

## Chapter 14

**'The long-term legacy implications for London 2012  
and lessons learned from previous Games'.**

**Debbie Sadd and Ian Jones,  
School of Services Management,  
Bournemouth University  
dsadd@bournemouth.ac.uk  
jonesi@bournemouth.ac.uk**

Key words: events, London Olympics, long-term legacy planning,  
social impacts, rejuvenation, 'London' model.

**Abstract**

Celebrations have been part of man's history, with events ranging from the commemoration of phases of the moon to historical and cultural festivals, including the life cycle celebrations of birth, marriage and death. Events originated from the commercialisation of such popular celebrations and as our population becomes more culturally diverse, so do the events appearing (Bowdin et al, 2001).

All events have impacts and legacies. Large scale events have major benefits, including destination image, urban developments and the legacy left behind after the event is held. In order to maximise the long-term potential for these benefits, legacy planning as early as possible is paramount. Case studies of the Sydney Games show that whilst they have been known as 'the best games ever', the legacy planning post the Games (beginning in 2000) were negligible and the consequences of this are on-going (Cashman, 2006). For the organisers of the Barcelona 1992 Games, their built environment and the re-modelling of the city, was part of a larger scale long-term redevelopment and their legacy planning was part of an overall vision for the city (Abad in Moragas and Botella, 1995).

What appears to be a long-term strategic plan for London, especially in relation to the social impacts of the four main boroughs involved in the staging of the 2012 Games, could become known as the 'London' model of urban rejuvenation for future mega-event planners, particularly in relation to the long-term future legacy.

This chapter sets out to evaluate the lessons learned from the Games of Sydney and Barcelona in relation to legacy planning, especially the social consequences, and 'best-practice' lessons to be incorporated within the London 2012 planning in relation to future long-term legacies. London won the right to host the 2012 Games on the basis of their regeneration plans for an area of London containing socially deprived conditions. All the 'paper' promises within the bid document discuss the major regeneration project with the associated large scale spend on infrastructure, it is vital that the promises are turned into long-term viable legacy.

*"the task ahead for London is to embed the preparation for the hosting of the Games into a broader social policy agenda from the outset. Delivering social legacies are people based issues not facilities"* (London Bid Document, 2005 p xi)

**Event Legacy**

Event legacies are categorised into those which are economic, social, political, technological, environmental and legal. However, others included are physical, psychological and cultural and they can be further sub-divided into those that are classified as hard legacies (generally those tangible aspects) and those which are soft (generally intangible). It is only economic and to some extent environmental, physical and technological legacies that can be objectively measured. Psychological, socio-cultural and political legacies are more subjective and therefore more difficult to quantify and therefore accurately measured, but do they need to be 'measured'? The socio-cultural and psychological legacies are sometimes the most valuable, in that they may *'enhance the long-term well-being or lifestyle of residents in a very substantial manner – preferably in a way that reflects the values of the local population'* (Richie, 2000 p 156), yet they may also have devastating consequences on the local population.

### **Olympic Event Legacy**

An International Symposium on Legacy of the Olympic Games (1984-2000) was held in 2002, in Barcelona, to discuss and explore the various aspects of Olympic Legacy. One of the key findings that emerged was that legacy, in Olympic terms, is crucial in the organization and the ultimate evaluation of Games yet, that in attempting to define legacy, there can be several meanings of the concept. Volrath's (2005) definition suggests that legacy should include aims, motives, meanings and impacts in relation to the different translations of the term within the various languages and cultures of the Olympic family. Hiller (1998), however, prefers to use the word outcomes instead of legacy, whereas Cashman (2006) refers to the term 'impacts'. The Symposium agreed that there had been insufficient attention given in the past to the concept of 'legacy' and identified a greater need for research on the subject, and in particular it recommended that legacy building should commence with the decision to bid for the Games (Ritchie, 1987, Cashman, 2006). Such a decision has resulted in the appointment of Tom Russell as the Legacy Director in 2008 for London 2012, a decision which in itself was late as the bid was won in 2005, but at least the appointment has been made ([www.lida.gov.uk](http://www.lida.gov.uk)). London's bid to host the 2012 was successful partly because of its legacy plans for the Games site area which featured heavily in its bid documents.

Ritchie (2000) believes that legacy planning in respect of the Olympics can lead to the attainment of long term benefits to host destination residents. However, Malfas et al (2004) argue that whilst the Olympics may seem attractive through the positive economic benefits they accrue, the social impacts may be negative, particularly when residents are forced to move to make way for event infrastructure. They also highlight the Atlanta 1996 Olympic Games, when 9500 units of affordable housing were lost and \$350 million in public funds diverted from low-income housing and the social services to fund the Olympic preparation. In both Barcelona and Sydney, residents were forced to re-locate (Mackay, 1997 & Beadnell, 2000). These examples illustrate how prior legacy planning is crucial and ideally that legacy planning should be instituted concurrently with the planning of the main Games. This is crucial from the outset of the planning, in order to identify and plan for any negative impacts that may arise. The clearance of the proposed Olympic site in London has already necessitated the forced removal of the Clays Lane, Peabody Estates residents and two traveller sites in Clays Lane and Waterden Road, and therefore it is already questionable as to where the positive social legacies from this lie. Hiller (1998, 2006), Lenskyj (2002) and Olds (1998) write about the negative impacts and legacies

that hosting the Games have left on the communities in both Sydney, Montreal and Calgary. Cashman (2006, p 1) refers to the psychological impacts of the Sydney 2000 legacy on the population and how after the Games had finished, the emotional legacy left many feeling like the ‘carnival is over’ and of ‘what happens next?’ There was little preparation for the immediate post-Games legacy planning in Sydney and even now, some 8 years later, plans are still progressing for the development of the Olympic Park (Lochhead, 2005) Whilst the disruption caused through the preparation stage will be inconvenient for some, there must be an outcome for the population, especially in the post-Games use of the Olympic facilities. In Sydney, the main stadium had to be reduced from a capacity of 120,000 to 80,000 to make it viable and even Jack Rogge, the IOC President, questioned why such a big capacity was required at the outset. Chalkey and Essex (1999) agree that whilst host cities can be transformed by the Games and have an enhanced international profile; some games have negative legacies through stadia that become ‘white elephants’. Whilst correctly considered post-Games use can result in positive outcomes, the IOC has recognised the possibilities of planning resulting in negative consequences. Since July 2003, they have placed emphasis on maximising the long-term legacy of the Games, and it is anticipated that from the 2012 London Games onwards the issues of infrastructure and the associated legacy developments will feature more prominently, achieving even greater significance. Well planned infrastructure can lead to urban transformations of not just sporting venues, but also transport (as seen in Athens), accommodation (Sydney and Barcelona), services, telecoms and the living environment. Chalkey and Essex (1993) and Essex and Chalkey (1998 & 2003) further argue that the most successful Games to date (Barcelona) have been those that have taken the hosting of the Games as part of a wider regeneration development. The maximum Olympic effect will occur if all the developments are in one area thus reducing transportation problems. In the case of London 2012, several venues will be dispersed around London; however athletes and spectators are to be transported on high speed transportation between venues. Chalkey and Essex (1993) further suggest that those events that have a mixture of public and private funding have produced ‘substantial and impressive results’.

The main impacts and legacies from each particular Summer Games of the last 40 years can be divided as outlined in Figure 1

Games	Main Impacts observed	
Mexico, Munich, Montreal	Political and Social	
Atlanta, Los Angeles	Economic and Social	
Barcelona	Social	
Sydney	Environmental, Technological and	
	Social	
Athens	Environmental	
Beijing	Social, Political, Environmental	

Figure 1 – Olympic Impacts Adapted by author from Chalkey and Essex, (1999) & Essex and Chalkey, (1998 & 2003)

However the changing infrastructural impacts of each of the Games can be divided into themes, as adapted by the author from the work of Chalkey and Essex (1999) and Essex and Chalkey (1998 & 2003) as seen in Figure 2

Summer Olympic Games	Winter Olympic Games	The three distinct Olympic phases re infrastructural development
PHASE ONE; 1896-1904	PHASE ONE: 1924-1932	
A	A	
Small scale, poorly organised and not necessarily involving any new infrastructure	Minimal infrastructure transformation apart from sports facilities	
PHASE TWO: 1908-1932	PHASE TWO: 1936-1960	A =prior to the 1960's infrastructure transformations and expenditure were minimal
A	A	
Small scale, better organised and involving construction of purpose built facilities	Emerging infrastructural demands, especially transportation	
PHASE THREE: 1936-1956	PHASE THREE: 1964-1980	
A	B	
Large scale, well organised and involving construction of purpose built sport facilities with some impact on urban infrastructure	Tool of regional development, especially transportation and Olympic Villages	
PHASE FOUR: 1960-1996	PHASE FOUR: 1984-2002	B =cities that did improve their infrastructure but mainly focussed on the sporting facilities
B	B	
Large scale, well organised and involving construction of purpose built sports facilities with significant impacts on urban infrastructure	Large scale, urban transformations, including multiple Olympic Villages	
PHASE FIVE: 1996-2012	PHASE FIVE; 2002-2010	C =Cities that capitalised on the widespread opportunities for urban transformations and have recognised the role events can play within this process
C	C	
Urban regeneration projects have become recognised opportunities from the hosting of the games and the opportunities for enhanced place image. Scale of developments is in danger of imploding. Post games legacy planning beginning to gain momentum. Community involvement in planning gaining strength	Events being used to transform image in world's media and to enhance place image. Environmental concerns featuring heavily in planning, some community consultation	
PHASE SIX: 2012 onwards	PHASE SIX; 2010 onwards	D = Games to return to celebrations of sport and culture with environmental issues being at the heart of a
D	D	
Less extravagance in games to be replaced by collaborative planning	Environmental issues of prominence, especially in fragile mountain	

and urban regeneration	regions. Collaborative	collaborative planning
at the forefront of the	planning essential	process. Less
rationale for hosting.		extravagance & opulence
Environmental issues of		to be portrayed during
prominence and long		games.
term legacy planning		
from outset		

Figure 2 - The changing infrastructural impacts of the Olympics – Source author (2008) adapted from Chalkley & Essex (1999) and Essex and Chalkley (1998 & 2003)

Smith and Fox (2007) write about the hosting of large events associated with physical regeneration of cities that stimulate ‘softer’ impacts of social and economic regeneration. In the case of Manchester 2002, and the hosting of the Commonwealth Games, all the projects were games themed and this has led to the phrase of “event themed regeneration”, as opposed to beforehand where it was known as “event led regeneration”. Event themed regeneration was a key strength of the legacy programmes due to the organisational structures involved and the mix of projects linked to the games. A greater range of benefits was gained by helping to avoid problems seen in other cities, such as post games use of facilities and local community engagement in the planning (Mace et al, 2007). The organisers had a ‘uniting’ theme for regeneration and targeted approaches at the most needy beneficiaries. Programme managers said their programmes would not have been successful if not linked to the games with social and economic initiatives. Hiller (2006) writes that the processes to transform urban spaces through regeneration receive little attention and that the Barcelona example of the extensive waterfront development is a prime example of such opportunities

### **Barcelona 1992**

The 1992 Olympic Games are a good example of what can be achieved through boosting the image of a city, increased tourism and urban regeneration. Barcelona’s Olympic planning was focused on the long-term benefits of the city as a whole by having good transport links between the various sites, viable accommodation use post-games and an overall investment policy formulated in terms of social benefits, improved telecommunications (Botella, 1995), and the ‘opening up of the sea to the city’ (Mackay, 2000). He further acknowledges that all this took place within 6 years, as it was publicly acknowledged from the outset of the bid for the 1992 Games, that they were to be an opportunity to re-launch the city of Barcelona. Waitt (2001) suggests that the actual hosting of a mega-event can also result in a phenomenon called ‘civic boosterism’, which has the capacity to unite polarised socio-economic sections of the community through the generation of feelings of community pride. The conclusion drawn from Waitt’s study is that the local response to mega-events is complex, agreeing with other writers such as Fredline and Faulkner (2000), and Ley and Olds (1988) and Mihalik and Simonetta (1999), in that the residents ranked intangible benefits higher than the economic ones. In Waitt’s study, the level of citizen support diminished the closer the Games got, as they became more concerned about the negative benefits. The lesson for future games is that it is imperative to garner, foster and maintain community support, especially if such

communities perceive that they are not getting value for money from the infrastructure improvements. Therefore, organising committees must ensure funding is secured at the earliest possible stage of capital improvement projects, so as to garner and foster community support.

### **Sydney 2000**

Owen (2001 & 2002) argues that in the case of Sydney, in the areas adjacent to the Olympic Park, the social and political impacts were overshadowed by the need to provide physical and symbolic legacies of the games, i.e. the more tangible elements. Due to a lack of community participation in the planning processes, negative social impacts resulted, a situation not helped by restricting public access to community facilities and also by removing local authorities planning powers. For Auburn Council, the Olympics provided an opportunity for urban governance to be approached with a more entrepreneurial style. This involved a more pro-active stance, particularly in the development of facilities that could be marketed to attract investment into the area, but without losing the focus of the local residents' well being. Such entrepreneurial governance includes the centralisation of planning powers including the streamlining of processes, high level of private sector involvement and the subversion of the democratic principles of openness, accountability and the community participation in planning (Owen, 2002) The important point is to ensure that the local communities get the transparency and accountability they deserve in the planning of their future urban environment.

Sydney did, however, have world class venues, the largest remediation project in Australia and the creation of the largest metropolitan parkland in Australia, alongside Newington being one of largest solar powered suburbs in the world. The Sydney Olympic Park Act of 2001, wanted social, economic, environmental and financial returns from its investment in the park and to secure a lasting Olympic Legacy. However, Lochhead (2005) writes that at time of the Games, as well as during the planning stages, the post games legacy was little considered. The Sydney Olympic Park Authority only published their 7-10 yr plan in 2002, identifying 8 main sites for development, including facilities for up to 10,000 workers and 3,000 residents. They later decided to propose Vision 2025 envisaging a mix of uses within the urban area, resulting in a critical mass of residents and workers as well as transport infrastructure improvements. Under the longer-term programme, the precinct would retain its current amenity and major event capacity, but its viability would be significantly enhanced, particularly vital as both the main stadia have suffered such viability issues since the Games ended.

In several developments for the Sydney Games, the infrastructure was not approved at a local level, but by the Minister for Urban Affairs and that the planning was from a regional and national perspective with the result being sharp rent increases and ensuing homelessness in some areas. In Auburn, the council retained control and ownership of many community facilities and services, enabling them to control costs and to offer employment to the local population. In conclusion, Owen believes that *'entrepreneurialism is not the hegemonic ideology that many urban geographers believe'* (2002; p 333), as managerial and democratic concerns operating still behind the

entrepreneurial frontage because of local action through community empowerment. Due to a lack of community participation in the planning processes, negative social impacts have resulted, not helped by restricting public access to community facilities and also by removing local authorities planning powers (Owen, 2002, Lenskyj, 2002). Cashman (2006) also argues that the benefits of hosting the games for the local population were very vague, especially in the case of Homebush, due to the envisaged benefits either being over inflated or simply being too complex to measure in monetary terms. Additionally, often there is no post-games monitoring in place to measure the long term benefits coupled with a lack of objectivity in terms of what is to be measured. Yet, the organisers of the Games disagreed with Cashman by arguing that these benefits can outweigh the negative ones, despite the overcrowding, increased costs, taxes and disruption. Often the local residents are not consulted about the development plans for their area, only being informed of the positive benefits that will accrue as result of the Games taking place, yet the developers/organisers often report that they have public support via opinion polls undertaken amongst the community and by asking potential detractors and community representatives to join the bid committees.

Owen (2002), writing about the 2000 Olympics, compared the urban governance policies of three local government areas in relation to the social and political legacies of their involvement in the games. All three areas, Auburn, Ryde and Waverley adopted quite different styles of entrepreneurial governance and also different styles of dealing with 'activist' elements in their neighbourhoods, resulting in some cases of communities securing considerable benefits accruing locally from the Games. In Auburn's case it is interesting to note that the former mayor, Patrick Curtin was involved in most of the negotiations on behalf on the council, yet in the intervening period before the Games took place an election had been held and Mayor Le Lam was elected to the position of Mayor, thus displacing the one person who had been at the forefront of the negotiations on behalf of the community. Owen further writes of the shift in urban governments from a managerial approach towards urban politics, to one in which entrepreneurial attempts to improve economic and social welfare take precedence over managerial concerns. Old style management involving the centralisation of planning powers, privatisation of government operations, relaxation of normal planning process and the assumption of risk by the public sector have '*resulted in reduced and ineffective community participation through the subversion of democratic principles*' (2002; p 324) However, when considering the size of the planning involved in the staging of the Olympic Games, special planning agencies have to be established to oversees the efficiency of the process, it is the manner in which they exercise their powers that Owen investigated in his three case studies.

The case of Auburn Council was different to that of Ryde and Waverley, as there appeared to be little tension between the council and the Olympic Organising authorities. This was due mainly to the fact that much of the area was already owned by the State and Federal Governments, having received poor management for many years and had become degraded and desolate wasteland. The council involvement was mainly through providing supporting infrastructure, being very entrepreneurial and democratic in its dealings with the organisers. However, despite many of the perceived legacies being

negative for the local communities, Auburn Council managed to keep the interests of their residents in the forefront of all their negotiations, and any local community opposition was carefully listened to and acted upon according to Cashman (2006), yet from research undertaken in 2007 by the author this would not appear to be the case. Unlike the other two areas, the Auburn residents were not losing the use of a facility whilst preparations for the games took place as the parkland was unusable anyway. The council and local community groups recognised through the consultation process that they would inherit the legacy of the Sydney Olympic Park, which for the council would generate income and be a place for the community to use. However the council did suffer from a lack of openness and co-operation and information from the Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (SOCOG)

### **London Legacy**

By applying the key findings of the International Symposium of the Olympic Games 2002, to the London legacy planning so far, it can be concluded that:

The legacy building starts with the decision to bid for the games – one of the key reasons for London winning the 2012 bid was on the basis that the legacy planning was recognised from the initial stage of deciding to bid for the Games.

1. There are several meanings of the concept of legacy, and in translation there are better words to include which express the historical roots and Olympic Movement more comprehensively- London, whilst not explicitly conceptualising legacy has designed positive and long lasting 'legacy' proposals.
2. Sustainable development is paramount within legacy planning in order to protect the environment, yet technological development is crucial for the games. The infrastructure for the games should be beacons of environmentally friendly development – as proposed in the post-Games plans for the park, it's infrastructure with several stadia being relocated to other parts of the country and the main stadium being reduced in capacity post-Games.
3. Intangible legacies are as important as tangible legacies, especially cultural legacies as the ultimate source of all other legacies, i.e. the games rituals, torch relay, opening and closing ceremonies – cultural Olympiad being rolled out nationwide and other intangible legacies to include skills training and the volunteer programme.
4. The IOC role within legacy planning is one of ensuring the effective transfer of knowledge between organising bodies and moreover to raise the awareness of the importance of legacy planning. '*Lowest cost possible with maximum benefit for the athletes and citizens*' (p3). The IOC would like to ensure that genuine, lasting sporting legacies are created. Legacy will become a crucial component within the bid process especially evidencing post-games initiatives - Knowledge transfer playing a crucial role within London planning
5. More attention is required to research into the legacy of the games, especially longitudinal research and more comparative studies. Also the creation of libraries of Olympic related research and other documentation with all Olympic Study Centres inter-linked- several academic institutions are already involved in longitudinal research programmes.
6. Output from the conference can form part of the Legacy of the Olympic Movement – already being used by London Organising Committee.



In the UK, the 2002 Commonwealth Games held in Manchester were an excellent example of legacy planning helping to demonstrate the positive impact mega sports events can have on the domestic population in terms of raising awareness, participation levels and volunteering in sport. In addition, the hosting of the Commonwealth Games played a noteworthy role in the regeneration of the area and a significant boost to the economy of the North West of England. Given the magnitude of the Olympic Games, in comparison to the Commonwealth Games and because they will be based in the South East and beyond, the legacies have the potential to spread beyond London to other parts of the country, especially through the establishment of the Nations and Regions Group structure. The facilities, the volunteering programme, the infrastructure, the cultural integration and awareness must all be harnessed and focussed towards the legacy goals being set. The timing of the Commonwealth Games was also important as they showed the World that the UK can host major sports events successfully.

Yet, despite all the positive legacy plans that are in place and in order for the successful conclusion of a well-organised Games in 2012, there are the inevitable negative legacy stories arising. Already in London, in order to make the site viable for development in the Lower Lea Valley, many different groups have been affected through forced relocation including two traveller camps, the Manor Road allotment holders, the residents of the Clays Lane, Peabody Estate and many local businesses. Their respective legacies are all negative to date and whilst consultation took place, it was not equitable. Many sections of the bid documentation mention potential benefits for the local community to the Olympic Park, yet the evidence from previous Games points to these communities changing in social structure post the Games. It will be interesting to see the social structure of the new site residents' post 2012 and what the eventual long-term legacies for them become.

## References

Abad, J.M., 1995. A Summary of the Activities of the COOB '92. In M de Moragas and M. Botella (eds). *The Keys to Success – The social, sporting, economic and*

*communications impact of Barcelona '92*. Barcelona, CEO-UAB

Beadnell, M. (2000). Sydney's homeless to be removed for Olympics. Online  
<http://www.wsws.org/articles/2000/feb2000/olymp-f03.shtml> accessed 07/11/06

Bowdin, G., McDonnell, I., Allen, J., and O'Toole, W. 2001. *Event Management*. Oxford, Butterworth-Heinemann

Cashman, R., 2006. *The Bitter Sweet Awakening – The Legacy of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*. Sydney, Walla Walla Press

Chalkley, B & Essex, S. (1999) Urban development through hosting international events: a history of the Olympic Games. *Planning Perspectives*, 14(4), 369-394

Essex, S. and Chalkley, B. (1998) Olympic Games: Catalyst of Urban Change, *Leisure Studies*, 17, pp.187-206.

Essex, S. and Chalkley, B. (2003) Urban Transformation from Hosting the Olympic Games, University Lecture on the Olympics, Barcelona, Centre d'Estudis Olímpics (UAB), International Chair in Olympism (IOC-UAB). Online Article:  
<http://olympicstudies.uab.es/lectures/web/pdf/essex.pdf>

Fredline, E., Faulkner, B., 2000. "Host community reactions: a cluster analysis", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 27 No.3, pp.763-84.

Hiller, H., 1998. Assessing the impact of mega-events: A linkage model. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1 (1), 47-57

Hiller, H., 2000. Mega-Events, Urban Boosterism and Growth Strategies: An Analysis of the Objectives and Legitimations of the Cape Town 2004 Olympic Bid. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. 24(2): 439-458

Hiller, H., 2006. Post-event Outcomes and the Post-modern Turn: The Olympics and Urban Transformations. *European Sport Management Quarterly* 6(4): 317-332

Lenskyj, H. J. (2002) *The Best Olympics Ever? Social Impacts of Sydney 2000*. New York, State University of New York Press.

Ley, D., and K. Olds. 1988. Landscape as spectacle: World's fairs and the culture of heroic consumption. *Society and Space*, 6, 191-212.

Lochhead, H., 2005. A New Vision for Sydney Olympic Park. *Urban Design*, 10, 215-222

London Bid Document, 2005. London 2012 Bid team, London.

London Development Agency, 2008. *LDA appoints Tom Russell to head Olympic Legacy Directorate*-<http://www.lda.gov.uk/server/show/ConWebDoc.2308>

Mackay, D., 2000. *The Recovery of the Seafront*. Barcelona, Aula Barcelona

Mace, A., Hall, P. and Gallent, N., 2007. New East Manchester: Urban Renaissance or Urban Opportunism? *European Planning Studies*, 15 (1), 51-65

Malfas, M., Theodoraki, E. & Houlihan, B. (2004). Impacts of the Olympic Games as mega-events. *Municipal Engineer* 157 (ME3): 209-220

Mihalik, M. B., Simonetta, L., 1999. A midterm assessment of the host population's perceptions of the 1996 summer Olympics: Support, attendance, benefits and liabilities. *Journal Of travel research*, 37 (3), 244-248

Olds, K. (1998) Urban Mega-Events, Evictions and Housing Rights: The Canadian Case. *Current Issues in Tourism* 1 (1): 2-46

Owen, K. A., 2001. *The Local Politics of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games: processes, and politics of the venue preparation*. Sydney, UNSW

Owen, K. A., 2002. The Sydney 2000 Olympics and Urban Entrepreneurialism: Local variations in Urban Governance. *Australian Geographical Studies*, 40 (3), 323-336

Ritchie, J.R.B., 1987. *The Impacts of the 1988 Winter Olympics on Calgary: A tourism perspective*. Paper presented at the 18<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Travel and Tourism Research Association. Seattle, WA, USA

Ritchie, J. R. B., 2000. Turning 16 Days into 16 Years through Olympic Legacies. *Event Management*, 6, 155-165.

Smith, A., and Fox, T., 2007. From 'event-led' to 'event-themed' Regeneration: The 2002 Commonwealth Games Legacy programme. *Urban Studies*, 44 (5), 1125-1143

Volrath, A. (2005) Eternity Games – Legacies and collective identity through sport events: studies on legacies of community building in the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games. In D. Adair, B. Coe & N Gouth (eds) *Beyond the Torch*. Sydney, Australian Society for Sports History

Waitt, G. (2001) The Olympic spirit and civic boosterism: the Sydney 2000 Olympics. 3(3): 249-278