major events as well as housing new ones. A lot of the events within the Greater London Authority are put on by the Mayor, so there is scope to pull events out of central London and further East.
- Desire for a complex of arts buildings, spaces and open performance spaces.
- Desire for allotments.
- Suggestion to also include social enterprise perspective on the plans for legacy cultural opportunities.
- Ideas about the principles for arts and cultural spaces in legacy (mainly in transformation period 2013-2016) were about the concept of “pavilions”:
 - low cost
 - accessible

- flexible
- temporary
- can support a variety of activities
- welcoming of diversity
- Geographically spread
- carefully targeted to specific audiences (content and programmes).

Examples mentioned that illustrate some or all of these principles were:

- LIFT model (Cultural Exchange Centres).
- Stratford Circus (theatre next to a restaurant, next to a transport hub).
- Southbank (free street offer alongside paid facilities).

5) Process and communications

- Need to ensure arts and culture is accessible financially to older people (eg: National Portrait Gallery project with Age Concern), young people and low income groups.
- London 2012 and the LDA need to build up their communication channels with local communities in East London so there is a two way dialogue about what is happening and how local people can be involved. Local people should be asked about what they want to be involved in rather than being told what they should be involved in.
 - Only a few companies can actually build. The arts have a key role in this as a cost effective way to get people involved.
 - You say you want to involve the communities but how are you showing it? You are not feeding back what you are doing with these ideas.
- Need for more briefing meetings to tell artists/local creative communities about what are the opportunities for them from the Games and the Cultural Olympiad.
 - They want to know how to get involved in the process since they don't know how to.
- Groundwork was identified as providing a good model for setting up transparent, local structures and steering groups and it was recommended that a relevant Southbank representative should be part of the dialogue process.
- Need to get the media involved in the LMF process as a 'media event' that works at a local as well as a global level.

Some participants raised concerns about the delivery of the LMF (funding, management and governance) and the current impact of the Olympics on arts and cultural organisations and heritage protection around the 4 Olympic boroughs is going to be managed.

- My experience is that we have a flourishing cultural environment. In Clapton we feel very disconnected from the Olympics, everything in the community is under threat by developers building lots of blocks of flats

which don't integrate culture. A local cinema, a cultural hub is under threat, further eroding evidence of arts and culture.

A question was asked about how the LDA reaches out and creates a Legacy for the rest of the UK. The Regions need to be represented in the Olympics and they need to be involved in the opening and closing ceremonies.

Participants made a strong plea for improving the location and promotion of future LMF workshops in order for a wider and more diverse group of people (both residents and organisations) to be able to attend and offered information on other networks to engage with for future events. It was suggested that:

- Meetings should be held somewhere central.
- Making sure there is more uptake.
- Evening session.
- Liaising with Audiences London (they held an event on 15/10 attended by 80+ organisations on Olympic issues and can distribute information to cultural organisations in their networks).

Finally, some participants gave feedback on the materials, mainly image renderings used at the workshop:

- I don't know who did the drawings I can't see myself in them. Why are these drawings a starting point? This is so shopping centre, where are the herb gardens and allotments? Don't be afraid of the rough edges.
- As it stands these pictures do not show a place I want to visit.
- One principle you could take is to experiment on how designers can work with communities. We need to feel like there is ownership.

LMF Issue Workshop: Social Infrastructure

Date: 17th October 2008

Facilitator: Helen Inman, Melissa Abache

Summary of key discussion points

Accessibility of facilities: need to recognise the need for parking for older people and disabled but design should prioritise pedestrians and cyclists (street layout, landscaping).

Models of provision for services: participants felt that co-location was a good approach but there was more interest in the approach to commissioning, management, building in diversity, and using more effectively existing social infrastructure (eg: schools).

Consultation process: need to engage closely with experts and operators, fringe masterplan teams, existing communities, voluntary and community organisations.

1) Social infrastructure ambitions:

After the presentation on the LMF masterplanning work to date (Output B), the facilitator introduced the following topics for discussion with the group as part of the work the team is taking forward:

- Principle of co-location of social infrastructure facilities across the site mainly for the arguments of space and cost effectiveness and maximising the beneficial relationships between certain uses (eg: school with library, GP surgery with community centre, etc).
- Principle of accessible facilities: accessibility is understood in this context as including physical, economical and social conditions to encourage people going through boroughs to use facilities.
- Principle of going beyond the LMF boundaries in assessing the social infrastructure needs and in informing the proposals for new facilities and their management regimes.
- Currently the team is investigating options for the following venues:
 - Main Olympic Stadium: as a 25,000 seat stadium in Legacy it could host a secondary school and options include a studio academy for 350-1000 pupils with or without a sports focus. This could sit alongside conference facilities and potentially a hotel. This would be in addition to the Chobham School already planned in Stratford City.
 - Arena 3: there is flexibility for the use of this venue but currently exploring use as a multi use centre including sports, courts, events, exhibitions etc.

- IBC/MPC: also flexible but with a media use or hub and with a community hub around Hackney Wick train station. Currently assessing ideas of research and higher education institution taking space here.
- Aquatics Centre: currently discussion with Tower Hamlets and Newham Councils on the provision of leisure water, community health and fitness centre.

2) Accessibility of facilities:

Participants started the discussion on acknowledging the reality of car use and dependency in the communities around the site and in East London generally and how this in turn raises concerns about:

- Car parking needs and standards as an often ignored key element of social hubs to work effectively (eg: for disabled and older people).
- A hierarchy of transport models is needed and preference for responsible car use approach.
- Accessibility needs to be considered in and around the park (eg: Disney model of catering for different abilities through monorail, car parking, etc).
- Area needs to be designed with pedestrians and cyclists as the primary users - street layout and landscaping treatments to favour them over cars.

3) Models of provision for services:

One participant emphasised how the approach to provision of social infrastructure services can't use the assumptions they use today.

- As well as co-location need to think about the management models for these centres and this is the key to real change.
- Consider and build in as possible diversity in new and existing communities. There is an attractive offer for investment but also a need to provide a cultural offer that reflects the traditions and cultures of East London.

Additional suggestions concentrated on the stakeholders that should be part of the dialogue and how they would add value to the process:

- Need to talk to the experts and operators to feed into this thinking. A lot of the change will come around the commissioning structure for new facilities and success will depend on these. This also helps to ensure that plans are drawn cost efficiently and are not entirely led by design processes.
- Need to engage with the fringe masterplan teams to ensure that the provision proposed is coordinated and also with existing communities

as otherwise there is the risk that the new facilities will feel as someone is coming in from the outside and imposing them.

- The third sector (voluntary and community organisations) needs to be well represented and accommodated within the social infrastructure facilities whilst the private sector needs to help lever in the wow factor to make these work in terms of investment and attracting people.
- Use schools and other social infrastructure more effectively. Is there really a need for new schools to be built or is it a case of using existing facilities better and expanding these?
- Open schools up during non school hours and days:
 - Operate gyms in them etc - as this has worked well elsewhere (eg: Inside Out in Bromley by Bow, Dagenham school).

Finally, participants offered examples of different approaches being applied across London that the team should explore in more detail:

- Bromley by Bow Centre as a central hub accessible to communities and having working relationships with satellite organisations like “Inside Out” (community gym and holistic health practice).
- Sport schools in existing stadiums or large sports facilities need to be treated sensibly and you need to feel part of it, otherwise is a monstrosity that attracts large crowds regularly.
- London Leisure academy puts things in existing places.
- Eltham site one stop shop example.
- Peckham pods examples.
- Museum and cultural heritage offer.
- The need for neutral and shared faith facilities: flexible venues that can accommodate an inter faith purpose.
- Most examples are ad-hoc and done in a compartmentalised commissioning project.

The workshop finished by a quick update on the plan for improving the set of skills of East London residents: both now and future skills set. This skills investment really needs to happen now so that it can benefit the Legacy changes and help make them happen.

LMF Issue Workshop: Employment and Economy

Date: 20th October 2008

Facilitator: Melissa Abache

Summary of key discussion points

Skills training needs: participants felt it should concentrate on basic level (e.g. ESOL), provided through non traditional means (e.g. RSL, schools) and funding controlled at borough level in order to have an impact on the existing communities.

Opportunities from the IBC/MPC venue: excellent opportunity but needs to be well connected (particularly to the Central Line) with operators signed in early on and linked to small businesses and the HE/FE sectors.

Areas of specialism within the LMF: concern about excluding opportunities for, specialist manufacturing, transport and logistics and importantly “*green industry*” and sustainability.

Delivery mechanisms: balance is needed to attract large international investors that will add value to London’s economy and support the micro and small business community.

1) Presentation on LMF work to date (Output B):

Comments received after the presentation on the latest masterplan framework included questions about the views of local people in terms of walking conditions in reference to the “dead ends” diagram shown in the presentation and the need to include in the vision improvements to connectivity, and secondly, about the plans for the IBC/MPC area in Legacy and if any changes in this area would have a significant impact on the rest of the site taking into account the very unique needs of the media and creative industries sector that could be relocated on site. These needs were summarised as being:

- *Affordability of space*
- *Fun and nice neighbourhoods*
- *Flexible*

2) Presentation on LMF Economic vision and ambitions:

The facilitator presented some of the baseline assumptions and data that had been used for drafting the latest economic and employment vision for the site after 2012. Below are the comments received grouped in the three main topics of discussion: delivery, connectivity and skills:

Skills:

- Need to invest in skills training strongly at a very basic level and also attitude changing to help tackle the worklessness issues. In this regard, ESOL provision is also really important in this area and maximising the benefits from the construction skills opportunities that are available.
- Access to the skills and training needs to be made available through different channels such as RSLs, schools and other non traditional means to reach those that don't seek it out directly.
- Schools are part of problem and the solution. They need to attract and retain really good teachers in East London but the housing offer doesn't create incentives. Related to this, more businesses need to recruit locally and more needs to be done to up skill local population so they can offer the right skills for new workforce that will be needed.
- Skills funding currently controlled through nationally rather than locally therefore the process can't respond to the specific local needs and skills gaps etc. This model could be more effective if adult skills funding was controlled at a borough level.

Economy:

Discussion on this topic revolved around the offer provided by the IBC/MPC and associated employment uses included media and cultural activity.

Comments included:

- Culture and Economy are tightly linked and we need to make the most of this. Success in both fields often has a knock on effect. Live, work and play issues all need to be dealt with hand in hand.
- Media activity is built along the Central Line. Therefore the media centre will need to have very easy and fast links directly back to Stratford City Central Line in order to attract the right clientele.
- Early engagement with operators is needed to try and get them interested in the legacy venues and opportunities.
- Need to link small business and enterprise into the HE/ FE sectors as well to really make the most of these connections. Students in East London often live locally and have the impetus to become entrepreneurs.
- Areas of specialism being considered within the LMF economic offer seem a bit narrow. Need to broaden the offer too to include creative skills that lead to real innovation. Manufacturing can still play a big role and shouldn't be discounted. Also transport and logistics. Green technologies?

Delivery:

Participants felt that the Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) will have to spend a lot of time and money on international investors; convincing them they want to invest in the scale of Excel and Westfield. These large scale developments tend to be inferentially funded. There were questions about how much budget the delivery vehicle will have.

The SPV management structure will also have a massive impact on micro and small business level as well - they will need to support this level of business and help create a competitive environment for them to flourish.

One participant considered that there was a need to identify early on “[big anchor tenants at the IBC and other venues - like Google at IBC/MPC](#)” to create the right impression and the perception shift needed to regenerate the area in a similar way to what happened with Canary Wharf.

- [What is the global competitive market demanding right now and in 15 years time? Need to fill the gap to make this area really carve its own niche. Just as 1930's depression automobile industry carried America though and with Canary Wharf it was changing to banking and trading processes that created the need for a new financial centre- we need to find the commercial USP \(unique selling point\) for the legacy park \(could it be green industry and sustainability?\).](#)
- [It needs to add value to London's economy as a whole - we are talking big impact here. At same time needs to be a bottom up approach as well with access to business start up space, business and enterprise support - planning for the provision that will be needed in 2014 and onwards.](#)

Conclusions and next steps

The team are very grateful for all the contributions and discussion. Some valuable points were made for the LMF team to follow up on. There were areas of praise and support as well as constructive criticism, all of which are really helpful.

All this work has been fed back to the LMF design team to help inform their latest stage of design work – “Output C”.

Feedback to all participants will take place via direct correspondence and on the legacy now website www.legacynow.co.uk

Next phase of formal consultation on Output C work will take place from Feb 09 – April 09. There will be more workshops similar to these as well as public roadshow activity to reflect how issues and ideas have been taken on board so far and help develop the plans to the near final stage, prior to planning application in late summer 2009.