

## **A sporting legacy for London?**

February 2011





## **A sporting legacy for London?**

February 2011

# Copyright

**Greater London Authority  
February 2011**

Published by  
Greater London Authority  
City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
More London  
London SE1 2AA  
[www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)

enquiries 020 7983 4100  
minicom 020 7983 4458

ISBN

This publication is printed on recycled paper

# Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee Members

Len Duvall (Chair)	Labour
Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair)	Liberal Democrat
Tony Arbour	Conservative
John Biggs	Labour
Andrew Boff	Conservative
Victoria Borwick	Conservative

## Contact

For further information contact: Elizabeth Williams on 020 7983 4394 or [Elizabeth.williams@london.gov.uk](mailto:Elizabeth.williams@london.gov.uk).

For press enquiries contact Alastair Cowan on 020 7983 4504 or [Alastair.Cowan@london.gov.uk](mailto:Alastair.Cowan@london.gov.uk).

# Contents

	<b>Chair's foreword</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>What success would look like</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Assessing London's needs: the scale of the challenge</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>A coordinated and strategic approach</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>An efficient allocation of resources</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Sustaining the legacy beyond 2012</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>38</b>
	<b>Appendix 1 Recommendations</b>	<b>40</b>
	<b>Appendix 2 Sports legacy bodies</b>	<b>42</b>
	<b>Appendix 3 Orders and translations</b>	<b>45</b>

# Chair's foreword

This Committee has long been supportive of the commitment to increase grassroots sport participation and to use the 2012 Games as a way of helping to achieve this. We welcome the establishment of the Mayor's sports fund and the steps he has taken to put the GLA at the heart of strategic decisions about sports funding.

We do not underestimate the scale of the challenge though. Sports participation rates in the capital are stubbornly static and among some groups rates are disproportionately low. Similarly, no other host city can point to a sustained increase in sports participation on the back of the Games so the Games on their own are unlikely to be enough. Also, as we enter a period of a reduction in public spending it will be a challenge to ensure that grassroots sport investment is maintained.

We recognise progress has been made in bringing together the key players and identifying strategic gaps in sports provision. However, the slow progress in getting funding streams off the ground means it will be the end of this year before we can assess whether the Mayor's fund has increased the numbers participating in sport or influenced the investment decisions of the major funders.

The Committee also looked at what was happening on the Olympic site to see if the bid commitment to use the facilities for the community after the Games was likely to be realised. While we heard of excellent work by the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority in embedding legacy uses of their facilities for the community, we found little evidence to show how the Mayor's highly ambitious target for community access to the facilities at the stadium will be met.

A sustainable sporting legacy in the capital looks a long way away at the moment but the building blocks are there. We were impressed by the work and commitment of those pursuing this goal and through this report seek to lend our support and provide constructive suggestions to help deliver it. We are grateful to all those who gave up their time and contributed in other ways to the investigation which led to this report.

**Len Duvall OBE AM**  
**Chair of the Economic Development, Culture, Sport and**  
**Tourism Committee**

## Executive summary

One of the legacy promises for the Olympic and Paralympic Games 2012 was an increase in community sport to be encouraged by the galvanising effect of the Games themselves and investment in grass roots sport. In the capital, the Mayor has produced a strategy that aims for “a leaner, fitter London” and he has made a £15.5 million fund available.

A successful sporting legacy in London would see increases in participation rates overall and among those groups, such as women, disabled people and older people, who are currently less likely to participate. It would also involve bridging the gap between the supply of sporting facilities and the demand for them that varies across the capital.

Progress towards these goals to date has largely been seen in two areas. First, there has been some useful work to identify gaps in provision. Secondly, the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner is working to bring together the myriad of public, private and third sector organisations involved in the funding and provision of sport to ensure work is coordinated and does not duplicate.

Progress was initially slow in setting up the Mayor’s sports fund. This means that it will be over the next 12 months before we can start to make a definitive assessment of its impact. We have not yet seen clear evidence that this relatively small amount of funding will fill strategic gaps in provision nor that other more significant funders have been influenced by the GLA’s work in this area.

We have set two milestones over the next year that we expect to help us and others get a clearer picture. First, we have asked that the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner respond to us by May on issues we have recommended that she address:

- involving the education and health sectors in the work of the board which oversees the strategic provision of sport in London
- working with LOCOG to ensure that there is widespread use of an Olympic brand which can be used to raise the profile of grass roots sports projects
- examining the rationale for the decision to run some of the Mayor’s funding rounds in-house and to contract-out others



- ensuring that funding decisions are taking into account the research which shows where demand for swimming pools and sports halls in London exceeds supply

In an environment where public funding is being cut, including for sport, the Mayor needs to demonstrate that his funding is well-targeted and adding value. Over the next 12 months we expect to see evidence of the impact of this funding such as increased participation in the facilities funded. The Mayor is also funding projects that aim to use sport to meet wider social objectives. We have therefore asked that the Mayor's Sports Commissioner report back by December 2011 on progress against these objectives.

London's bid for the Games promised that the facilities on the Olympic Park would be accessible to the community after the Games and the Mayor has a target that they should be available for 90 per cent of the time. We found a stark contrast between the positive work of the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, which is ensuring community use of facilities is central to its post-Games plans, and the Olympic Park Legacy Company, which does not appear to have clear plans for ensuring the Mayor's highly ambitious 90 per cent target is met. We have therefore recommended that the Mayor take steps to use his influence to ensure community access is central to ongoing discussions about the Park.

Achieving a sporting legacy was always going to be difficult but it is likely to become even more so. The evidence from previous Games did not support the ambitions for a sustained sporting legacy and it will be a challenge to keep community sport a priority as public spending cuts start to take effect. The Mayor needs to set out plans that go beyond 2012 and we recommend that he commit to a continuing role for his Sports Commissioner and the London Community Sports Board.

We welcome the Mayor's ambitions and the progress made by his Sports Commissioner in some areas. The next 12 months will be important in determining the extent to which the ambitions for a sporting legacy will be realised and the impact that the Mayor's funding and influence can have. This report is intended to help this happen.

# Introduction

London's bid to host the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games carried with it the promise of a golden opportunity to inspire and enable people to take part in regular sporting activities. Not just elite athletes, who would benefit from new and improved world-class facilities, but also members of the public who would be inspired to adopt a healthier, more active lifestyle.

This is an important and widely supported goal. Achieving a sustained and significant increase in levels of sports participation among members of the public could contribute towards health and social policy objectives such as tackling obesity, reducing health inequalities, and encouraging social inclusion so as to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour.

In this report, we assess the progress that has been made to date towards a significant and sustained increase in public participation in sporting activities, and make recommendations for further work to build on what has already been achieved.

## The scale of the challenge

We support the aspiration to use the Games as a catalyst for increased public participation in sport. However, the scale and complexity of the challenge will make it very difficult to achieve this aim.

More than four in five people in London do not take part in regular, moderate exercise. Almost half of London's population is classified as being 'inactive'.<sup>1</sup> These high levels of inactivity have consequences for individuals and for society as a whole. They are likely to lead to illness and ill health, and are associated with health inequalities and wider social problems such as crime and anti-social behaviour.<sup>2</sup> NHS London has estimated the cost of the levels of inactivity of Londoners at £105 million per year.<sup>3</sup>

In London, there are additional complexities and difficulties arising from the density, diversity and mobility of the population, the complex

---

<sup>1</sup> Taking part in less than 30 minutes of moderate intensity exercise in the last 4 weeks, source: The Mayor's Sporting Future for London, April 2009, page 14

<sup>2</sup> [Shaping Places through Sport](#), Sport England

<sup>3</sup> This figure is referenced in the Mayor's Sporting Future for London document. Its origin is a 2009 report by the Department of Health, *Be active, be healthy: a plan for getting the nation moving*. The cost estimate is based on the costs of treating five diseases defined by the World Health Organisation as having some relation to physical inactivity.

political governance of the city, and a lack of facilities, particularly in some areas.<sup>4</sup> For example, our 2008 research into swimming pool provision found that one-third of Londoners live more than twenty minutes' walk away from a public swimming pool and there is little prospect of this changing in the near future.

### **The opportunity provided by the Games**

The Games offer a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to galvanise organisations to focus, coordinate and increase their efforts. There is the potential to draw together a disparate range of organisations in the public, private and third sectors under the Olympic banner in order to provide a better focus, direction and coordination. There is also the opportunity to use the Olympic brand to attract additional investment and support, for example from Olympic sponsors and others who wish to associate themselves with the ambition and inspiration of the Games. This is particularly important in a context of cuts in public expenditure that will inevitably mean there is less public funding available for facilities and programmes to increase sports participation.

These benefits are not guaranteed or automatic. There is little evidence from previous events to show that simply hosting an Olympic and Paralympic Games in itself leads to increased sports participation. Our work in 2007 on the legacy of Olympic and Paralympic Games in host cities showed that no host city has yet experienced a lasting increase in public participation in sports activities. Even cities that have achieved a positive legacy from the Games have not seen any discernible change in participation rates.

### **The role of the Mayor**

Increasing sports participation in the capital has not always been a priority of strategic government in London. Those involved in sports participation range across the public and private sectors but it is only since the award of the 2012 Games to London that the Mayor and GLA have sought to play a central role.

---

<sup>4</sup> *A Sporting Future for London*, page 14,  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/archive/mayor/publications/2009/docs/sporting-future-2009.pdf>

There is a plethora of funding bodies and providers.<sup>5</sup> In addition to these bodies, there are a large number of local providers of sporting facilities in the private and voluntary sectors.

This raises the question of where and how the Mayor and GLA can add value. When intervening in the provision of sports facilities, and other projects to increase sports participation, it is important to demonstrate how that intervention has made a difference.

The Mayor's strategy for sport, *A sporting future for London*, sets out the reasons for his involvement and the role that the GLA could play as a strategic authority. These reasons largely centre on providing leadership and coordination for the range of bodies that do fund and provide sports facilities and programmes.

There are two related strands to the developing role of the Mayor in sporting provision in London. First, the Mayor has enabled the GLA to be a direct funder of projects to increase sports participation through a £15.5 million fund. Secondly, the Mayor's strategy for delivering a sporting legacy identifies a lack of strategic leadership of the various bodies involved in sports provision and funding which the Mayor and GLA are seeking to fill.

The ultimate goal of these interventions, as set out in the Mayor's strategy, is to deliver a grass roots sporting legacy by securing a sustained increase in sports participation and using sport to help tackle wider social problems in the capital.

### **The focus of this report**

Our focus in this report is on how successfully the Mayor is providing strategic leadership on sports provision and funding and what effect this is having on the prospects for a lasting sporting legacy after the 2012 Games.

### **Evidence base**

This report is based on our discussions with Kate Hoey MP, the Mayor's Sports Commissioner, and the written submissions we received from a range of organisations and individuals. These submissions are published separately with this report. We have also referred to existing evidence such as research and surveys by Sport

---

<sup>5</sup> The table in Appendix 2 summarises the key national, regional and local public bodies involved, their remit and funding.

England and the information and data contained in the Mayor's strategy, *A Sporting Future for London*. We are grateful to all those who contributed to this review.

This report builds on our previous work on sports participation in the capital. In 2008, the Committee published a report on the prospects for a sporting legacy for young Londoners with the aim of influencing the developing work by the Mayor.<sup>6</sup> We also return briefly in this report to issues we raised in 2006 on the prospects for a sporting legacy for disabled people, a subject which we intend to explore in greater detail later this year, and our broader work on legacy which drew on the experience from other host cities.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> [2012 Sporting Legacy for Young Londoners](#), Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee, November 2008

<sup>7</sup> [A sporting legacy for people with disabilities](#), August 2006 and [A Lasting legacy for London? Assessing the legacy of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games](#), 30 April 2007

# 1 What success would look like

- 1.1 The overall aim of the Mayor's strategy is to achieve a sustained and significant increase in the proportions of people who participate in regular sports activity, including among those who are less likely than others to take part.
- 1.2 The main existing tool for measuring success is Sport England's Active People survey, which asks a sample of the population about their participation in sports.<sup>8</sup> The survey provides a useful indication of overall levels of participation in sport and points to some differences in the levels of participation in different local authority areas and among particular groups.
- 1.3 The Active People Survey does have some limitations as a measure of the success of investment in sports participation. For example, it does not cover less formal forms of sports participation or exercise, such as recreational walking and cycling, and it does not provide an insight into the reasons for the differences in participation levels among different groups. The Central Council for Physical Recreation warned against putting too much store in these figures pointing out "any increase in participation must be considered with caution as causality is impossible to prove".<sup>9</sup>
- 1.4 Other measures must be taken into account in order to gain a full understanding of the impact of policies and programmes on sports participation. For example, Sport England has developed a satisfaction survey, which it suggests is a better proxy measure of the effectiveness of investment. It will also be important to look at the outcomes of specific projects and programmes, as well as assessing trends in participation rates among the general population.
- 1.5 Similarly, as well as the direct health benefits, a successful sporting legacy would be able to demonstrate wider social benefits. The Mayor argues that sport can help to tackle social issues such as crime and academic underachievement and has linked funding to initiatives, which place an emphasis on this. Research from Sport England shows that there is growing evidence about the benefits that regular involvement in sport and physical activity can have for individuals and communities, including reducing anti-social behaviour and tackling

---

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.sportengland.org/research/active\\_people\\_survey.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/research/active_people_survey.aspx) Sport England is a national body funded by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport to deliver the Government's sport legacy programme.

<sup>9</sup> Written submissions to the Committee, p 4

crime.<sup>10</sup> Projects funded on this basis will need to demonstrate positive outcomes beyond sports participation and improved health.

- 1.6 The Mayor has also sought to establish the GLA as the strategic leader of the various bodies involved in the delivery of sports participation projects. We would therefore expect to see evidence that the Mayor's involvement has made a demonstrable difference to the types of projects funded and the way various funders have worked together to fill strategic gaps in provision which have been identified.

---

<sup>10</sup> [Shaping Places through Sport](#), Sport England, July 2009

## 2 Assessing London's needs: the scale of the challenge

- 2.1 A strategic approach to increasing sports participation must be based on an assessment of the gaps in existing provision of facilities and of those groups which are less likely to participate. Such an assessment is also important in establishing a baseline against which the impact of the interventions of the Mayor and others can be measured.

### Facilities

- 2.2 Progress has been made in identifying gaps in facilities and groups for which provision should be targeted. Sport England, in partnership with the GLA's Planning Team, has carried out a strategic facility needs assessment across the whole of London. Such an assessment is important to ensure investment in facilities meets needs and fills gaps in existing provision rather than duplicating it. Sport England notes, "no other region in the country has undertaken this level of detail to understand their facility needs".<sup>11</sup>
- 2.3 Sport England's work focused on three facilities types: sports halls, swimming pools and artificial grass pitches.<sup>12</sup> It considered existing and planned provision against current demand and the future demand based on population projections to 2021. In doing so, the research identified mismatches between supply and demand.
- 2.4 Across London the supply of swimming pools matches demand but this masks sub-regional variations. Demand exceeds supply in the Central and East sub-regions of the capital where accessibility to swimming pools is a "big issue". The research also found that the quality of existing swimming pools and their facilities is a bigger issue than the number of pools.
- 2.5 Demand for sports halls exceeds supply across all sub-regions of London and the situation is projected to worsen. Again the Central and East sub-regions have the greatest mismatch between supply and demand. Population increases by 2021 are set to increase demand for sports halls by 22,200 visits in the weekly peak period, the equivalent of 27 four-court sports halls.
- 2.6 Sport England has also developed a web-based tool, which creates detailed profiles for every London borough. The Local Sport Profile

---

<sup>11</sup> Written submissions to the Committee, p 45

<sup>12</sup> The Development of a Needs and Evidence Based Approach to Planning for Community Sport in London, July 2010 – summary provided to the Committee and available on request.



generates a sporting profile for individual areas in the form of charts and tables bringing together data on sporting participation and provision.<sup>13</sup> This is intended to assist boroughs to develop and deliver interventions, which will maximise participation, and meet identified needs.

### **Demographic differences in levels of sports participation**

- 2.7 Overall levels of sports participation in London are in line with the national average. These figures have remained largely unchanged over the last three years. Participation among women, disabled people and over-55s has remained particularly low. According to Sport England's Active People survey, nine in ten disabled people reported that they did not participate in regular sports activities, and rates among older people are similarly low. In the 2008/09 survey of Londoners, 17 per cent of women said that they took part in regular moderate exercise, compared with 25 per cent of men.
- 2.8 The Mayor recognised in his Sporting Future for London strategy that certain groups "feel excluded from sporting activities and/or have particularly low rates of participation in London". He highlighted "those in lower socioeconomic groups, young women aged 14 to 24; older people, black and minority ethnic people, disabled people, lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans (LGBT) people."
- 2.9 There is support for some though by no means all of this analysis from the existing evidence. Women and those categorised as having a limiting illness or disability are less likely to participate in sport based on the Active People Survey, and this is supported by other evidence about the reasons for lower participation levels among these groups.
- 2.10 The survey also reports that BAME people are less likely to participate in sports activities. However, there is no disaggregation of different BAME groups, and there is a lack of evidence to inform a detailed analysis of underlying factors and causes that might contribute to the reported differences in participation rates. An approach that simply supports projects that target black and minority ethnic people is unlikely to do justice to the complex issues involved.

---

<sup>13</sup> See [http://www.sportengland.org/research/local\\_sport\\_profiles.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/research/local_sport_profiles.aspx)

- 2.11 Similarly, we are unclear what the basis is for the assertion that LGBT people are under-represented in sports participation figures nor what, if any, policy response is being proposed.
- 2.12 The equalities implications for sports participation are complex. We support the emphasis on trying to raise participation rates among women and disabled people. More work, however, needs to be done on understanding the factors which affect the participation rates of other equalities groups and whether a policy response, such as targeting resources, is justified.
- 2.13 **The Committee supports a focus on projects that seek to increase participation among women and disabled people who are clearly less likely to participate in sport. We would, however, expect more detailed work to be done to understand the causal factors in lower participation among other equalities groups before policy responses are taken forward.**

#### **Increasing sports participation among disabled people**

- 2.14 The evidence does point towards lower participation rates among disabled people. In 2006, the Committee published a report, *A sporting legacy for people with disabilities*, which set out a vision for the provision of facilities across the capital:<sup>14</sup>

“Whether [disabled people] choose to participate for fun, or to aspire to the highest levels of achievement, they will be able to find user-friendly information on what’s available, where and how to get there. Every facility, whether in a school, community hall or privately run centre, will meet a quality standard for the quality and accessibility of its services and the training undertaken by its staff.”

- 2.15 The progress towards realising this vision is the subject of some debate. Interactive, the lead strategic development agency for sport and physical activity for disabled people, highlighted the Committee’s 2006 report as the “catalyst” for a change in the way sport and

---

<sup>14</sup> Available from <http://legacy.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports/culture/disability-sport.rtf>. We note and take on board the request from Interactive, the lead strategic development agency for sport and physical activity for disabled people in London, that, in future, the Committee adopts the term “disabled people” rather than “people with disabilities”.

physical activity for disabled people is viewed in the capital. Others highlighted barriers to participation by disabled people.

- 2.16 The relatively low levels of participation of disabled people remain a concern. The Active People Survey shows that Londoners categorised as having a limiting illness or disability are nearly three times less likely to participate regularly in sport than those who are not so categorised. The Committee proposes to return to the issues it raised in its 2006 report later this year. In doing so it will seek the views of a wide range of individuals and groups representing disabled people to assess the progress that has been made in tackling the issues the Committee raised in 2006 and the current challenges presented by reductions in public funding.

## 3 A coordinated and strategic approach

- 3.1 The previous chapter set out what is known about the levels of participation in London and the work that has been carried out recently to identify where the gaps in provision are. This chapter examines how the Mayor has sought to bring together existing bodies under his leadership to coordinate the support for community sports projects in the capital. It also looks at the role of others such as central government and local authorities and their influence on the prospects for a sporting legacy in London.
- 3.2 The Mayor's strategy argued that there was a need for greater collaboration and coordination between all the organisations involved in the funding and provision of grass roots sport.<sup>15</sup> This was borne out in the submissions we received from organisations involved in sports provision. Proactive Central London, one of five sub-regional networks of organisations committed to working together to increase participation, summarised the issue:

"There is a challenge to engender and support partnership working at a regional and local level and it is often easier for organisations to work to their own agenda and for their own, rather than the collective, good."<sup>16</sup>

Similarly, Sport England noted the importance of partnership working which helps "to derive greater value for money on the investment made by both organisations and ensures that investment complements rather than competes, maximising opportunities across the capital".<sup>17</sup>

### **The London Community Sports Board**

- 3.3 The Mayor's response to this need was to establish a new London Community Sports Board (LCSB) which would aim to improve coordination of ongoing activity, drive delivery and monitor progress towards meeting the legacy goals. Its role as set out in the strategy is:
- collaborating with key delivery partners on the development of action plans for delivery
  - monitoring progress on the implementation of these plans
  - supporting the delivery of stakeholders' existing aims and objectives
  - identifying further ways to align policies, activities and resources

---

<sup>15</sup> *A Sporting Future for London*, Mayor of London, April 2009, p 11

<sup>16</sup> Written submissions to the Committee, p 23

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid*, p 40

- providing advice to the Mayor to shape policy and decision making at national 2012 forums (e.g. the Olympic Board and the new National Sport Legacy Board)
- advising the Mayor about GLA policies and future sporting priorities for London.

- 3.4 Chaired by Kate Hoey, membership of the LCSB is taken from the public, voluntary and charitable sectors, including London Councils, the British Olympic Association and Central YMCA. A full list of the members of the LCSB is reproduced in Appendix 2 to this report.
- 3.5 Some of those who responded to the Committee suggested that the work of the Sports Commissioner and the LCSB has started to improve collaboration and coordination of the various bodies involved. One example given was the facilities audit carried out by Sport England and the GLA and summarised above. Others referred to the benefits of ensuring that the various funding bodies were meeting regularly to discuss provision and the allocation of funds.
- 3.6 While most respondents to the Committee were positive about the creation of the LCSB and the forum it provided, some noted that the process of bringing together multiple organisations to work in a coordinated way remained an ongoing challenge. Proactive Central London argued that greater use could be made of Community Sport and Physical Activity Networks (CSPANs) that operate in each borough. These partnerships typically bring together the local authority, schools sports partnerships, primary care trusts and the voluntary sector.
- 3.7 The role of schools as key providers of facilities was recognised in the Mayor's strategy. The state and independent education sectors could be significant players in helping to ensure maximum availability of existing facilities and there may be a developing role for the LCSB in ensuring that this resource is used effectively. Their potential role has been recognised and acknowledged by Kate Hoey. However, these sectors are not specifically represented on the LCSB. Similarly, engagement with CSPANs would bring in the health sector.
- 3.8 **We welcome the creation of the London Community Sports Board and the steps taken by the GLA to bring together the key organisations. We recognise that achieving a strategic approach to provision of projects supporting sports**

**participation across the capital continues to be a challenge. We look to the Commissioner and Board to develop further this work to ensure effective links with the health and education sectors.**

#### **Recommendation 1**

**We recommend that the Sports Commissioner and London Community Sports Board develop their partnership approach to incorporate the local health and education sectors. We ask that the Sports Commissioner report back to the Committee by May 2011 on how she plans to ensure the state and independent education sectors, and local and regional health providers, can contribute to the Mayor's strategic aims for sports participation; and what the timescale is for this work.**

#### **Making full use of the Olympic brand**

- 3.9 One way in which the various bodies involved in sports provision can be brought together by the Olympics is through the branding of initiatives. This is intended to help make the link between high profile elite events and community sport.
- 3.10 A number of organisations which submitted information to our investigation questioned the extent to which the full potential of the Olympic brand and marketing of sporting opportunities was being realised.
- 3.11 The Inspire Mark is a version of the London 2012 brand specifically created for the community and voluntary sectors. The brand is awarded to non-commercial projects that can use the mark to promote their activity. Some organisations suggested the Inspire Mark has not been widely adopted by sporting bodies to date, and that this represented a missed opportunity to associate their activities with the Games. The Central Council for Physical Recreation (CCPR) summed up the issue and the potential available from an Olympic brand:

“Strong Olympic participation programme branding would also raise the profile of the efforts by governing bodies, sports groups and clubs by creating a higher level of consciousness around the Games and the legacy organisers promised to create. The Inspire Mark has only been made available to a very few sports projects and its nature means that it can't be awarded to any projects which attract any degree of private

funding. As such, its penetration is minimal. Branding such as that enjoyed by Millennium projects would create a link in people's minds between the Games and local and community programmes and would greatly improve the visibility and credibility of efforts to get people into sport and activity."<sup>18</sup>

- 3.12 Others made similar points. London Swimming said, "If we were able to create a simple legacy brand that linked to the games but the IOC were comfortable with and allowed this to be used creatively and collaboratively by anyone to promote a sporting legacy it would spread like wild fire. This doesn't need a huge budget but it does need leadership to get things out in the public domain so they can be used."<sup>19</sup> The Women's Sport and Fitness Foundation also suggested "there is little Olympic branded activity that is capitalising on any festival effect."<sup>20</sup>
- 3.13 Some were critical of existing initiatives, which though well intentioned were unlikely to reach their target audience without better marketing. London Swimming emphasised the importance of "showcasing existing provision to more potential participants". It criticised the Get Active London project as "an example of poor practice" suggesting that "the belief that if we build a single website without a marketing budget that lists existing provision across London will increase participation is really last century thinking".<sup>21</sup>
- 3.14 In order for the Games to act as the catalyst it should be for increased sports participation, the work to promote and support sports participation must be clearly linked to the Games. For example, there may be opportunities to enable providers to link their work to the Games and use the profile of the event to promote their facilities and programmes.

---

<sup>18</sup> Written submissions to the Committee, p 4

<sup>19</sup> Ibid, p 21

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, p 27

<sup>21</sup> Ibid, p 20

**Recommendation 2**

**We recommend that the Sports Commissioner and the London Community Sports Board negotiate with LOCOG to broaden the way the Olympic brand could be used to raise the profile of the work being done to achieve a sports participation legacy. We ask that the Sports Commissioner report back to the Committee on this in May 2011.**



## 4 An efficient allocation of resources

- 4.1 It is in the allocation of resources that the value of the interventions of the LCSB and the Mayor needs to be demonstrated. The work of Sport England and the GLA in developing the strategic facilities needs assessment and the local sport profile is intended to influence how funds are distributed to maximise the impact they will have on levels of sports participation. Similarly, as we set out above, the available data on participation rates suggests differences between the participation rates of various demographic groups and the need for targeted interventions.
- 4.2 There are broadly two ways in which the influence of the Mayor on funding provision may be assessed: the example set by the allocation of grants from the Mayor's £15.5 million sport fund; and the extent to which major funders of sports projects have been influenced by the strategic lead offered by the LCSB.
- 4.3 In order to assess the role of the Mayor's sports fund and the Mayor's influence on other funders it is important to examine the funds available from other sources and the recent changes which might affect them.

### **Funding from central government**

- 4.4 The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) has the creation of a sports participation legacy as one of its priorities, and £135 million of National Lottery funding has been allocated to support this. Direct programme expenditure across all policy areas within the DCMS is set to reduce by 17 per cent by 2014/15.<sup>22</sup> This is likely to have implications for the amount of funding that is available for sports participation.
- 4.5 Some national schemes have already been cancelled, including free swimming for under-16s and over-65s, which the Government assessed as not providing value for money. The Government also announced on 20 October 2010 that it was ending the £162 million PE and Sports Strategy and would not continue to provide ring-fenced funding for School Sport Partnerships.<sup>23</sup> These partnerships brought together groups of schools to develop physical education and sport opportunities for young people. The Secretary of State for Education said that the partnerships were "neither affordable nor likely to be the

---

<sup>22</sup> DCMS business plan, November 2010, p 19

<sup>23</sup> Refocusing sport in schools to build a lasting legacy of the 2012 Games, Department for Education press release, 20 October 2010

best way to help schools achieve their potential in improving competitive sport”.

- 4.6 The announcement about School Sport Partnerships proved controversial. The decision was criticised in an open letter from a group of British athletes and was the subject of a petition to the Department for Education.<sup>24</sup> Similarly, the Assembly unanimously passed a motion in December 2010 calling on the Mayor to make a strong case to Government to continue the School Sport Partnership programme.<sup>25</sup>
- 4.7 The Government announced on 20 December 2010 that it would pay school sport partnerships to the end of the summer term 2011 at a cost of £47 million.<sup>26</sup> It will also provide £65 million from the Department’s spending review settlement to enable every secondary school to release one PE teacher for a day a week in the school year 2011/12 and 2012/13. These initiatives would replace the £162 million PE and Sports Strategy.
- 4.8 The Government also funds Sport England through a direct grant from the DCMS and a contribution from the National Lottery. Sport England supports the 46 national governing bodies of individual sports and seeks to increase the participation levels of adults. Sport England’s budget is to be reduced by around 33 per cent by 2014/15 as a result of the decisions announced in the Comprehensive Spending Review.<sup>27</sup> The Chief Executive of Sport England said that the CSR was “tough for grassroots sports”.<sup>28</sup> She also said she was pleased that a request to protect its investment in the 46 individual sports had been reflected and she welcomed the reforms of the National Lottery which would bring in additional money to sport.

#### **Funding from local authorities**

- 4.9 Local authorities are key public sector providers of public sports facilities and opportunities. London local authorities spent £94 million

---

<sup>24</sup> see, for example, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-11896962>

<sup>25</sup> “Assembly opposes grassroots sports cuts”, London Assembly press release, 8 December 2010

<sup>26</sup> ‘Gove: “I want competitive sport to be at the centre of a truly rounded education”’, Department for Education press release 20 December 2010

<sup>27</sup> [www.sportandrecreation.co.uk](http://www.sportandrecreation.co.uk)

<sup>28</sup> <http://www.morethanthegames.co.uk/london-2012/2013030-sports-bodies-reactions-comprehensive-spending-review>

<sup>29</sup> However, the Comprehensive Spending Review suggests a reduction across all areas of local authority spending over the next four years of around 14 per cent.<sup>30</sup> Spending on sport is discretionary for local authorities and it therefore seems inevitable that spending will be reduced.

- 4.10 Other funding sources for sport in the capital are the large number of voluntary groups and charities. These in turn often rely on contributions from central and local government.
- 4.11 It is too early to say how the reductions in public spending over the next few years will affect sports provision. It is clear though that funding will be extremely tight. This makes it especially important that the Mayor can demonstrate the value added by his direct funding of sport and the influence it has on others.

### **The Mayor's sports fund**

- 4.12 In January 2009, the Mayor directed the London Development Agency to ring-fence £15.5 million over three years for investment in projects associated with his sporting strategy. The Mayor's sports fund is intended to provide a lever for the GLA to develop its role as the strategic lead for sporting provision across the capital. The Sports Commissioner described the fund as important because it "brought the Mayor and the GLA to the table" while recognising that even with the match funding required for successful bids the funds were not going to "solve all the problems of London".<sup>31</sup>
- 4.13 Others reiterated this point. The Director of London Swimming noted: "£15 million would not even buy you a single leisure centre with a swimming pool. Therefore this funding needs to be used to point the way – set a direction for sport in the capital and unlock potential".<sup>32</sup>
- 4.14 The Mayor's funding is divided between three separate funding rounds over three years from 2009/10: the £7.5 million facilities fund; the £3 million training and skills fund; and the £4 million sports participation fund.

---

<sup>29</sup> CIPFA Finance and General Statistics 2009/10

<sup>30</sup> *Spending Review 2010*, HM Treasury, Table 1, p 10

<sup>31</sup> Transcript of Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee meeting 7 September 2010, p 14

<sup>32</sup> Written submissions to the Committee, p 18

### *A slow start*

- 4.15 We heard some criticism of the early administration of the funds. Writing in August 2010, the Director of London Swimming concluded: “I had expected us to have made a lot more progress by now ... it has taken a long time before the facilities round was launched, the training round is live for quick wins but not officially launched and the ‘other intervention’ pot has not been launched yet”.<sup>33</sup>
- 4.16 There were also specific delays to the distribution of funds awarded to some schemes. Of one of the early pilot projects, the Director of London Swimming reported: “The processes and procedures from LDA to GLA do not seem to have worked or even exist. For example, we got our contract for the mobile pools in September (we had committed to delivery in July) and we got paid in December (having been exposed to costs since July)”.<sup>34</sup>
- 4.17 The Mayor’s Sports Commissioner accepted these criticisms highlighting problems with the transfer of responsibility from the LDA to the GLA. GLA officers also noted: “historically the GLA has not been a grant giving organisation so this is very much a new piece of work”.<sup>35</sup> Both were confident that processes had now been put in place to ensure such delays would not be repeated.
- 4.18 A key step taken by the GLA to improve the administration of the funds has been to appoint external organisations with grant-giving experience to manage the allocation. For example, after a tender process, the GLA appointed the Football Foundation as the delivery partner for the facilities fund.<sup>36</sup> Similarly, the skills and training fund is managed by the National Skills Academy. Kate Hoey argued that to deliver the management of these funds from within the GLA would have been more expensive and involved employing “substantial numbers of people”.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Written submissions to the Committee, p 17

<sup>34</sup> Ibid

<sup>35</sup> Transcript of Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee meeting 7 September 2010, p 18

<sup>36</sup> This does not mean the facilities fund is targeted only at football; the Football Foundation is a multi-sports organisation and has distributed money from the facilities fund across a wide range of sports.

<sup>37</sup> Transcript of Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee meeting 7 September 2010, p 16

### *Facilities fund*

- 4.19 Grants from the facilities fund are to be awarded in a series of funding rounds between April 2010 and March 2013. The first funding round was completed in December 2010 and 13 projects from ten London boroughs received funding of a total of £1.26 million.<sup>38</sup>
- 4.20 The second bidding round is currently under way and successful bids will be announced in May 2011 when the third round will be launched.
- 4.21 Feedback from those involved in sports participation suggests that the allocation of grants from the facilities fund has been carried out effectively. Sport England said that there was “close consultation around various funding streams which helps to make the most of the funding that is available”.<sup>39</sup> The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority pointed to a partnership approach which “ensures that investment complements rather than competes, maximising opportunities across the capital”.<sup>40</sup>
- 4.22 We would expect to see evidence to support these assertions about the way funds are disbursed. Sport England recommended that the GLA use the findings of its facilities audit when considering investments from its own funding streams.<sup>41</sup>
- 4.23 This is a stated aim of the facilities fund. The Football Foundation, which administers the facilities fund, states that the decision process will “take into account the local need for the facility [which] will be informed by the data that we compiled in our recent work in partnership with Sport England which shows where the greatest facility shortages currently exist”.<sup>42</sup>
- 4.24 This may be difficult to achieve because of the other factors which will determine the allocation of funds. Grants awarded under the facilities round are based on bids from boroughs and other providers of sport facilities. Quality bids may not come from areas with facility shortages. Bids will also be determined by the extent to which they

---

<sup>38</sup> Twenty-sixth Mayor’s Report to the Assembly, 15 December 2010

<sup>39</sup> Written submissions to the Committee, p 42

<sup>40</sup> Ibid, p 64

<sup>41</sup> The Development of a Needs and Evidence Based Approach to Planning for Community Sport in London, July 2010

<sup>42</sup> <http://www.footballfoundation.org.uk/apply/pslfacilityfund/?locale=en>

attract match funding and the availability of such match funding will not necessarily follow the geographical need.

- 4.25 It is not possible to draw definitive conclusions from the few grants that have been awarded from the facilities fund to date. After the second round of bidding we would expect to see a clear correlation between the grants awarded and the facilities gaps identified by Sport England's research.

### **Recommendation 3**

**We recommend that after the announcement of the second round of successful bids for the facilities fund in May 2011, the Mayor's Sports Commissioner report to the Committee on how the Mayor's funding is adding to the supply of sports facilities in areas where demand exceeds supply.**

#### *Training and skills fund*

- 4.26 There has been relatively little progress in allocating the training and skills fund. The LCSB set up the London Leisure Academy project, under the National Skills Academy for Sports and Leisure, to lead on the management of this fund but minutes of the Board's meetings suggest there has been concern about the lack of clarity over likely outcomes.<sup>43</sup> A small proportion of the £3 million skills and training fund has been allocated to date: the Committee was told in October 2010 only £43,386 had been allocated to deliver training to 534 individual recipients. The Mayor stated in December 2010 that over 1,000 courses had been delivered.<sup>44</sup>
- 4.27 **While we recognise that it takes time to ensure that funds are allocated effectively and achieve outcomes, the lack of progress with the skills and training fund is very disappointing.**

#### *Sports participation fund*

- 4.28 The last fund to be launched was the sports participation fund in summer 2010. This is being managed in-house within the GLA with decisions made by a panel drawn from the membership of the LCSB. The fund is split into three categories: increasing participation in sport; community development; and 'at risk' young adults which seeks

---

<sup>43</sup> Minutes of London Community Sports Board, 28 January 2010 – available from the Committee

<sup>44</sup> Twenty-sixth Mayor's Report to the Assembly, 15 December 2010

to support projects that use sport and physical activity to tackle issues such as crime, worklessness, homelessness or drug and alcohol abuse. The first round of grants from this fund was announced at the beginning of December 2010.<sup>45</sup>

- 4.29 **Given the statements from the Sports Commissioner about the early management of the Mayor's sports fund and the new role this will create for the GLA as a grant-giving body, managing the sports participation fund in-house is not without risk. The rationale behind the decision to contract-out the management of the other two funds was, we conclude, well argued and we will therefore want to ensure that the management of the sports participation fund is carefully monitored.**

#### **Recommendation 4**

**We recommend that the Mayor's Sports Commissioner evaluate the costs and benefits of the different approaches that have been taken to managing and allocating the Mayor's funds. We ask that she report back to the Committee in May 2011 on the outcome of this review and how they will be taken into account in future funding rounds.**

#### *Measuring the success of the Mayor's investment in sport*

- 4.30 The success of the Mayor's interventions will be judged against the two objectives set for it: its direct impact on participation rates; and the influence he has had over other funders.
- 4.31 In order to measure success therefore, those receiving grants need to demonstrate what impact the investment has had on participation rates overall or on different target groups. We do not wish to add to the administrative burden of those organisations in receipt of grants from the Mayor's sports funds. We note that grant recipients are expected to have in place ongoing research and monitoring programmes to demonstrate their effectiveness and consider that this monitoring should be publicly available.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> "Mayor announces further funding for community sports participation", press release, 6 December 2010

<sup>46</sup> See, for example, Sports Participation Fund, GLA, August 2010, p 29

- 4.32 The sports participation fund also incorporates a wider role for the funding by earmarking funds for wider social objectives such as reducing crime among young people. While we note the Mayor's arguments that there is some research to support the view that sports projects can contribute to these wider policy goals, we would not want to see the primary goal of increasing sports participation watered down.
- 4.33 Furthermore, the Mayor needs to demonstrate that the direct funding he has awarded and the leadership provided by the LCSB has directly influenced the funding decisions of other bodies. We welcome the positive comments of a number of bodies about the influence of the Mayor's Sports Commissioner and the LCSB. We expect to see in the coming months some clear examples of how strategic decisions about the allocation of resources across London have been influenced by the work of the LCSB and Mayor.

#### **Recommendation 5**

**We recommend that in December 2011 the Mayor's Sports Commissioner report to the Committee on the outcomes from the grants awarded from the Mayor's sports funds. This should include details of the numbers of additional people who have started taking part in sport and progress against other social objectives set out for the funds.**

**We further recommend that in reporting back to the Committee in December 2011, the Mayor's Sport Commissioner set out how the work of the London Community Sports Board has sought to influence the funding decisions of others and the progress that has been made in filling the strategic gaps identified by the Board's work.**

- 4.34 Two years after the Mayor directed the LDA to provide £15.5 million for sport in the capital and 18 months since the publication of his strategy, grants are now being awarded and other funders are working with the GLA through the London Community Sports Board. The next 12 months will be important in determining the extent to which these interventions are starting to affect levels of sports participation. The recommendations in this chapter are intended to ensure that the Committee and others can evaluate their effect. This should inform future decisions about funding and other resources in the longer-term.



## 5 Sustaining the legacy beyond 2012

- 5.1 Most of the activities described in this report relate to the work being done in advance of the Games. For this work to have a lasting impact, work will need to continue beyond 2012.
- 5.2 Some commentators have criticised organisers for being shortsighted in planning the sporting legacy for the UK. John Amaechi, a former Olympian has criticised the lack of a legacy plan post 2012.<sup>47</sup> Similarly, Sir Steve Redgrave, a government 2012 sports champion, has said, “there has been little talk about what is going to happen in the years after the Olympics. The success of these Games will not even be what happens in 2013, but what happens in 2020 and beyond”.<sup>48</sup>

### **The Mayor’s role after 2012**

- 5.3 The Mayor’s ability to affect the extent of any sporting legacy after the Games will depend on the continuing role of the GLA in sports provision and the influence he is able to bring to bear on the community use of new facilities built for the Games.

### *The London Community Sports Board and the Sports Commissioner*

- 5.4 The work of the London Community Sports Board and the Mayor’s Commissioner for Sport has to date focused on bringing together the key organisations and managing the allocation of resources from the Mayor’s sport fund.
- 5.5 The Mayor’s strategy does not extend beyond 2012 – its focus is on actions that can be taken prior to the Games, taking advantage of the profile and attention that are associated with the run-up to the event. The Mayor’s sport fund runs out at the end of 2011/12.
- 5.6 There is a continuing role for a London Commissioner for Sport and for the LCSB beyond 2012. Without this it is difficult to see where the strategic oversight will come from to build on the impetus of the Games. The problems of a disparate range of funding and delivery bodies in the capital will quickly re-emerge without somebody to provide a strategic lead. In a reduced funding environment this risks undoing much of the work that has been done to date and missing the opportunities that the Games will bring.

---

<sup>47</sup> [http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport1/hi/olympic\\_games/8291308.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport1/hi/olympic_games/8291308.stm)

<sup>48</sup> Steve Redgrave comments, *The Guardian*, 27 December 2009

### **Recommendation 6**

**We recommend that the Mayor commit to retaining a role for his Sports Commissioner and the London Community Sport Board after 2012. We ask that in a response to this report in May 2011 he set out his plans for delivering a sporting legacy beyond 2012 and the extent to which seed funding might be available to ensure the GLA role is retained.**

#### *Olympic facilities*

- 5.7 Our focus in this report is on community rather than elite sport but there is still potential for some of the new facilities built for the elite events during the Games to increase the provision for community sport in the long-term. This was recognised in the London bid which promised that, after the Games, the Park facilities would be “accessible for all levels of ability and blend sport, culture and the environment in a way that makes sports an integral part of the community”.<sup>49</sup>
- 5.8 The facilities on the Olympic Park are an important resource and offer significant new facilities in east London. Kate Hoey told the Committee that while her responsibilities lay with grass roots sport rather than the Games themselves she recognised the potential of the facilities. Of the prospects for a football club taking over the Olympic Stadium she recognised the potential noting that other stadiums she had visited around the world were “humming during the day” and were used for community activities such as nurseries.<sup>50</sup>
- 5.9 The Mayor has a target that Olympic Park facilities will be available for use by the community for 90 per cent of the time after the Games. This is on the basis that most elite facilities are only in use for relatively short periods. The 90 per cent target seems optimistic. We were told that it is going to be very challenging to achieve but it remains important as an indication of intent. Kate Hoey noted,

---

<sup>49</sup> *Olympic Games concept and legacy*, Candidate file, July 2007, p 23

<sup>50</sup> Transcript of Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee meeting 7 September 2010, p 6

“everyone else may have gone away from that [the 90 per cent target] but we are still trying to push it”.<sup>51</sup>

- 5.10 It is not clear what mechanisms are in place to ensure that community access remains central to decisions about the Park in legacy use. The Mayor’s Sports Commissioner continues to argue for it but accepted that she does “not really have the power to change” though she has “some” influence.<sup>52</sup>
- 5.11 The potential for community use of Olympic facilities can be seen from the work of the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority.<sup>53</sup> The Authority is in charge of the White Water Centre, VeloPark and Tennis and Hockey centres at Eton Manor, from the bid stage right through to legacy use. It has worked in partnership with the associated National Governing Bodies as part of the detailed planning for how venues will be used by elite and grass roots both during and after the Games. It recently supported England Hockey’s concerns for adequate hockey facilities for competition post games and ensured that the specification for Eton Manor gave hockey a suitable post-Games competition venue.
- 5.12 The Authority has clear plans and goals for sporting use of the venues after the Games. It is keen to introduce new people to the sports of canoeing, cycling, tennis and hockey and argues that by increasing the amount of people taking part in these sports at a grass roots level, it is likely that more people will continue activity into club and then elite level sport. It hopes to engage 400,000 new participants in sports on the site each year and has set out plans on how to do this.
- 5.13 **We commend the work of the Lee Valley Park Regional Authority in ensuring community use of Olympic facilities after the Games is central to its developing plans. Its work is an excellent example of how a sporting legacy can be embedded into the preparations for the Games and provides a useful blueprint for others.**
- 5.14 By contrast, at this stage, it is far from clear what plans are in place to embed a sporting legacy in the venues that will be managed by the Olympic Park Legacy Company (OPLC), including the Stadium, Aquatics centre and Handball arena. While we recognise the 90 per

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid

<sup>52</sup> Ibid

<sup>53</sup> Written submissions to the Committee, pp 63-74

cent target is optimistic, community access for anything over 50 per cent of the time would represent a useful addition to the provision of sports facilities and needs a target to form the basis of negotiations with potential tenants.

- 5.15 There is nothing to suggest the 90 per cent target has formed part of negotiations. In March 2010, the OPLC launched a 'soft market testing exercise', inviting potential tenants to set out how they could use the stadium.<sup>54</sup> A summary of responses received stated that all respondents expressed the desire to make the stadium accessible to the public, although the level of access was not specified.
- 5.16 There are other opportunities for the OPLC to help facilitate a sporting legacy. The CCPR noted, "if the park is able to provide affordable and fit for purpose accommodation for sporting bodies this would be a key contribution to sporting legacy and help to retain a sporting ethos within the park post-games".<sup>55</sup>
- 5.17 Access to the Park after the Games is likely to be an important factor in maintaining the interest of the local community and ensuring a long-term engagement with the facilities. The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority noted the risk from the fact that the Park will be closed to the public until 2013/14 suggesting this "has the potential to disengage the local community".<sup>56</sup> It suggests, "events and activities for the local community be incorporated within the plans for redevelopment, so that local people immediately reap the benefits of the park." It is not obvious to us who will be in a sufficiently influential position to pursue such ideas under the current governance model.
- 5.18 The Mayor has influence over the Olympic Park after the Games through his 50 per cent ownership of the Olympic Park Legacy Company. This influence will be even stronger if it is reconstituted as a Mayoral Development Corporation. There is little to suggest that the Mayor's Sports Commissioner currently has a platform to pursue sporting legacy goals in the ongoing discussions about the Park.

---

<sup>54</sup> *Olympic Stadium Legacy: Memorandum of Information*, Olympic Park Legacy Company March 2010

<sup>55</sup> Written submissions to the Committee, p 2

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid*, p 65

**5.19 The sporting facilities on the Olympic Park are significant assets and provide an opportunity for the Mayor to realise his sporting legacy goals. We are disappointed that there appears to be no mechanism currently in place to ensure that targets for community access, and retaining a sporting ethos in the Park after the Games, are realised. The role of the Mayor's Sports Commissioner is not being given appropriate prominence in discussions about the future of the Park.**

#### **Recommendation 7**

**We recommend that by May 2011 the Mayor set out to the Committee: whether he remains committed to a 90 per cent target for community use of Olympic Park facilities; and how he proposes to meet any target, with key milestones and a timetable for achieving it. In doing so, he should address the question of whether there is a role for his Sports Commissioner on the OPLC, and any successor body, or what alternative mechanism he proposes to ensure community access is central to decisions about the Park after the Games.**

**We further recommend that the Olympic Park Legacy Company ensures targets for community access are included in its ongoing discussions with potential future tenants or owners of sporting facilities on the Olympic Park.**

## 6 Conclusion

- 6.1 The big ambitions for a sporting legacy from the 2012 Games were always going to be difficult to deliver. We recognise the unique challenges faced by the capital in encouraging and facilitating people to take part in sport. There is also a very different financial situation from the one faced when the bid was won in 2005.
- 6.2 Some good progress has been made. We commend the work of the Mayor's Sports Commissioner and the London Community Sports Board in starting to bring together the disparate groups that contribute schemes and facilities to support sports participation in the capital. This is likely to remain an ongoing challenge but is essential if existing resources are to be used to their maximum potential and new sources of funding are to be applied in a strategic way.
- 6.3 We welcome the fact that many of the issues we have raised previously in this policy area have been taken on board and we continue to support the efforts made to realise a sporting legacy from the 2012 Games. Our proposals in this report are intended to support and enhance the existing work and ensure that all the resources available are channelled in the most effective way.
- 6.4 Future funding sources are uncertain. Even the huge potential offered by the venues on the Olympic Park has only been partially realised to date. A categorical commitment for community use of these venues after the Games can still, and must, be delivered.
- 6.5 While the national frameworks and funding sources for sports participation remain uncertain, the onus is on the Mayor to drive this agenda at a regional level embedding the goal of sports participation in the decisions he still has to make about the Games. The Mayor also needs to demonstrate that his interventions in the funding and provision of community sport meet the objectives he has set.
- 6.6 A little realism is clearly necessary. The evidence from previous Games did not support the ambitious targets for increases in sports participation made at the time of the bid. More importantly, the retrenchment in public finances has squeezed already limited funds to invest in infrastructure for facilities and

coaches, which will be needed if any sort of a sporting legacy is to be delivered.

- 6.7 Perhaps unsurprisingly there is little evidence to date of a “Games effect” on the sports participation rates of Londoners, which remain unchanged from previous years. Furthermore, the Games are still over a year away. Only in the last few months has significant progress started to be made in the allocation of grants from the Mayor’s fund. And many of those responding to our investigation highlighted the difficulties of trying to ensure a strategic oversight of the decisions of disparate funding bodies and providers.
- 6.8 Over the next 12 months though as we get closer to the Games themselves the funding provided by the Mayor, and the influence he has had over the funding of others, will need to start to show results. We have set out in this report what we and others will expect to see and intend to monitor progress carefully.
- 6.9 The Mayor’s ambition for a “leaner, fitter London” after the Games is a welcome one. There is much to be done for it to be realised. The recommendations in this report are intended to help make some contribution towards this goal and we urge those involved to take them on board.

# Appendix 1 Recommendations

## Recommendation 1

We recommend that the Sports Commissioner and London Community Sports Board develop their partnership approach to incorporate the local health and education sectors. We ask that the Sports Commissioner report back to the Committee by May 2011 on how she plans to ensure the state and independent education sectors, and local and regional health providers, can contribute to the Mayor's strategic aims for sports participation; and what the timescale is for this work.

## Recommendation 2

We recommend that the Sports Commissioner and the London Community Sports Board negotiate with LOCOG to broaden the way the Olympic brand could be used to raise the profile of the work being done to achieve a sports participation legacy. We ask that the Sports Commissioner report back to the Committee on this in May 2011.

## Recommendation 3

We recommend that after the announcement of the second round of successful bids for the facilities fund in May 2011, the Mayor's Sports Commissioner report to the Committee on how the Mayor's funding is adding to the supply of sports facilities in areas where demand exceeds supply.

## Recommendation 4

We recommend that the Mayor's Sports Commissioner evaluate the costs and benefits of the different approaches that have been taken to managing and allocating the Mayor's funds. We ask that she report back to the Committee in May 2011 on the outcome of this review and how they will be taken into account in future funding rounds.

## Recommendation 5

We recommend that in December 2011 the Mayor's Sports Commissioner report to the Committee on the outcomes from the grants awarded from the Mayor's sports funds. This should include details of the numbers of additional people who have started taking part in sport and progress against other social objectives set out for the funds.

We further recommend that in reporting back to the Committee in December 2011, the Mayor's Sport Commissioner set out how the work of the London Community Sports Board has sought to influence



the funding decisions of others and the progress that has been made in filling the strategic gaps identified by the Board's work.

#### **Recommendation 6**

We recommend that the Mayor commit to retaining a role for his Sports Commissioner and the London Community Sport Board after 2012. We ask that in a response to this report in May 2011 he set out his plans for delivering a sporting legacy beyond 2012 and the extent to which seed funding might be available to ensure the GLA role is retained.

#### **Recommendation 7**

We recommend that by May 2011 the Mayor set out to the Committee: whether he remains committed to a 90 per cent target for community use of Olympic Park facilities; and how he proposes to meet any target, with key milestones and a timetable for achieving it. In doing so, he should address the question of whether there is a role for his Sports Commissioner on the OPLC, and any successor body, or what alternative mechanism he proposes to ensure community access is central to decisions about the Park after the Games.

We further recommend that the Olympic Park Legacy Company ensures targets for community access are included in its ongoing discussions with potential future tenants or owners of sporting facilities on the Olympic Park.

## Appendix 2 Sports legacy bodies

		Remit	Budget (where available)
<b>National</b>			
	DCMS	Deliver a safe and successful Olympic and Paralympic Games in London in 2012, and urgently form plans to deliver a genuine and lasting legacy	£135m National Lottery funding for national legacy plans
	Sport England	Sponsored by DCMS to grow levels of adult sporting participation for all sport except in-school (including curriculum PE) and elite level sport	£250m / year £135m Exchequer and £116m National Lottery funding
	Youth Sports Trust	An independent charity working to encourage all young people to take part in five hours of PE and sport each week, both in and out of school time.	£15m per year
	National Governing Bodies (46)	Bodies responsible for individual sports, e.g. UK Athletics	£120m (National Lottery and Exchequer) per year, from Sport England
<b>Regional</b>			
	Mayor of London / GLA	Deliver a grass roots sporting legacy for Londoners from the 2012 Games by securing a sustained increase in participation in sport and physical activity amongst Londoners.	£15.5m until 2012
	London Community Sports Board	Non-statutory advisory group to oversee the delivery of the Mayor's strategy and investment of the £15.5 million, and to advise the Mayor on London-wide delivery of grass roots sport and physical activity.	No associated budget

<b>Sub-regional / Local</b>			
	OPLC	Long-term planning, development, management and maintenance of the Olympic Park and its facilities after the London 2012 Games.	Not known
	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Management of the remaining venues: Velopark, Hockey and Tennis centre and the White Water Centre	
	Pro Active Partnerships	Five in London: East, Central, North, South and West of London, part of the national County Sports Partnership network. Each Partnership consists of a network of organisations to increase participation in physical activity and sport.	Funding secured from Sport England: £200,000 per year for each London region to 2015
	Host Borough Unit's Strategic Regeneration Framework	By 2015, the SRF targets are that the host boroughs will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• narrow the gap on adults exercising for 30 minutes three times a week to 0.5% points (an extra 15,000)</li> <li>• narrow the gap on adults not taking any physical activity to 1% point (an extra 25,000 adults)</li> <li>• ensure that nearly all children will be participating in school sport (an extra 48,000).</li> </ul>	No associated budget
	Boroughs	Local delivery of sport and recreation	£94 million in 2009/10

The membership of the London Community Sports Board is:

Member	
Kate Hoey MP (Chair)	Mayor's Commissioner for Sport
Nick Bitel	Chief Executive, London Marathon Trust
Shaun Dawson	Regional Sport Champion for London
Brian Dickens	North Lambeth/North Southwark Sport Action Zone
Cllr John Fahy	London Councils
Lord Colin Moynihan	Chairman, British Olympic Association
Sangita Patel	London Community Sports Network
Rosi Prescott	Chief Executive, Central YMCA
Mark Sesnan	Chairman, ProActive Central; Managing Director, GLL
David Sparkes	Chief Executive, Amateur Swimming Association
Andy Sutch	Chair, London Federation of Sport and Recreation

# Appendix 3 Orders and translations

## How to order

For further information on this report or to order a copy, please contact David Bellman, Administrator, on or email: [david.bellman@london.gov.uk](mailto:david.bellman@london.gov.uk)

## See it for free on our website

You can also view a copy of the report on the GLA website: <http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports>

## Large print, braille or translations

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of this report in large print or braille, or a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call us on: 020 7983 4100 or email:

[assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

### Chinese

如您需要这份文件的简介的翻译本，  
请电话联系我们或按上面所提供的邮寄地址或  
Email 与我们联系。

### Vietnamese

Nếu ông (bà) muốn nội dung văn bản này được dịch sang tiếng Việt, xin vui lòng liên hệ với chúng tôi bằng điện thoại, thư hoặc thư điện tử theo địa chỉ ở trên.

### Greek

Εάν επιθυμείτε περίληψη αυτού του κειμένου στην γλώσσα σας, παρακαλώ καλέστε τον αριθμό ή επικοινωνήστε μαζί μας στην ανωτέρω ταχυδρομική ή την ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση.

### Turkish

Bu belgenin kendi dilinize çevrilmiş bir özetini okumak isterseniz, lütfen yukarıdaki telefon numarasını arayın, veya posta ya da e-posta adresi aracılığıyla bizimle temasa geçin.

### Punjabi

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਇਸ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ ਦਾ ਸੰਖੇਪ ਅਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਲੈਣਾ ਚਾਹੋ, ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਇਸ ਨੰਬਰ 'ਤੇ ਫੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਉਪਰ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਡਾਕ ਜਾਂ ਈਮੇਲ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ।

### Hindi

यदि आपको इस दस्तावेज़ का सारांश अपनी भाषा में चाहिए तो उपर दिये हुए नंबर पर फोन करें या उपर दिये गये डाक पते या ई मेल पते पर हम से संपर्क करें।

### Bengali

আপনি যদি এই দলিলের একটি সারাংশ নিজের ভাষায় পেতে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে যোগাযোগ করবেন অথবা উল্লিখিত ডাক ঠিকানায় বা ই-মেইল ঠিকানায় আমাদের সাথে যোগাযোগ করবেন।

### Urdu

اگر آپ کو اس دستاویز کا خلاصہ اپنی زبان میں درکار ہو تو، براہ کرم نمبر پر فون کریں یا مذکورہ بالا ڈاک کے پتے یا ای میل پتے پر ہم سے رابطہ کریں۔

### Arabic

الحصول على ملخص لهذا المستند بلغة،  
فرجاء الاتصال برقم الهاتف أو الاتصال على  
العنوان البريدي أو العادي أو عنوان البريد  
الإلكتروني أعلاه.

### Gujarati

જો તમારે આ દસ્તાવેજનો સાર તમારી ભાષામાં જોડતો હોય તો ઉપર આપેલ નંબર પર ફોન કરો અથવા ઉપર આપેલ ટપાલ અથવા ઈ-મેઇલ સરનામા પર અમારો સંપર્ક કરો.

**Greater London Authority**

City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
More London  
London SE1 2AA

**[www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)**

Enquiries 020 7983 4100  
Minicom 020 7983 4458