

Park life
The legacy of London's Olympic venues

December 2011



Park life

The legacy of London's Olympic venues

December 2011

Copyright

**Greater London Authority
December 2011**

Published by
Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA
www.london.gov.uk

enquiries 020 7983 4100
minicom 020 7983 4458

ISBN 978-1-84781-482-1

This publication is printed on recycled paper

Cover image copyright London 2012

Economy, Culture and Sport Committee Members

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

The Economy, Culture and Sport Committee agreed the following terms of reference for this investigation in May 2011:

- To examine plans for legacy use, governance and funding of the new permanent venues for the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games within London, including the aquatics centre, Eton Manor, hockey centre, velopark and handball arena.
- To seek to influence decisions regarding the Olympic and Paralympic venues by recommending ways to ensure positive social and economic legacies for Londoners.

The Committee would welcome feedback on this report. For further information please contact Richard Berry on 020 7983 4199 or Richard.Berry@london.gov.uk. For media enquiries please contact Alastair Cowan on 020 7983 4504 or Alastair.Cowan@london.gov.uk.

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| | Chair's foreword | 7 |
| | Executive summary | 8 |
| 1 | Introduction | 10 |
| 2 | Potential benefits of the venues | 15 |
| 3 | How to maximise the benefits of the venues | 20 |
| 4 | Conclusion | 31 |
| | Appendix 1 Recommendations | 32 |
| | Appendix 2 Submission from Transport for London | 33 |
| | Appendix 3 OPLC venue access requirements | 38 |
| | Appendix 4 Views and information | 41 |
| | Appendix 5 Orders and translations | 43 |

Chair's foreword

Londoners were promised that the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games would deliver a long-term legacy for the city. Basing the Games venues in east London was fundamental to this effort, as they are intended to help secure the regeneration of the communities in and around the Olympic Park. Our investigation has considered whether the right plans are being put in place to make sure this happens.

Having examined options for the Olympic Stadium and media centre last year, in this investigation we focused on the plans for the other permanent sporting venues on the park: the aquatics centre, the velopark, the handball arena and the Eton Manor hockey and tennis centre.

These venues will provide state-of-the-art facilities for the world's best athletes in 2012, with stunning architecture and the latest environmental technology. Spectators will be guaranteed an unforgettable experience, with every available ticket for events to be staged at these venues well on the way to being sold out. However we need to make sure the venues will work for London long after the Games are over. This can be achieved if the venues become both valued community assets and major drivers of the visitor economy in east London.

The venues need to become compelling new visitor attractions for London, because getting people through the doors is vital for the long-term viability of the venues, and the Olympic Park as a whole. The venues should be open to the public for as long as possible, and easily accessible for local people and visitors from further afield. Within and between the venues there should be a range of things to do: the Park can be a place where visitors can not only go swimming, but also watch an event or concert, have lunch, visit an exhibition and do a bit of shopping.

We know those who will own and run the venues after 2012 share these ambitions. In this report we set out what some of the key components of their future plans should be. By agreeing the right strategy now, London will move a great deal closer to achieving a sustainable legacy for its Olympic and Paralympic venues.

Dee Doocey AM

Chair of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee



Executive summary

Any additional public funding of the venues beyond 2012 has to be cost-effective, delivering strategic benefits for Londoners.

Five permanent sporting venues are being constructed in east London for next year's Olympic and Paralympic Games. After the Games are over the venues are expected to provide a long-lasting legacy for the benefit of Londoners. The Committee examined the legacy plans for the largest venue, the Olympic Stadium, in its 2010 report, *Legacy United?* In this investigation we have considered each of the other venues: the aquatics centre, the velopark, the handball arena and the Eton Manor hockey and tennis centre.

The starting point for our investigation was the evidence that the venues are very unlikely to generate enough revenue to cover their operating costs after 2012. Maintaining the venues will therefore require an ongoing call on public money, in addition to the £465 million taxpayers have already spent building them. The Committee has not approached this issue with a fixed idea that further subsidies must be ruled out; however, we want and expect any additional public funding of the venues beyond 2012 to be used cost-effectively, delivering strategic public benefits.

The key benefit that the venues can deliver is to help regenerate east London by stimulating jobs and employment opportunities in and around the Olympic Park. The regeneration potential of the venues depends on the level of footfall they generate. Visitors can be attracted through spectator events, although these venues are not designed for sports that stage regular, large events. The venue owners and operators need to ensure that their plans for their venues and complementary facilities encourage regular visits.

The venues also need to become accessible community assets, which are used by community groups, open to the public most of the time and affordable for local people to use. This goal complements the regeneration ambition, because achieving it will also ensure frequent footfall at the Park.

The Committee has identified a number of ways in which the Mayor and the venue owners – the Olympic Park Legacy Company (OPLC) and the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA) – can deliver these benefits. These focus on measures that can be taken to boost visitor numbers at the venues and in the surrounding area:

- Visitors can be attracted to the venues for opportunities to participate in sporting activity if the venues are open for general

public access. Venue owners and operators need to promote a 'pay and play' approach to the venues as far as possible. We welcome the OPLC's detailed plans ensuring that the aquatics centre and handball arena will be accessible to the public at all times except for during major events, and recommend that the LVRPA sets out similar plans for the velopark and Eton Manor hockey and tennis centre.

- The Olympic Park needs to offer a range of attractions and experiences that complement the venues, giving people a variety of reasons to visit the area and encouraging them to stay longer. The Mayor and OPLC have endorsed this approach to the Park; we recommend further specific proposals for new attractions are developed.
- The venues need to be marketed collectively as elements of a single visitor destination, the Olympic Park. The Park should be promoted as a 'day out' experience, where people can undertake a range of activities at and between the venues. We recommend the OPLC and LVRPA develop a joint marketing strategy to deliver this.
- The ticketing systems for the venues should ensure people can access the venues with the minimum hassle and confusion, and help encourage them to visit multiple venues. We recommend that the OPLC and LVRPA establish a single selling point for tickets, and allow visitors to buy entry to several venues and attractions in one purchase.
- Transport connections are excellent for the Olympic Stadium and aquatics centre, but need to be improved for other venues in the north and west of the Park. TfL has recognised that service and station capacity upgrades are required at Leyton and Hackney Wick stations, and pedestrian access from Leyton should also be enhanced. We recommend the Mayor agrees improvement priorities with TfL, the OPLC and the LVRPA.

We ask that the Mayor, the OPLC and the LVRPA respond to our recommendations by the end of March 2012.

The Committee has identified a number of ways in which the OPLC and LVRPA can help boost footfall at the venues.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Along with a host of other facilities, five permanent sporting venues are being constructed in east London for next year's Olympic and Paralympic Games. These venues will provide world-class facilities for the world's best athletes in the summer of 2012. After the Games are over the venues are expected to provide a long-lasting legacy for the benefit of Londoners.
- 1.2 The Economy, Culture and Sport Committee has considered the legacy plans for the 2012 venues in several investigations since London was awarded the Games. In 2010 we published a report examining the legacy of the Olympic Stadium in detail, recommending that the Olympic Park Legacy Company prioritise sporting uses for the stadium that guaranteed regular events with high numbers of spectators.¹
- 1.3 Following our earlier investigation, in early 2011 we set out to examine the legacy plans for the other sporting venues on the Olympic Park. These are the aquatics centre, the velopark, the handball arena (also known as the multi-use arena) and Eton Manor (a field hockey and tennis venue). Responsibility for the legacy of these venues is shared by the OPLC and the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority. Full details of the uses, ownership and size of these venues are provided overleaf in Table 1, with their locations on the Olympic Park shown in Figure 1.
- 1.4 In conducting this investigation the Committee has gathered views and information from a wide range of individuals and organisations. We held a series of meetings in public with experts and key stakeholders, and received a number of written submissions. Those we have consulted include the OPLC, the LVRPA, sporting associations, venue operators and leisure industry experts. We also visited the Olympic Park and toured several of the venues. For further details of the submissions received and meeting participants please see Appendix 3.

¹ *Legacy United? The legacy of London's Olympic venues*, London Assembly, September 2010. Available at: <http://www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/the-london-assembly/publications/2012-games/venue-legacy>.

Table 1: Permanent venues on the Olympic Park

| Venue | Cost ² | Games use and capacity | Planned legacy use and capacity | Legacy owner |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Olympic Stadium ³ | £486 million | Opening and closing ceremonies, athletics 80,000 seats | Football, athletics; potentially rugby, cricket 60,000 seats | Olympic Park Legacy Company |
| Aquatics centre | £269 million | Swimming, diving 17,500 seats | Swimming, diving, water polo 2,500 seats, expandable up to 3,500 | Olympic Park Legacy Company |
| Velopark | £93 million | Track cycling, BMX 6,000 seats in velodrome; 6,000 seats at BMX track | Track cycling, BMX, road cycling, mountain biking 6,000 seats in velodrome | Lee Valley Regional Park Authority |
| Eton Manor | £60 million ⁴ | Aquatics training, wheelchair tennis; 10,500 seats across several tennis courts | Tennis, five-a-side football, field hockey ⁵ 3,000 seats at main hockey pitch, expandable up to 15,000 | Lee Valley Regional Park Authority |
| Handball arena / Multi-use arena | £43 million | Handball, goalball, fencing 6,000 seats | Potentially basketball, boxing, gymnastics, badminton, volleyball and other sports 6,000 seats, expandable up to 7,500 | Olympic Park Legacy Company |

² *London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: Quarterly Report*, Department for Culture, Media and Sport, July 2011; Cost information on Eton Manor provided by Olympic Delivery Authority, September 2011

³ The OPLC is currently conducting a tender process for the Olympic Stadium, which may lead to changes in the planned legacy uses and capacity.

⁴ The cost of Eton Manor does not include the initial construction cost of the hockey centre at a different location in the Olympic Park. The hockey centre is being funded by the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games (LOCOG), which provided the following statement to the Committee: *“As a private company that is privately-financed, LOCOG does not publish individual venue costs which are commercially confidential with their suppliers.”*

⁵ Leyton Orient Football Club has also proposed constructing a 15,000-seat football stadium at the Eton Manor site; see written submission from Leyton Orient Football Club, August 2011. Copies of the written submissions received by the Committee are available on our website at www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/the-london-assembly/publications/2012-games or from the London Assembly secretariat

Most of the venues are likely to have operating costs that exceed the revenue they generate.

Focus of investigation

- 1.5 The starting point for this investigation is the evidence that the venues are very unlikely to generate enough revenue to cover their operating costs after 2012. Maintaining the venues will therefore require an ongoing call on public money, in addition to the £465 million taxpayers have already spent building them.
- 1.6 The evidence that the venues will probably make operating losses has been provided by the owners themselves, and drawn from examples of similar venues elsewhere. The LVRPA told the Committee that both the velopark and the Eton Manor hockey and tennis centre could make a loss of up to £300,000 per year, depending on a range of factors.⁶ The OPLC has not been able to provide similar projections because of ongoing negotiations with potential operators. However, the OPLC has indicated that the aquatics centre is likely to require an operating subsidy, as do the vast majority of public swimming pools in the UK, although cannot ascertain the level until the outcome of the current tender process.⁷ The Ponds Forge Aquatics Centre in Sheffield is very similar to the 2012 aquatics centre; it costs £7 million a year to operate, and generates just £4 million in revenue.⁸ The OPLC believes the handball arena may, exceptionally, be able to generate revenue that matches or exceeds operating costs.⁹
- 1.7 Londoners therefore face the prospect of providing subsidies for these venues for the foreseeable future. We know that the LVRPA's venues will be funded by a combination of the revenue from a Council Tax levy¹⁰ and the organisation's commercial activity across the Lee Valley.¹¹ The OPLC told the Committee that the aquatics centre might

⁶ Written submission from Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, September 2011, pages 4-5. The LVRPA have emphasised that these projections represent early estimates, with several areas of uncertainty. Usage prices have not yet been set, and no agreements with sporting associations have been finalised. Furthermore, these projections do not include any possible income from commercial sponsorship.

⁷ Written submission from Olympic Park Legacy Company, August 2011, page 5.

⁸ Written submission from Sheffield City Council, August 2011, page 1. Ponds Forge is an Olympic-standard pool with 2,600 seats, and is used by members of the public and elite athletes.

⁹ Written submission from Olympic Park Legacy Company, August 2011, page 5

¹⁰ The Council Tax levy applies to residents of London, Essex and Hertfordshire.

¹¹ Written submission from Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, September 2011, pages 1-2. Of the £18 million LVRPA budget, £12 million is drawn from the Council Tax levy and £6 million from commercial income.

be subsidised using proceeds from the handball arena,¹² although to date they have not confirmed how they would meet any funding shortfall. The OPLC will confirm expected operating costs and revenue projections for the venues following the outcome of the current tender process; a business plan covering all OPLC activity is expected to be published in early 2012.

- 1.8 The Committee has not approached this issue with a fixed view that public subsidies must always be ruled out. The Greater London Authority Group already effectively subsidises a range of services, such as public transport, and numerous regeneration projects across the city. However, the Committee wants and expects any additional public funding of the venues beyond 2012 to be used cost-effectively, delivering strategic public benefits in support of the legacy goals.
- 1.9 The Committee's report sets out to advise the Mayor, the OPLC and the LVRPA on how to ensure and enhance the cost-effectiveness of any continued funding of the 2012 venues. We do this by addressing two related issues:
- In Chapter 2 we examine the potential benefits of the venues to Londoners, focusing on the economic gains associated with attracting visitors to the Park and opportunities for sports participation.
 - In Chapter 3 we ask what steps can be taken by the OPLC and LVRPA to maximise these benefits, focusing on ways to stimulate footfall.
- 1.10 The report recommends specific measures to the Mayor, OPLC and LVRPA that will help ensure a sustainable future for the 2012 venues, for the benefit of London. We look forward to further discussion on the implementation of our recommendations.

¹² Written submission from Olympic Park Legacy Company, August 2011, page 5.

Figure 1: Olympic Park (legacy mode)



Source: Olympic Park Legacy Company, September 2010. The design of the velopark road circuit may be altered, subject to planning approval.

2 Potential benefits of the venues

Key points

- The permanent sporting venues have an important role, complementary to the Olympic Stadium, in boosting job and business opportunities in east London by attracting visitors to the Olympic Park.
- Maximising the level and regularity of footfall, and integrating the venues with the local economy, are necessary for successful regeneration.
- The venues can contribute to the goal of increasing physical activity if they are available for community use; this will also support footfall at the venues.

2.1 The Committee has explored the benefits to Londoners of the 2012 venues. We have focused in particular on the potential gains associated with boosting the visitor economy in and around the Olympic Park. A supplementary benefit is the potential to increase levels of physical activity among local communities.

Regenerating east London

2.2 The Mayor has made five key commitments to Londoners for the legacy of the Games.¹³ Among these are commitments to “transform the heart of east London” and to “ensure Londoners benefit from new jobs, businesses and volunteering opportunities.” The Strategic Regeneration Framework for the Games legacy – developed by the host boroughs and supported by the Mayor and central government – echoes these commitments with targets in increasing employment and median earnings in local communities.¹⁴

2.3 The key finding of the Committee’s previous work on the venues was that a high level of footfall is necessary if local communities are to benefit. That is, the venues will only contribute significantly to the

¹³ Mayor’s Question Time, 17 July 2008 [Question 1102/2008]. The five commitments were established by the previous Mayor and endorsed by Boris Johnson.

¹⁴ *Strategic Regeneration Framework: An Olympic legacy for the host boroughs*, London Boroughs of Greenwich, Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest, October 2009. The London Borough of Barking & Dagenham has subsequently been added to the host boroughs group.

The 2012 venues will only contribute significantly to the regeneration of east London if they can regularly attract high numbers of visitors.

regeneration of east London if they can regularly attract high numbers of visitors.¹⁵

- 2.4 The OPLC and LVRPA have provided initial projections for the expected footfall at their venues. The OPLC estimates that the aquatics centre will attract 800,000 visits per year and the handball arena 600,000 visits per year.¹⁶ The LVRPA estimates that its venues will attract 450,000 visits per year in total.¹⁷
- 2.5 The venues being considered in this investigation differ from the Olympic Stadium in their size and likely uses. In the Committee's investigation of the stadium, we recommended that the OPLC's legacy plan prioritised options that could deliver frequent large events; for instance, Premier League football games at least once a fortnight. The aquatics centre, velopark, handball arena and the Eton Manor hockey and tennis centre can also stage spectator events, but not of the same scale. The venues all have a smaller capacity, and the sports they are designed for do not tend to attract large numbers of spectators more than a few times per year.
- 2.6 The total level of footfall, however, is not the only key factor in the venues' impact on regeneration. Both the regularity of footfall and the links with the wider local economy need to be addressed.
- 2.7 Increasing the regularity of footfall requires venues to be in use on non-event days. Dr Jim Coleman, a regeneration consultant, told the Committee during our previous investigation that frequency of use is important in ensuring that sporting venues generate sustainable employment:

"Where there is a lot of activity and regular activity you are more likely to have full time employment, you are more likely to have longer-term employment contracts... Where a stadium is used

¹⁵ See *Legacy United? The legacy of London's Olympic venues*, London Assembly, September 2010.

¹⁶ Written submission from the Olympic Park Legacy Company, August 2011, pages 7 and 9.

¹⁷ This figure includes visits to the Lee Valley White Water Centre, and Olympic venue that is not located on the Olympic Park. Written submission from the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, September 2011, page 3.

irregularly there will be a greater reliance, I think, probably on casual, shorter-term employment contracts.”¹⁸

- 2.8 Dr Larissa Davies of Sheffield Hallam University told the Committee that sporting venues need to be linked strongly with economic activity in the surrounding area:

“...quite important is how the stadium is embedded within broader regeneration strategies of an area. Again, that will very much influence the impacts a stadium will have so the stadium that is embedded within the local economy and within regeneration initiatives will have much greater impact than a stadium that is just located without any connections with broader activities.”¹⁹

- 2.9 The Committee has heard about a major sporting venue being isolated from its local economy: Wembley Stadium. David Bernstein, former chair of the company that owns Wembley, criticised the lack of complementary leisure development around the stadium.²⁰ Similarly, Dr Jim Coleman told the Committee that people had little reason to visit the Wembley Stadium area on a non-match day, which limited the impact of the stadium on the local economy.²¹

Conclusion

- 2.10 The regeneration potential of the sporting venues considered by the Committee in this investigation depends, like the Olympic Stadium, on the level of footfall they generate. This is key to boosting job and business opportunities at and around the venues after 2012. The venue owners and operators need to ensure that their plans for their venues and complementary facilities encourage frequent footfall, both for large events at the venues and at times when no events are being staged.**

¹⁸ Transcript of Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee meeting, 8 June 2010, page 4

¹⁹ Transcript of Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee meeting, 8 June 2010, page 3

²⁰ Transcript of Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee meeting, 8 June 2010, page 6

²¹ Transcript of Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee meeting, 17 November 2009, page 3-4

The OPLC and LVRPA are committed to encouraging local communities to use the venues.

Physical activity

- 2.11 Increasing physical activity is a key goal for the Games legacy. One of the Mayor's five legacy commitments is to "increase opportunities for Londoners to become involved in sport."²² The Committee has examined the Mayor's plans in detail in a previous report on this topic.²³ The Strategic Regeneration Framework for the Games legacy – developed by the host boroughs and supported by the Mayor and central government – sets targets to increase the proportion of adults participating in recommended levels of physical activity, and the proportion of children participating in school sport.²⁴
- 2.12 The 2012 venues may support participation in physical activity if the sporting facilities were made available for community use. Sport England told the Committee that venue operators need to target groups that are under-represented in sport, including disabled people and those from deprived socio-economic groups.²⁵ Mark Sesnan of Greenwich Leisure, a sports venue operator, told the Committee that the venues could be used, for instance, by the general public, local schools and disability groups.²⁶ He argued that these uses will also ensure the venues are used seven days a week, as they would not be needed for large spectator events every day.²⁷
- 2.13 The OPLC and LVRPA have both confirmed that they will encourage community use of their venues.²⁸ The OPLC has told the Committee that it will require the operators of the aquatics centre and handball area to run outreach programmes for local people and schools,²⁹ and charge a usage price in line with average prices across the host boroughs.³⁰ The LVRPA has suggested that it will run its venues

²² Mayor's Question Time, 17 July 2008 [Question 1102/2008].

²³ *A sporting legacy for London?*, London Assembly, February 2011.

²⁴ *Strategic Regeneration Framework: An Olympic legacy for the host boroughs*, London Boroughs of Greenwich, Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest, October 2009. The London Borough of Barking & Dagenham has subsequently been added to the host boroughs group.

²⁵ Written submission from Sport England, August 2011, page 3.

²⁶ Transcript of Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 19 July 2011, pages 12-13.

²⁷ Transcript of Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 19 July 2011, page 2.

²⁸ Written submission from Olympic Park Legacy Company, August 2011; Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, September 2011.

²⁹ Written submission from Olympic Park Legacy Company, August 2011, page 9.

³⁰ Peter Tudor, Transcript of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 13 September 2011, page 12. Minutes and transcripts of Committee meetings are available at www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListMeetings.aspx?Committeeld=233 or from the London Assembly secretariat.

similar to the way it runs the Lee Valley Athletics Centre, which is used for community activity and offers subsidised prices for schools and unemployed people.³¹

2.14 Clearly, the venues themselves could only make a relatively small contribution to the Mayor's goal of increasing sports participation levels among Londoners. However, they do have the potential to be important community assets that should be available to the local community. Any reasonably-priced new sporting facilities in this area are welcome: in the four London boroughs in which the Olympic Park is situated there are approximately 600,000 adults who do not meet recommended levels of participation, of three half-hour sessions per week.³²

Conclusion

2.15 The sporting venues on the Olympic Park cannot alone deliver a significant increase in physical activity among local communities. This does not mean, however, that the venues should not be used for this purpose. Making the venues available to the public will help bring footfall to the Park, which is particularly important at times when large events are not being staged. Improving levels of physical activity would be a key additional benefit. We therefore welcome the commitments set out by the OPLC and the LVRPA to promote community access and to make the venues available at prices that people in the local area will be able to afford.

³¹ Written submission from Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, September 2011, pages 6 and 12-13.

³² *Active People Survey 4*, Sport England, 2010; *Mid-2010 Population Estimates*, Office for National Statistics, 2011.

3 How to maximise the benefits of the venues

Key points

Footfall on the Olympic Park can be enhanced if the OPLC and LVRPA:

- Ensure a high level of public access to the venues, with a ‘pay and play’ approach for visitors.
- Make complementary attractions available in the surrounding area.
- Market the Park as a single destination offering a ‘day out’ experience to visitors.
- Ensure visitors can access multiple attractions on the Park via a common ticketing system.
- Work with Transport for London to identify and deliver improvements in transport connections to the venues.

3.1 The Committee’s investigation has established a number of key factors in determining the impact of the venues on the regeneration of east London: the number of visitors they attract, the regularity of this footfall, and the extent to which visitors stimulate economic activity beyond the venues.

3.2 This evidence suggests that the owners and operators of the venues could aim for a broad, optimal outcome. We envisage a situation in which the venues would be used by as many people as possible, throughout the day, every day of the week, and that those people would enjoy a range of activities both at the venues and in the surrounding area. The Committee has identified a number of steps that could help toward achieving this outcome.

Public access

3.3 To stimulate footfall the venues need to offer activities and experiences that attract visitors. Mark Sesnan of Greenwich Leisure emphasised attracting visitors to participate in sport. He argued that the venues need to offer ‘pay and play’ options to encourage casual visitors; he cited the example of the venues on the Sydney Olympic Park, where this does not happen:

“If you go to Sydney Olympic Park, the only thing you can pay to play and do is actually in the aquatic centre. Everything else has to be organised and it is too complex to access for anybody who only

has a couple of weeks on holiday or is visiting Sydney for the weekend."³³

- 3.4 Under the 'pay and play' approach, occasions when venues are closed to public users should be minimised. The two main activities that would lead to closures are spectator events and training sessions for elite athletes.
- 3.5 Although there are no firm plans for sports governing bodies to move their main training base to the Olympic Park, it is possible that all of the venues could be used for elite athlete training. The Crystal Palace National Sports Centre, operated by Greenwich Leisure, is used by both elite athletes and community users. Mark Sesnan told the Committee that there is tension because of these competing demands on the facilities.³⁴ The flexibility of the Olympic Park venues – for instance, the aquatics centre can be divided in to five separate swimming pools, while the velopark contains four distinct facilities for different sports – could allow elite and community use simultaneously.
- 3.6 The venues will be used for large spectator events, both sporting and non-sporting. For example, the OPLC is considering plans to host the 2016 European Swimming Championships at the aquatics centre, and is aiming to hold music concerts regularly at the handball arena.³⁵ These events would attract large crowds, and therefore stimulate footfall on the Park. The OPLC told the Committee that it would coordinate with the LVRPA to avoid situations where more than one venue on the Park is holding a large event simultaneously.³⁶
- 3.7 As discussed in the previous chapter, the OPLC and the LVRPA have committed to making venues available to the public and community groups. The LVRPA has indicated that its venues – the velopark and Eton Manor hockey and tennis centre – will be run in a similar way to the Lee Valley Athletics Centre, which is open to the public for 80 per cent of its opening hours, and used by elite athletes for the remaining

A 'pay and play' approach would encourage people to visit the venues to participate in sport and physical activity.

³³ Transcript of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 19 July 2011, pages 9-10.

³⁴ Transcript of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 19 July 2011, page 10.

³⁵ Notes of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee visit to the Olympic Park, September 2011. Visit notes are available from the London Assembly secretariat or on our website at www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=233&MIId=4407&Ver=4.

³⁶ Peter Tudor, Transcript of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 13 September 2011, page 22.

time. In a new Sport and Healthy Living Policy, the OPLC has produced more detailed plans for the aquatics centre and handball arena: it has developed a set of minimum requirements that will be embedded in contracts with the operator(s) of the venues.³⁷ These requirements state that there must be public access to the venues at all times except for during major events, as well as specifying what level of access should be provided for educational use, sessions for disabled people and elite use. Please see Appendix 3 to view the requirements developed by the OPLC in full.

Conclusion

- 3.8 Footfall on the Park would be stimulated if potential visitors are able to use the venues to participate in activities. The venue operators should therefore promote a 'pay and play' approach for the venues, although we accept there will be some limitations on public access. Large spectator events should be staged on the Park, as these bring high levels of footfall and can be part of the visitor experience, but events should be coordinated to ensure multiple venues are not regularly closed simultaneously. We do not anticipate that elite use of the venues will restrict public access to any great extent, although operators need to ensure this is the case.**
- 3.9 The OPLC have set out detailed requirements for the aquatics centre and handball arena, guaranteeing a high level of public access. We welcome the commitment to include these in contracts with external operators. The LVRPA should set out similar plans for the velopark and Eton Manor. As a minimum, the LVRPA should adopt its own approach from the Lee Valley Athletics Centre of providing public access for at least 80 per cent of the venue opening hours.**

Recommendation 1

The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority should ensure that their venues are open for public access for at least 80 per cent of their opening hours. This should be guaranteed in a set of minimum requirements developed by the LVRPA, corresponding to those produced by the OPLC in its Sport and Healthy Living Policy. The LVRPA should respond to

³⁷ *Sport and Healthy Living Policy*, Olympic Park Legacy Company, unpublished – provided to the Committee in December 2011.

this recommendation by the end of March 2012.

Complementary attractions

- 3.10 The Olympic Park can also offer other activities to potential visitors that complement the venues. Professor Terry Stevens, a leisure industry consultant, told the Committee that there was potential for complementary attractions in the ‘gaps in between’ the venues, for instance, sports taster sessions, museums, a hall of fame or an IMAX cinema.³⁸ Dr Andrew Smith of the University of Westminster has studied several examples of ‘sports zones’ in other cities – including Manchester, Cardiff and Doha – where multiple sport venues are located in one place, similar to the Olympic Park. His research suggests:

*...there needs to be an attempt to diversify the users of these zones, so that they are not merely used irregularly by elite athletes and passive spectators. By supplementing stadia and other venues with more participatory sports facilities, museums, halls of fame, exhibitions, demonstrations, interpretation of previous events and other sports attractions, these zones may be able to attract visitors when events are not taking place. This incidental use would allow these sites to be more fully utilized and avoid the tendency for them to be desolate, obsolete and segregated urban areas.*³⁹

- 3.11 The potential benefit of this approach is that it would increase footfall. The spectator events or participatory activities staged at the venues would be among a wider range of experiences people can have on the Park. More people would be encouraged to visit the Park, undertake more activities and stay for longer.

- 3.12 The OPLC has indicated to the Committee that it supports this approach to the development of the Park, although no firm plans for complementary attractions have yet been announced. Duncan Innes, Executive Director of Real Estate, told the Committee:

“...there will be lots of smaller scale programming and events going on around the Park so if you come for a swim in the morning you

³⁸ Transcript of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 19 July 2011, page 14.

³⁹ *The Development of “Sports-City” Zones and Their Potential Value as Tourism Resources for Urban Areas*, Andrew Smith, *European Planning Studies*, 18 (3).

The Olympic Park could offer a range of other visitor attractions to complement the venues.

can go for a cycle in the afternoon and then a concert in the evening or visit the festival or a street market or whatever.”⁴⁰

- 3.13 This approach is also reflected in the Supplementary Planning Guidance for the Olympic Legacy, published for consultation by the GLA in September 2011. The guidance sets out the Mayor’s priorities for the development of the Olympic Park and the surrounding area, and promotes the addition of new attractions around the venues:

Permanent and temporary uses [of the Park] should incorporate activities that will complement the community and cultural offer of the stadium and its associated Legacy facilities. Uses which celebrate the sporting legacy, artistic talent, excellence in learning, invention and innovation such as a museum, art gallery or exhibition centre will be particularly welcome.⁴¹

Conclusion

- 3.14 The visitor offer on the Olympic Park should extend beyond the venues, and include a range of complementary experiences and attractions. This would encourage people to visit the Park and spend longer in the area while there. We welcome the OPLC’s and the Mayor’s commitments to this approach. We expect further, more detailed proposals to be developed by the OLPC in its future plans for the Park, and will review these to ensure appropriate steps are being taken.**

Recommendation 2

The Olympic Park Legacy Company should update the Committee by the end of October 2012 on its plans to establish additional visitor attractions on the Olympic Park to complement the sporting venues.

Marketing

- 3.15 The Committee has explored different approaches to marketing the venues. The key issue we have addressed is whether the venues should

⁴⁰ Transcript of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 13 September 2011, page 8.

⁴¹ *Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance* [consultation draft], Greater London Authority, September 2011.

be marketed individually, or as part of a park-wide offer to potential visitors.

- 3.16 Professor Terry Stevens told the Committee that the Olympic Park should be promoted as a single destination with a clear, overall brand. He cited ski resorts in the United States as a positive example of this approach, where there are multiple individual businesses within the resort, but they are promoted as a whole by a resort-wide operator. Professor Stevens argued:

“...it has to be a very clear sub-destination, and it might be a sports tourism sub-destination, with a clear brand, clear vision, and a sign-up by all the key stakeholders to achieving that vision in a way that makes sense to their individual businesses, but to the sub-destination as a whole.”⁴²

- 3.17 Sport England supported this approach in its evidence to the Committee. Its submission suggested that park-wide marketing would generate higher footfall, because visitors would be encouraged to spend longer on the Park visiting several venues and attractions:

“...we suggest that the OPLC and LVRPA market the Park as a destination in itself, attractive to individuals across the country, not just locally. They need to create a place where people and families spend a day swimming, cycling, having lunch and doing a bit of shopping. For the Park to be sustainable it has to be more than just individual venues operating in isolation of each other. This requires the owners to work together to ensure the Park is marketed in its entirety as a day out destination for leisure, in the same way theme parks or other recreational spaces are viewed. This way the OPLC and LVRDA maximise the usage of the Park, as people will be encouraged to use multiple parts of the Park for longer in one visit.”⁴³

- 3.18 The OPLC has given the Committee information on its approach to marketing. The OPLC will agree marketing plans with the individual venue operators it appoints.⁴⁴ Peter Tudor, Director of Venues, told the Committee he is currently developing a marketing strategy for the

⁴² Transcript of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 19 July 2011, page 8.

⁴³ Written submission from Sport England, August 2011, page 3.

⁴⁴ Written submission from Olympic Park Legacy Company, August 2011, page 9.

Park, and hopes to encourage people to attend multiple venues when visiting the Park.⁴⁵

- 3.19 Shaun Dawson, Chief Executive of the LVRPA, told the Committee that it wants to cross-sell venues, so for instance, *“When you go to the velodrome you should be aware of what is happening in the aquatics centre and vice versa.”*⁴⁶ However, there is less emphasis in the evidence we have received from the LVRPA on the concept of marketing the Park as a whole to potential visitors. As the authority argued in its written submission:

*Olympic Park is not a single destination; rather it comprises a range of very different venues and other attractions, each with its own market and business plan and with various operators and owners.*⁴⁷

- 3.20 Marketing the Park and venues as a whole will require the cooperation of the various owners and operators, a group of at least five different organisations, including public agencies and potentially private and voluntary sector bodies. The OPLC told the Committee it is planning to establish structures to coordinate these parties. A group will be set up as an advisory body to the OPLC Board, involving the owners, operators and local boroughs.⁴⁸ There is no plan to give this coordinating body any overall authority to determine the marketing of the venues, or oversight of a park-wide marketing team or budget; these powers will be retained by individual owners and operators.

Conclusion

- 3.21 The Committee considers that visitors can be more easily attracted to the Olympic Park if it is marketed as a single destination suitable for ‘day out’ trips. Although we expect that many people may visit the Park simply to attend one venue, others would be interested in undertaking a range of experiences at the Park. The marketing of the Park should emphasise this variety of possible experiences. Coordinated work by the OPLC and LVRPA would be needed to deliver this**

⁴⁵ Transcript of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 13 September 2011, page 7.

⁴⁶ Transcript of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 13 September 2011, page 8.

⁴⁷ Written submission from Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, September 2011, page 16.

⁴⁸ Peter Tudor, Transcript of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 13 September 2011, page 22.

The venues should be marketed as part of a day out experience on the Olympic Park.

message. We do not want to prescribe specific arrangements for the OPLC and LVRPA to undertake this joint marketing activity, although the two organisations should consider whether there are sufficient mechanisms for coordination between them.

Recommendation 3

The Olympic Park Legacy Company and Lee Valley Regional Park Authority should develop a joint marketing strategy for the venues and the Olympic Park, which sets out plans to market the Park as a whole and encourages people to visit multiple venues. The OPLC and LVRPA should confirm their plans to develop a joint strategy, and what mechanisms they will put in place to ensure coordinated delivery of the strategy, in responses to the Committee by the end of March 2012.

Ticketing

- 3.22 The Committee has considered how to make the venues as accessible as possible to visitors after 2012. The ticketing system for entry to the venues is a key aspect of accessibility; it can also be used to encourage 'day out' trips to the Park.
- 3.23 Enhancing access may also be achieved through the ticketing system. Mark Bradley, a sport industry consultant, told the Committee that it was important to address customers' perceptions of the 'ease of use' of a sporting venue. He cited an example of a sports ticketing system covering multiple businesses: the Veltins Arena in Gelsenkirchen, Germany, where visitors can buy one ticket allowing entry to an event and all local transport.⁴⁹
- 3.24 The LVRPA has endorsed this approach. Shaun Dawson told the Committee that visitors should be able to buy tickets covering multiple venues, for instance cycling at the velopark plus entry to the ArcelorMittal Orbit, the observation tower in the Park.⁵⁰ The OPLC told the Committee it is currently developing plans for the ticketing

A coordinated ticketing system could encourage people to visit multiple venues in one trip.

⁴⁹ Transcript of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 19 July 2011, pages 18 and 22.

⁵⁰ Transcript of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 13 September 2011, page 8.

system, which may lead to the development of one ticketing system, or multiple systems that can ‘talk to each other’.⁵¹ Beyond this, no further details of what tickets will be available for visitors to the Park have been set out.

Conclusion

- 3.25 Footfall at the venues can be maximised if they are as easy as possible to access. Ticketing is an area where the OPLC and LVRPA can make the venues more accessible to the public, by allowing them to visit the attractions of the Park with minimum hassle and confusion. Taking into account the various technical and financial issues that may need to be addressed, the OPLC and LVRPA should strive to deliver a single selling point and multiple-venue ticketing.**

Recommendation 4

The Olympic Park Legacy Company and Lee Valley Regional Park Authority should ensure that visitors to the Olympic Park can buy tickets for multiple venues and attractions in one purchase, and that tickets for all of the venues are available from a single source. The OPLC and LVRPA should respond to this recommendation by the end of March 2012.

Transport

- 3.26 The Committee has received evidence suggesting that public transport and pedestrian connections to particular venues may need to be enhanced to ensure the venues are as accessible as possible.
- 3.27 In the northern section of the Park, where the velopark and Eton Manor are located, there are concerns about the restricted capacity of the closest transport station, Leyton (London Underground), and the barriers to pedestrian access caused by major roads and railways lines. As the London Borough of Waltham Forest told the Committee:

“Neighbourhoods in Leyton are physically disconnected with the major venues. This is due to the presence of major physical barriers: the A12 running from east to west, and the Lea Valley railway

⁵¹ Peter Tudor, Transcript of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 13 September 2011, page 7.

running from north to south. As a result, while Eton Manor and the velopark are within a ten-minute walk of Leyton Underground station 'as the crow flies', the walk is actually almost double this."⁵²

3.28 In the west of the Park, where the handball arena is situated, concerns centre on the connectivity of the main station, Hackney Wick (London Overground). As this is also the closest station to the media centre, the Committee also addressed this issue in its previous report. We considered the relatively long distance between Hackney Wick and the Park, and the low frequency of services, in comparison to the east of the Park where Stratford station (Underground, Overground, National Rail and Docklands Light Railway) is located.⁵³

3.29 Transport for London also provided a detailed submission confirming that it recognises the need to upgrade connections to the Park (reproduced in full in Appendix 2). TfL wants to increase the capacity of Leyton station, and the train capacity for the London Overground service through Hackney Wick. A number of pedestrian access improvements have been set out in the Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance. However, as yet, TfL has not allocated the necessary funding to deliver these improvements. One enhancement that does have more definite plans is the OPLC's proposal to introduce a shuttle bus to connect venues to local public transport stations, which would help address some of the issues identified.⁵⁴

Public transport and pedestrian connections to the venues need to be improved.

Conclusion

3.30 Transport connections in this part of east London have been improved significantly ahead of the Games. Beyond 2012, however, continued enhancements are required to make the venues as accessible as possible to local communities and visitors arriving from further afield. We are encouraged that the OPLC and TfL have recognised a number of necessary improvements. Funded plans to deliver these need to be developed.

⁵² Written submission from London Borough of Waltham Forest, August 2011, page 3.

⁵³ Written submission from Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, September 2011, page 16; see also *Legacy United? The legacy of London's Olympic venues*, London Assembly, September 2010.

⁵⁴ Duncan Innes, Transcript of the Economy, Culture and Sport Committee meeting, 13 September 2011, page 20.

Recommendation 5

Transport for London should discuss priorities with the Olympic Park Legacy Company and Lee Valley Regional Park Authority regarding improvements to the public transport and pedestrian access to the venues after 2012. Following this period of consultation the Mayor should report back to the Committee by the end of March 2012, setting out the agreed priorities and indicating how these will be delivered.

4 Conclusion

This report has established how the Mayor, the Olympic Park Legacy Company and the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority can ensure the aquatics centre, velopark, handball arena and the Eton Manor hockey and tennis centre can best support the legacy goals, given the ongoing public subsidy that is required. This requires maximising the potential benefits of the venues to Londoners.

The Committee identified two related benefits that the venues can deliver. The first is to help drive the regeneration of east London by stimulating the visitor economy, boosting local employment and business opportunities. The second relates to the role of venues as community assets, providing opportunities for local people to participate in physical activity.

To deliver both of these, the venues need to be accessible. We have set out that the venues need to be open to the public most of the time, and be affordable for people to use. We have also discussed improvements to public transport and pedestrian access to the venues, and asked the Mayor to take forward funded plans to deliver these.

The further measures the Committee has identified will enhance the venues' contribution to the local visitor economy. The venues should be marketed collectively, as key attractions in a 'day out' experience on the Park. Ticketing for the venues should support this approach, by providing a single selling point and multiple-venue tickets. Finally, a variety of complementary attractions should be established to enhance visitors' experience of the Park and encourage them to stay for longer.

These steps would ensure that the venues would be enjoyed by the local community and by visitors from further afield. They would help establish the venues post-2012 as facilities that are in use every day of the week, throughout the whole day, by as many people as possible, generating the legacy of participation and economic regeneration that was promised to east London.

Appendix 1

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority should ensure that their venues are open for public access for at least 80 per cent of their opening hours. This should be guaranteed in a set of minimum requirements developed by the LVRPA, corresponding to those produced by the OPLC in its Sport and Healthy Living Policy. The LVRPA should respond to this recommendation by the end of March 2012.

Recommendation 2

The Olympic Park Legacy Company should update the Committee by the end of October 2012 on its plans to establish additional visitor attractions on the Olympic Park to complement the sporting venues.

Recommendation 3

The Olympic Park Legacy Company and Lee Valley Regional Park Authority should develop a joint marketing strategy for the venues and the Olympic Park, which sets out plans to market the Park as a whole and encourages people to visit multiple venues. The OPLC and LVRPA should confirm their plans to develop a joint strategy, and what mechanisms they will put in place to ensure coordinated delivery of the strategy, in responses to the Committee by the end of March 2012.

Recommendation 4

The Olympic Park Legacy Company and Lee Valley Regional Park Authority should ensure that visitors to the Olympic Park can buy tickets for multiple venues and attractions in one purchase, and that tickets for all of the venues are available from a single source. The OPLC and LVRPA should respond to this recommendation by the end of March 2012.

Recommendation 5

Transport for London should discuss priorities with the Olympic Park Legacy Company and Lee Valley Regional Park Authority regarding improvements to the public transport and pedestrian access to the venues after 2012. Following this period of consultation the Mayor should report back to the Committee by the end of March 2012, setting out the agreed priorities and indicating how these will be delivered.

Appendix 2 Submission from Transport for London

Ms Dee Doocey AM
Chair, Economy, Culture and Sport Committee
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
London SE1 2AA

25 October 2011

Dear Dee,

Transport Connections to Olympic Park

Thank you for your letter of 28 September where you asked a number of questions on the above issue and I will address these in turn.

To support the work of the London Assembly's Economy, Culture and Sport Committee's investigation of the legacy plans for the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic venues you requested details of any plans TfL have to make improvements or investment in each of the following areas beyond 2012:

- Increasing the capacity of Leyton Underground station.
- Increasing service capacity and frequency through Hackney Wick station.
- New pedestrian bridges over the A12 and the Lea Valley Railway.
- Bus routes through the Olympic Park, and
- Any information about discussions on the Chingford – Stratford rail service.

TfL has been working very closely with GLA and relevant boroughs to produce the Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance (OLSPG) which is currently out for public consultation until 18 November. To support the preparation of the OLSPG, TfL has undertaken a Strategic Transport Study, which forms part of the public consultation materials.

On behalf of the Mayor, TfL has also prepared, through working with the six host boroughs in east and southeast London, an Olympic and Paralympic Transport Legacy Action Plan. This addresses how the Mayor and TfL can ensure a transport legacy from the 2012 Games, for London and specifically the six host boroughs. The document also addresses the matters you raise and is due to be published later this year.

These documents build upon the investment in transport in and around the Olympic Park which have been or will be completed ahead of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, and after the Games by 2014 the Olympic Park Transformation will have been completed. Further transport measures will be

required to support the further development in this area after 2012. These documents largely set out the approach to the areas you have identified which are summarised in the following sections.

Funding and Investment

The OLSPG consultation draft sets out the range of delivery mechanisms and funding sources which are potentially available. TfL will not be able to provide or fund all of the schemes you refer to and others in the Olympic Legacy area. The OLSPG sets out the key planning related funding sources, namely Planning Obligations, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), Planning Tariffs (such as exists in part of the area for the LTGDC), Tax Incremental Funding (TIF) and the Business Rate Supplement.

TfL will work with the GLA, who are preparing a Delivery Study which will assess, identify and quantify the social, community and transport infrastructure requirements of the development. This study and analysis will form part of a shared evidence base that could be used by local boroughs, the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA), LTGDC and, once established, the Mayoral Development Corporation (MDC), to develop S106, tariff and CIL approaches.

Increasing the capacity of Leyton Underground station

There are various options for increasing the capacity of Leyton station which have been suggested by London Underground, the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC) and London Borough of Waltham Forest.

The ODA have recently agreed to release some funds to carry out minor improvements to the station and environment ahead of the Olympic Games, to improve access and capacity.

By 2031 however, Leyton station will be heavily congested due to development growth assumed in the Reference Case. The extra demand from the OLSPG Preferred development scenario, which is in addition to the growth envisaged in the Reference Case, will make the level of congestion even worse with the current infrastructure. Further work is necessary to determine the preferred solution. Tackling this congestion would mean improving the capacity of the staircases, corridors and ticket gates. The depth of the ticket hall would also have to be increased to prevent run-offs on to the street.

Whilst there is currently no funding for LU to make these improvements in response to the planned growth in the OLSPG area, TfL will continue to explore further funding opportunities in the meantime. In the absence of

improvements, should congestion levels in the station increase due to the growth planned in the OLSPG area, LU will manage the congestion safely through a range of station control measures, including temporarily closing the whole station for busy periods, as a worst case. It is likely to require developer contributions to fully fund the scheme to ensure that the station can serve the area without regular station closures.

Increasing service capacity and frequency through Hackney Wick station

There has already been substantial investment in the London Overground including new signalling, an entirely new train fleet providing greater capacity and improved frequency of services, and this enhanced connectivity greatly improves people's access to jobs and services, as well as supporting businesses within and around Hackney Wick and the Olympic Park. Hackney Wick is now served in each direction by eight trains per hour in peak periods and six trains per hour in off-peak periods, compared to three trains per hour before.

In addition, the LTGDC is proposing to deliver additional workspace at Hackney Wick, and LTGDC has agreed plans with TfL and Network Rail to improve Hackney Wick station.

Network Rail's Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS), launched in July 2011, sets out that increasing service frequencies on this line is unlikely to be operationally viable because it is heavily used for freight, so further train lengthening is therefore likely to be required. The RUS sets out the potential to increase London Overground trains from 4 cars to 5 cars or 6 cars. TfL will continue to work with Network Rail and other stakeholders to support the business case so that these improvements can be delivered.

New pedestrian bridges over the A12 and the Lea Valley Railway

At this stage, the OLSPG is highlighting the key links that would need to be taken forward in the future for this area to meet the aspirations described in the OLSPG document. Strategic and local connectivity links were identified from previous studies and Masterplans for the area and were assessed in terms of meeting the objectives of both the OLSPG and the Mayor's Transport Strategy. The Transport Study identifies 23 key additional links to those already funded and committed in the area.

The key gaps identified include several options for crossing the A12 to the west of Olympic Park and also to the north and east of the Olympic Park over the Lea Valley Railway, as follows:

- Improving links from Roman Road, Fish Island to the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park and Stratford, in particular over the A12
- Improved links between Ruckholt Road and Leyton
- Creating new and improved pedestrian and cycle links between Leyton and the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park and Eton Manor
- Improving pedestrian and cycle links across the A12 especially from Bow Roundabout southwards, and improved pedestrian and cycle environment along the A12
- Further improvements at Bow Roundabout
- Improving north-south pedestrian and cycle connections on both sides of the River Lea to better link the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park north to Hackney Marshes and south to Three Mills, with particular focus where the river goes under the North London Line and the A12
- New bus infrastructure around the A12 to enable improved bus services

All these schemes will have to be subject to further development, assessment and analysis as they seek the necessary approvals and funding to proceed. Some of these proposals can be included in planning applications and funded through Section 106 agreements, or other funding mechanisms as set out above. Improving local connectivity will also support the use of more sustainable modes of travel and enable a higher proportion of local short trips to be made by walking and cycling rather than car or public transport. This in turn would help to manage the demands on both the road and public transport networks.

Bus routes through the Olympic Park

Bus operations in the area will be substantially uplifted through a minimum contribution of some £12.916 m to support bus services in relation to the Stratford City Development S106. This figure is likely to be enhanced as a result of index linking of the payments over time. An indicative network has also been prepared for the Post Games Transformation (PGT) period.

The OLSPG sets out requirements for bus only links and bridges to be provided in and around the Olympic Park, including: Sugar House Lane to the River Lea; Bromley-by-Bow North to Three Mills Lane; Devas Street to Bow Road via Devons Road and Stroudley Walk; and two-way operation of Eastway for buses. In addition, sufficient bus stands and facilities will need to be provided to meet both the additional demand from the increased population and employment levels and to support the increased mode share of buses required in this area.

An indicative network of bus routes to serve the Olympic Park has been developed in consultation with TfL, which will be included in the Legacy Communities Scheme (LCS) planning application. This network is indicative

as the bus network will continue to develop over the next twenty years to meet changing demand. The bus network in the Olympic Legacy area will be implemented through TfL's established bus route tendering programme and TfL will continue to work with key stakeholders, including the Boroughs, both within the bus tendering review programme and specifically in terms of particular projects in order to improve the overall bus network across the Legacy area.

Chingford – Stratford rail service

As part of the Stratford City S106 agreement there will be a number of transport improvements delivered through the developer obligations, which also includes the Chingford Link Project which Waltham Forest Council are actively promoting including Hall Farm Curve and the re-opening of Lea Bridge Road Station. The OLSPG sets out that rail links north of Stratford are poor and also includes the options of upgrading the West Anglia Main Line and infrastructure improvements at Tottenham Hale. TfL will continue to engage with Waltham Forest and other stakeholders, but it will be a matter for the appropriate rail authorities to address.

I trust that addresses the issues you have raised and if you want further information please contact Richard de Cani (Director, Strategy & Policy).

Yours sincerely,

Peter Hendy
Commissioner for Transport

Appendix 3 OPLC venue access requirements

The following is an extract from the Olympic Park Legacy Company's Sport and Health Living Policy. It is an example of the stipulations that have been embedded in the contracts for venue operators as part of the operator appointment process.

The OPLC is continuing to discuss the most advantageous programme with the potential operators and has told the Committee it anticipates that the essential requirements will be exceeded.

ESSENTIAL SERVICE REQUIREMENTS AT THE AQUATICS CENTRE

Programming (target usage)

Whilst the Operator is responsible for generating its own activity programmes, it is required to deliver as a minimum a number of sporting and non sporting activities. These minimum requirements are listed below:

- **The creation and delivery of community and regional sporting events.** The service provider must create and deliver a minimum of 30 community and regional events per year. These include for example Gala's and regional swimming events. To be eligible as an event, these must be of at least 3 hours duration and contain either [20] participants or [100] spectators.
- **Provide access for Legacy Company hosted events.** The Operator is required to allow the Legacy Company access to host a maximum of 7 days per year within the Aquatics Centre. The Operator will not charge the Legacy Company for the hire of the Venue on such days, however, it shall be entitled to recover any reasonable costs properly incurred, in accordance with Schedule 5 of the Agreement. This can be either all or part of the Aquatics Centre. The Legacy Company reserve the right to pass some or all of these days back to the Operator. These events might include either Major or Mega Sporting Events (e.g. International Swimming Championships) and non sporting events (e.g. fashion shows).
- **Community sport.** The Operator will provide the following **minimum hours of operation per week**:
 - Public access at all times (except during major and mega events) -
 - minimum of 4 lanes of 25m
 - Public access to 50m pool - minimum of 4 lanes for 40 hours
 - A range of aquatic exercise sessions - 21 hours
 - Parent and child sessions - 14 hours
 - School sessions - 20 hours
 - Lessons (inc. 'Learn to Swim') - 30 hours

- Aquatic session activities (for example these include: Scuba diving, canoeing, specialist health, water polo, family swimming, pool party) – 10 hours
 - Aquatic club activities (includes all aquatic activities) - 25 hours
 - Disability aquatic session activities - 7 hours
 - Disability aquatic club activities - 7 hours
 - Women/ men only sessions - 7 hours
 - School holiday programme - 28 hours during school holidays
 - Older people sessions - 7 hours
 - Young people sessions (under 16's) - 7 hours
- **Sports Development.** The Operator will provide the following **minimum hours of operation per week:**
 - Exercise referral - 7 hours
 - Sport development (working with inactive and hard to reach groups) - ten x 30 minute FREE sessions
- **High Performance sport.** The Operator will provide the following **minimum hours of operation per week:**
 - Swimming
 - Water time - 25 hours, 10 sessions, 6 days per week includes Saturdays
 - Land time - 16 hours
 - Disability swimming
 - Water time - 25 hours, 10 sessions, 6 days per week includes Saturdays
 - Land time - 7 hours
 - Synchronised Swimming - 25 hours per week
 - Diving
 - Water time - 25 hours, 10 sessions, 6 days per week includes Saturdays
 - Land time - 24 hours
 - Triathlon - 300 hours per year
- **Non sporting commercial activities.** The Operator is permitted to maximise commercial activities, provided that it complies with the Legacy Company's operational requirements and policies.

ESSENTIAL SERVICE REQUIREMENTS AT THE MULTI-USE ARENA

Programming (target usage)

The Operator is responsible for generating its own event activity programmes, it is required to deliver as a minimum a number of sporting and non-sporting activities. These minimum requirements are listed below:

- **The creation and delivery of community and regional sporting events.** The Operator must create and deliver a minimum of 15 community and regional events per year. These include for example London and East London sports tournament and festivals. To be eligible as an event, these must be of at least 3 hours duration and contain either 6 teams or 500 spectators.
- **The creation and delivery of British Basketball League matches [From year 3 onwards].** The Operator must create and deliver a minimum of 18 BBL matches per year.
- **Provide access for Legacy Company hosted events.** The Operator is required to allow the Legacy Company access to host a maximum of 7 days per year within the Multi-Use Arena. This can be either all or part of the Multi-Use Arena. The Legacy Company reserve the right to pass some or all of these days back to the Operator. These events might include either Major or Mega Sporting Events (e.g. International Sporting) and non sporting events (e.g. fashion shows).
- **Sports Development and Community sport.** The Operator will provide the following **minimum hours of operation per week:**
 - Public access at all times (except during events)
 - A range of exercise sessions - 21 hours
 - Parent and child sessions - 2 hours
 - Education sessions (schools, colleges and universities) - 36 hours
 - Coaching sessions - 28 hours
 - Sports session activities (for example these could include (not exclusively): basketball, badminton, volleyball, handball, netball, gymnastics, trampoline, martial arts) - 10 hours
 - Disability session activities - 5 hours
 - Disability club activities - 5 hours
 - Women/ men only sessions - 4 hours
 - School holiday programme - 10 hours during school holidays
 - Older people sessions - 4 hours
 - Young people sessions (under 16's) - 8 hours
- **High Performance sport.** The Operator will provide the following **minimum hours of operation per week:**
 - 16 hours
 - Disability sport
 - 5 hours, 5 sessions per week includes Saturdays

Appendix 4 Views and information

The Committee held two formal meetings with experts and stakeholders during this review. On 19 July 2011 we met:

- Mark Bradley, Director, The Fan Experience Company
- Philip Kimberley, Chairman, England Hockey
- Peter King, Executive Director, British Cycling
- Mark Sesnan, Managing Director, Greenwich Leisure
- Professor Terry Stevens, Managing Director, Stevens and Associates

On 13 September 2011 we met:

- Shaun Dawson, Chief Executive, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
- Duncan Innes, Executive Director of Real Estate, Olympic Park Legacy Company
- Peter Tudor, Director of Venues, Olympic Park Legacy Company

Agendas and transcripts from formal meetings are available from the London Assembly website via:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListMeetings.aspx?CommitteeId=233>

The Committee received written submissions from the following individuals and organisations:

- British Cycling
- British Olympic Association
- England Hockey
- Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
- Leyton Orient Community Sports Programme
- Leyton Orient Football Club
- London Borough of Waltham Forest
- Mayor of London
- Olympic Park Legacy Company
- Parkwood Leisure
- Sheffield City Council
- Sport and Recreation Alliance
- Sport England
- Transport for London

Copies of written submissions are available on the London Assembly website via:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/the-london-assembly/publications/2012-games>

Committee Members visited the Olympic Park to see several of the venues in September 2011. Notes from this visit are available on the London Assembly website via:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=233&MId=4407&Ver=4>

During this investigation, Committee Members and officers have held informal meetings with the Olympic Park Legacy Company, the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, Sport England, British Cycling, URS Scott Wilson (representing Leyton Orient Football Club), the NEC Group and the London Borough of Waltham Forest, and attended the Stadium Business Summit in June 2011.

Previous investigations

Evidence received during the Committee's previous work on related topics has also been used to inform this investigation, and has been cited in this report. Further details are available in the following reports:

A sporting legacy for London?, February 2011. Available at:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/publication/sporting-legacy-london>

Legacy United? The legacy of London's Olympic venues, September 2010. Available at:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/the-london-assembly/publications/2012-games/venue-legacy>

Legacy Limited? A review of the Olympic Park Legacy Company's role, February 2010. Available at:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/the-london-assembly/publications/2012-games/legacy-limited>

Appendix 5 Orders and translations

How to order

For further information on this report or to order a copy, please contact Richard Berry, Scrutiny Manager, on 020 7983 4199 or email: richard.berry@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.

Chinese

如您需要这份文件的简介的翻译本，
请电话联系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 ਆਪਣੀ 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 করুন অথবা উল্লিখিত ডাক ঠিকানায় বা ই-মেইল ঠিকানায় আমাদের সাথে যোগাযোগ করুন।

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

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

Gujarati

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

Greater London Authority

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

www.london.gov.uk

Enquiries 020 7983 4100
Minicom 020 7983 4458