

# London Journal of Tourism, Sport and Creative Industries



# London Journal of Tourism, Sport and Creative Industries (LJTSCI)

Volume 1, Edition 1, Spring 2008

<b>Editorial</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Visualising London</b> Stevenson and Inskip	<b>3</b>
<b>London's Hospitality Workforce: Cultural Diversity a Choice or Necessity?</b> Pantelidis and Wrobel	<b>13</b>
<b>Implications and Issues of London 2012 for the Sites' Residents</b> Sadd and Jones	<b>22</b>
<b>How can social marketing be used to promote sport?</b> Corcoran	<b>30</b>
<b>Reviews</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Call for Papers – LJTSCI Volume 1 Edition 2 Autumn 2008</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Editorial Policies</b>	<b>39</b>

# London Journal of Tourism, Sport and Creative Industries (LJTSCI)

## Scope of the Journal

London is one of the world's most heterogeneous and cosmopolitan cities. It is a quintessential 'global city' located at the interface of manifold networks and flows. *The London Journal of Tourism, Sport and Creative Industries* (LJTSCI) seeks to publish articles on a variety of related topics which encapsulates this diversity and the nature of its local-global intersections.

The subject area delivered at London Metropolitan University has a history of high quality research into anthropological/developmental studies and policy analysis. It is from these platforms that the journal aims to be a meeting place for research and discussion on a wealth of topics that should appeal to scholars, practitioners, policy makers and general readers. These articles can include research, works-in progress, case studies, developments in theory, book reviews and general reviews that contributes to the development of the subject field.

The journal addresses a broad subject field, while under the banner of Tourism, Sport and the Creative Industries it also includes, but is not restricted to, events, the Arts – including music and dance, heritage, hospitality, advertising & communications, music media & entertainment. We encourage submissions relating to these topics from a wide variety of perspectives; such as all areas of anthropology, management, economics, politics, history, sociology, psychology, cultural studies and marketing. The contexts of these research papers are also broad in scope covering relevant research form public, commercial and third sector organisations and settings.

## Journal Objectives

- Contribute to the growth of knowledge about in the areas covered by the Subject Field, including travel, tourism, sport, music and media, hospitality, events, arts/ heritage and other creative industries.
- Contribute to the growth of knowledge about pedagogy in the Subject.
- Provide a forum for academic debate and academy-industry interchange in the Subject (including organisations from the third sector/ the mixed economy of provision).
- Provide a mechanism for discussion of research that is a work in progress or as yet preliminary and emerging.
- Provide a pathway for the development of young, new, and PhD researchers in the Subject.
- Provide a pathway to bring to wider attention excellent examples of research carried out by LMBS students.
- Contribute to the strengthening of our links with alumni and other practitioners.
- Contribute to the strengthening of our links with international partners.

**Editorial Board:** Julie Scott, Michael Hitchcock, Tom Selwyn, I-Ling Kuo, Nicole Ferdinand, Milan Todorovic, Ioannis Pantelidis, Robert Lentell, Paul Kitchin

# Editorial

Welcome to the first edition of the *The London Journal of Tourism, Sport and Creative Industries*. It is my privilege to be the founding editor of this journal and work with the committed editorial board we have in place. The concept was formulated over 12 months ago and it is satisfying to see that the first edition of the journal has come to life. However it is also important at this stage to explain what the journal is about and to this effect put some substance into the scope which may not be initially apparent to readers. Feedback from some has suggested it is perceived as a journal dealing solely with issues in London. This is partly the case but it is not a comprehensive overview of what we are aiming to achieve. The journal will be a meeting place for scholarly research and discussion on a multitude of topics that encompass the local-global connections that exist within London. To this end this first edition contains articles covering experiences of life, work and leisure in London. Throughout the papers this concept of the local-global nexus becomes more tangible as we witness the various realities of the networks and flows of the city's multi-cultural populous.

In the first article Stevenson and Inskip provide an analysis of the interpretations that some of these populations apply to tourist sites in the London area. The authors use social semiotic analysis of photographic images to extract meaning and interpretation of the subjects' perspectives of the city. Building on the work of previous research [Morgan and Pritchard (1998) and Pink (2007)] the authors contend "the way people make images of places reflects the meaning of those places to them" and in turn is "affected by their experiences, background and values." They go on to present their findings from a structured analysis of the visual data, of which we are fortunate enough to have a sample within the article. Of interest are the varied meanings that can be derived through the images and how these various truths are all legitimate representations of the city.

The widening of the European Union has seen yet another cultural grouping make its way to London in search of new opportunities. Pantelidis and Wrobel provide an analysis of how employers, agencies and academics perceive new and existing populations, their characteristics in relation to work and their integration into the wider workforce. The authors present an analysis of the issues facing hospitality employers and perceptions of cultural barriers to obtaining employment in the field that are harboured by resident populations throughout the region.

Sadd and Jones analyse one of the many issues facing London in its preparation for staging the 2012 Olympics and dealing with the legacy post-event. The authors provide a strong overview of the legacy issues of population relocation from the Barcelona and Sydney experiences before moving onto an analysis of the challenges facing London. The reality of regeneration is the sheer scale and complexity of the operation involving many aspects of development and destruction in order to create an end product. One such area of concern is the displacement of existing communities to alternative regions away from their traditional areas of life and work. They contend that there are major issues for traveller communities as they are facing separation from the area and from their community ties.

Corcoran provides a discussion of the role of social marketing in increasing the health of the populous. She identifies the issues facing sport and health organisations in adopting social marketing and examines why their responses to this approach have been mixed. This piece presents eight elements of social marketing that can be used by these agencies to capitalise on the health/physical activity agenda. In tune with the discussion articles' objectives hopefully this will generate discussion from sport and health practitioners as well as marketers on the suitability of this approach in this region.

Little provides the first of our book reviews starting with *Gold and Gold's Olympic Cities: City Agendas, Planning and the World's Games, 1896-2012*. Lunt follows this with his analysis of O'Toole, Harris and McDonnell's fourth edition of *Festival & Special Event Management*.

Finally I'd like to express my thanks to Robert Lentell and the other members of the editorial board for their advice and assistance throughout the past 12 months in turning this idea into something tangible (in a manner of speaking). Thanks to Allan Boosey and Events Management Knowledge for their flexibility and courtesy in allowing us a channel for publication. Without this support the journal would have had to rely on existing in email format only. Thank you

also to Demetria Maratheftis and her colleagues in the marketing department for the first-class job they have done on creating the document that you are reading. And finally a warm thanks to the authors who submitted abstracts and full articles for their 'leap-of-faith' in choosing our new journal, I hope you are happy with the format and presentation of your work.

## References

- Morgan, N. & Pritchard, A. (1998). *Tourism promotion and power*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Pink, S. (2007). *Doing visual ethnography*. London: Sage.

# Implications and Issues of London 2012 for the Sites' Residents

Debbie Sadd

Bournemouth University

Ian Jones

Bournemouth University

Keywords: Olympics, London 2012, Legacy, Social Impacts, Residents, Relocation

---

## Abstract

The Olympic Delivery Authority have agreed to undertake in the process of organizing the London 2012 Games, one of the biggest urban regeneration projects seen in Europe for many years, destined to create a new town the size of Exeter once the Games have finished (ODA, 2006). Through examining past Olympic Games, this paper explores some of the soft legacy implications of the London 2012 Games and in particular the fate of the only 'residents' being relocated from the Olympic Site, twenty-one traveller families. The paper concludes with a discussion on how legacy can be sustainable and for the benefit of the whole community rather than particular sections.

## Introduction

The awarding of the 2012 Olympic Games to London is cited as being the catalyst for one of the biggest urban regeneration projects seen in Europe for many years, destined to create a new town the size of Exeter once the Games have finished (ODA, 2006). Whilst the media focus is on the development of the hard infrastructure needed to host the Games, it is the softer legacies and their long term implications that are often overlooked, and whilst previous Games have discussed the social implications of housing issues in relation to communities (Lenskyi, 2002, Hughes, 1993) there has been little written in the past regarding other communities/businesses that are relocated because of the Games' infrastructural requirements. This paper sets out to explain the fate of the site's current 'residents', what is happening to them at the time of writing, and what the plans are for their future. There are a wide variety of businesses/activities including a community church, cafes and scrap metal merchants yet there are only two residential communities in the area currently being developed, the Waterden Crescent travellers' site in Hackney and Clays Lane travellers' site in Newham. This paper will focus its attention to the relocation issues of the travellers from the Waterden Crescent site by examining the social implications of the relocation of this community and also highlight the unexpected and exceptional costs involved in the relocation processes. The paper will conclude with important lessons for London from the experiences of past Games, especially Barcelona (1992) and Sydney (2000).

## Event Legacy

Research on the social impacts of events, although limited, is becoming increasingly important (e.g. Waitt, 2001, Fredline et al, 2003, Cashman, 2006). Although such impacts are difficult to quantify, they are often examined through the residents' perceptions of the impacts (Fredline et al, 2003). Such impacts include developing a sense of place and community pride in conjunction with quality of life (Ritchie and Smith, 1991, Cashman, 2006) and the enhancement of social capital, vital in maintaining a productive and lively society. It is often assumed that if the economic benefits of an event are positive, it should therefore follow that the social impacts will also be positive. However, Malfas et al (2004) argue that whilst events may seem attractive through the positive economic benefits they accrue, the social impacts can be negative, particularly when residents are forced to leave their publicly funded housing projects to make



way for event infrastructure. They highlight the case of 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.

## 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 at all levels. One of the findings was that legacy in Olympic terms is crucial in the organization and the final evaluation of Games but that in attempting to define legacy, there are several meanings of the concept. This is especially true because of different translations of the term within the various languages and cultures of the Olympic family [Hiller (2000), for example, prefers to use the word outcomes instead of legacy].

The symposium agreed that legacy is multidisciplinary and dynamic and evolving constantly, therefore whilst being difficult to define *it is a local and global concept existing within cities, regions and nations as well as internationally*. (IOC, 2003, p.1). The symposium also discussed and explored various aspects of Olympic legacy at all levels and agreed that there has been insufficient attention given in the past to the outcomes of legacy and identified a great need for research into legacy and in particular that legacy building must start with the decision to bid for the games, (Ritchie, 1987; Cashman, 2006).

Sustainable development is paramount within legacy planning in order to protect the environment, and the infrastructure for the games should be beacons of environmentally friendly development, thus satisfying the IOC's third dimension of environmentalism. In April 2007 press cuttings (Harrison, 2007) reported that the UK bid was beginning to suffer through the lack of guidance and control from a central 'Legacy Tsar'. The regeneration opportunities would not be maximized until such a role was appointed as *"too many agencies and government departments are currently involved with no clear leadership"* Clear leadership is required for the 2012 legacy for it to maximize its potential positive benefits and impacts, yet for this to happen it needs to be centrally coordinated.

## Social impacts

Traditionally legacy denotes something that 'kicks in' as a result of something related happening as it is pre planned to happen at a certain time in the future. Volrath (2005) argues that legacy relates to the aims, motives, meanings and impacts of the Olympic Games but more specifically the results, effects and long-term implications. There are various types of legacy, yet it is only economic and to some extent environmental, physical and technological legacies that can objectively be measured. Psychological, social, cultural and political legacies are more subjective and therefore more difficult to quantify and therefore accurately measure. The social and psychological legacies are sometimes the most valuable (Ritchie, 2000), those that will 'enhance the long-term well-being or lifestyle of destination residents in a very substantial manner – preferably in a way that reflects the values of the local population (p. 156).

Ritchie (2000) writing after the Calgary and Salt Lake City Olympic Games, suggests that events can provide a short term period of intense excitement for residents of host cities and even nations and long term awareness of the host destination in tourism markets, yet without the proper strategic planning it can be difficult to justify the immense expense involved. He further believes that legacy planning in respect of the Olympics can lead to the attainment of long-term benefits to host destination residents. The city transformations that can be undertaken as a result of hosting mega events depend on the quality of the planning and this will therefore include any housing issues. For a sustainable legacy, all the objectives of the various stakeholders need to be addressed and a holistic approach taken to the development and management of the Olympic facilities. The regeneration dividend should become a blueprint for future Olympic cities.

Olds (1998) writes about the Canadian case studies of Expo '86 in Vancouver, 1988 Calgary Winter Olympic Games, and the rejected proposal to host the 1996 Summer Olympic Games in Toronto by focusing on the event organizers having to deal with event related housing impacts through forced evictions. He purports that for an effective community force to be heard an organized, strategic and resourceful coalition of community –based groups is vital in order to have the capacity and knowledge base to deal with the complexity of the situation, to act forcefully at whatever level and to formulate diverse strategies in order to take advantages when they arise to seek to achieve common goals. A similar situation also developed in Sydney, with the issue of how best to deal with the homeless population prior to the Games'

commencement. In addition, many people suffered above inflation rent increases on their properties from unscrupulous landlords in order to force them out their homes to capitalize on the money to be made from the Games (Beadnell, 2000). Special powers were invoked by the Olympic Authorities through Sydney City Council Rangers who were given the powers to remove anyone deemed a nuisance. Hamilton (2000) wrote that Sydney's newest Olympic Sport was the 'rent race', and McWilliams (2000) wrote at the same time that some tenants who had lived for 20 years in the same building were given 60 days notice to move out. According to Hall (1997) the creation of 'desirable' middle-class living conditions is often a precursor for higher property prices and increased rents. In addition there is also the risk of a breakdown in communities' structure as seen in Barcelona 1992 with the relocation of many of the indigenous communities from the waterfront to several separate sites around the city. For the 1988 Olympic Games in Seoul, 'undesirable' communities were either relocated away from the Olympic Torch relay route, so as to avoid being filmed by the media and in some places hidden behind a new wall specifically built for this purpose.

### **Examples from Barcelona 1992 and Sydney 2000**

The planning of the Barcelona Games of 1992 became part of an overall strategy developed in the post-Franco era of the 1970's in order to give the city back to the people after years of dictatorship rule and especially to stop the city 'turning its back on the sea' (Gold & Gold, 2008, MacKay, 2000). Influential politicians began an extensive programme of opening up spaces and transforming former industrial land into facilities for the Catalan people. One such influential local was Juan Antonio Samaranch, who encouraged Barcelona to apply for the hosting of the Games to compliment the plans already in place. The plan was to decentralize the games around the city by upgrading existing sporting facilities and spreading the facilities over four distinct areas. The main site being Montjuic where there was already a stadium, built in 1936, and a swimming pool constructed in 1972. The Diagonal was an existing sporting precinct and Parc de Mar and Vall d'Hebron also had existing facilities (Cashman, 2006). This conscious decision to spread the facilities around meant building a completely new Olympic village within the city, but away from the sporting facilities. The decision was made to develop the housing on derelict land close to the waterfront which had only limited light industrial use and was large enough to accommodate the building required. Rather than build the minimum facilities required various Spanish architects were commissioned to build blocks of apartments all with different designs that would be suitable for local people to move into post Games. As part of this overall project the opening up of the seafront again, away from industrial use, was completed but not without having to relocate a community of gypsies who had made their home along the waters edge in shanty towns, especially Somorrostro and Camp de la Bota (Walker and Porraz, 2003). The majority of the gypsies were rehoused in apartment blocks on the periphery of the city and whilst many have remained in these blocks some have returned to living in shanty towns in other parts of town as the only way of life they understand and also through disputes with other residents who disapproved on the gypsies moving in. However the developments in Barcelona continue to this day and rather than the Olympics being a catalyst for urban change (Chalkey and Essex, 1999) they have helped to accelerate plans that have been progressing for the last 30 years. There were no plans post the games to keep any of the newly created housing for social housing, but the city has recognized this need now and in its new developments are stipulating, in some cases, that approximately 25% of new units are available as social housing to be rented (Walliser, 2004) rather than forcing these renters to live on the periphery of the city and thus being socially segregated and polarized (Beckhoven et al, in press).

For the 2000 games, Sydney, in contrast to Barcelona, opted to develop a large urban project on the western edges of Sydney, despite there being many existing sporting facilities around other parts of the city. The original site selected in Moore Park was rejected by the residents, therefore for the 2000 bid Homebush Bay was selected so all the facilities could be contained in one site, with a few small exceptions. The land was similar to that used in Barcelona in that it was derelict with a few small businesses remaining but with no residents who would need to be relocated. The land had been identified for urban renewal in the 1970's and in the intervening years many businesses including a large abattoir was relocated, losing the local council of Auburn rental incomes of nearly \$1m, which has resulted in cuts in budgets to facilities provided by the local council to their citizens (Cashman, 2006). The development of the facilities for the Games was closely monitored by Greenpeace and therefore became known as the 'green games', thus satisfying the IOC's third dimension of environmentalism. However, the properties that are now residential suburbs are built on former contaminated soil and the local waters are still polluted, yet they obtain premium prices on the open market. Further extensive developments have taken place around the park thus alienating the poorer social classes even further,



but none of the properties have been kept for key workers thus having integrated housing. There was little post games planning for the facilities and whilst the games gave great hope to the local residents of the nearest suburb of Auburn; they have gained very little from being the nearest community to the Olympic Precinct. Here the local council did not have an open relationship with the Games organizers and thus their role as stakeholders with in the pre and post planning stages was largely ignored (Curtin, 2007). Felli (2004) argues that partnerships in the organizing of the games will only succeed if three basic principles are adhered to; a clear understanding of each parties defined contributions; mutual confidence and understanding through effective monitoring, early identification of problems and risks, sharing information, use of previous games experience, transparency, and commonality of language and competent collaborators sharing common values. Searle (2002) argues that the attraction of new world-class sporting facilities in a country so sports orientated helped gain public support for the new infrastructure developments.

## **The London Legacy**

When London won the bid to host the games on 6th July 2005, the London 2012 games vision was underpinned by the themes of delivering the experience of a lifetime for the athletes, leaving a legacy for sport, benefiting the community through regeneration and supporting the IOC and Olympic movement. The regeneration of the Lower Lea Valley will involve the regeneration of an entire community for the direct benefit of everyone who lives and works there at present, involving significant social and economic advancement. The bid committee believe this model of social inclusion will open up opportunities for education, cultural and skills development and jobs not just across the London area but also across the whole of the UK (London 2012 Candidate File, 2005a).

The Lower Lea Valley area earmarked for the Olympic Development is derelict and polluted land that has suffered from decades of under investment. The developments will become the biggest regeneration project in Europe in 150 years. The intention within the games legacy is to plan a network of restored waterways and new wildlife habitats to complement the physical infrastructure (London 2012 Candidate File, 2005b). The landscape is industrial and the surrounding communities are some of the most deprived in the country with 40% unemployment in the 5 Olympic boroughs of Tower Hamlets, Newham, Greenwich, Hackney and Waltham Forest, for example, 50% of children live in poverty in Newham (ODA, 2006).

The ODA (2006) say the games will result in a new town the size of Exeter being built in the Lower Lea Valley including 40,000 new homes with priority assigned to key workers, new schools, community and health facilities. New transport links including new roads, enhanced train services, line extensions and new stations in conjunction with improvements to utility infrastructure, including a new and improved sewage system will help to provide sustainable growth and development. The ODA's intention is to 'leave a lasting legacy for generations to come, improving lives and changing the face of London for ever'.

The Egan Review of April 2004 sets out the guidelines for sustainable development and demonstrates how Olympic regeneration benefits are interlinked with Sustainable Communities Plan (Vigor, et al, 2004). Governance will be a key element with clear rules and accountability being essential before any benefits can be accrued. The Mayor of London has therefore been given Olympic-specific powers eg overriding some existing planning laws. '*The LDA is the Mayor of London's agency for sustainable economic growth and is working to build a thriving economy for London's communities and businesses*' ([www.london.gov.uk/londonissues](http://www.london.gov.uk/londonissues)).

The economic benefits are to be realized by The London Development Agency especially in their mission to acquire the land necessary for the building of the Olympic Park. This will include relocation of those businesses and other residents from the site of the park, including the Travellers Park in Waterden Road, The Evangelical Church and the East London Bus Depot. Other players involved within the regeneration programme include the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, The London Thames Gateway Development Corporation and the 5 London Boroughs.

## **London Site Residents Experiences to date and Future Plans**

It is the London Development Agency (LDA) who are responsible for acquiring and clearing the site for the 2012 games. They are working very closely with the people who currently live and work and run businesses on the Olympic Park. Within the designated area for the Olympic Park site developments there are two licensed Traveller and Gypsy sites one of which is Waterden Crescent in the London Borough of Hackney. The LDA has been working with Hackney Council

and the traveller families to relocate those families affected to new sites within Hackney that are as close as possible to their old site, particularly in relation to the children from the site and their getting to and from school safely. In total there are 20 families to be relocated and they have lived on their present site, which is licensed by Hackney Council, for 13 years.

Under the Race Relations Act, Travellers of Irish and Romani Gypsy heritage are officially recognised as ethnic groups. The Housing Act 2004 and Department of Communities and Local Government Circular give Councils a duty to assess the needs of the travellers and provide appropriate new accommodation alternatives. However, regrettably for the travellers there is no site large enough for them to relocate on mass and therefore three new sites have been offered which means splitting the families up. One proposed site is the Millfield Road Depot in the Lea Bridge area which is presently a domestic waste and recycling depot. Before any work can begin on this site it is necessary to gain permission for a change of use even in spite of the special Olympic compulsory purchase laws that were introduced specifically for Olympic development. The council have to go through the correct procedures and consider the views of the local residents. Then it will be necessary to relocate the waste and recycling site before the ground can be prepared for the travellers to have their new facilities constructed. This whole process has to take place before the construction can begin for the Olympic facilities. This then needs to be repeated for the two other gypsy sites plus for all the other businesses that have to be relocated from the Olympic park area. Currently, there is no confirmed timescale for the process, and efforts to identify a clear timescale have proved largely unhelpful, for example Guy Nicholson, Cabinet Member for regeneration and the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, whilst being interviewed by the travellers himself, suggested that *"I can't tell you exactly when you'll be moving because it's tied up with all sorts of things happening, least of all getting your new homes ready for you. But, rest assured, everybody is talking to everybody about it"*.

Each new pitch for each family will consist of an amenity block (kitchen, living area and bathroom), outside area, space for two caravans (as they still wish to have the option to travel especially for special social celebrations), parking and landscaped grounds. Guy Nicholson, suggested;

*It's going to bring forward new homes for you and your families: new places to live for the future. What we've tried to do— and I think it will happen – is make sure that these new homes are better than the ones you currently live in, and are better places for the future... As a council we've asked that these sites are built to the highest standard. And that's not just about the home and the facilities, it's also about landscaping what's around your homes: the plants and the trees and the shape of the ground. We want to use the Olympics as a real opportunity to invest in your homes and to do it properly. The council also want to make sure the site is managed properly. They want to make sure the bins are emptied and the services work – electricity and water. So what we're doing is preparing properly so when we bring forward the new services for you in your new homes it's in the best possible way (Headliners 2007).*

The issue also remains regarding the management of the relocation of gypsy families. Again, there is evidence that no clear planning at the local level currently, exists, as evidenced by Guy Nicholson's response to questions regarding the relocation process, noting that;

*So far, what's been happening is that everybody's families have been talking to each other. And one would hope that it would be through that process that everybody would decide who they will live with (Headliners 2007).*

The total cost of this exercise is unknown but is no doubt contributing to the rising costs of the whole Olympic Park project. Relocation is also subject to legislation that has in the past designated Metropolitan Open Land spaces, upon which this development encroaches so appeals and counter appeals are also taking place.

Even the gypsies themselves have voiced concerns through their Waterden Crescent Residents Group (WCRG), especially on issues such as schools, health and other local services. Circular 01/2006 of Hackney Council draws attention to the social, economic and environmental needs of the traveller community and the impacts on the community in general. It seems that the Olympic Legacy may both satisfy the needs of the travellers in providing for a new and improved site to reside (London Development Agency, 2006), however perceived impacts are not entirely positive. One comment in response to the frequently asked questions released by the London Development Authority suggested that;

*The author [of the page] realizes that the relocation of the travellers will bring no benefit to the local*

community. So instead of answering the question the author has put in some totally irrelevant propaganda about the Olympics (Gamesmonitor.org, 2008).

Perhaps supporting Monbiot's views that;

*Democratic processes can be truncated, compulsory purchase orders slapped down, homes and amenities cleared. The Olympic bulldozer clears all objections out of the way. There can be no debate, no exceptions, no modifications. Everything must go (Monbiot, 2007).*

Although such claims have been refuted, the perceived, as well as actual impacts need to be carefully managed.

### **Important lessons to learn and recommendations**

Haynes (2001), comments on the International media reporting on the issues involving the Indigenous population in Australian, namely the aboriginal people. It could be argued that the Games themselves provided the impetus for reconciliation over past differences and that the games became a symbol of such reconciliation. This issue may arise in London but for an entirely different sector of the population, the travellers who have a permanent site on the area to be developed and also the largely diverse ethnic communities that live around the park.

For a sustainable legacy, all the objectives of the various stakeholders need to be addressed and an holistic approach taken to the development and management of Olympic Park. The regeneration dividend from London should become a blueprint for future Olympic cities but only through learning from past Games and the best practices that have emerged through studies of the social impacts of these Games. In particular, the positive and negative lessons from Barcelona, first with the relocation of the gypsy communities by putting them into high rise blocks without considering their cultural needs being a negative impact and more benevolently through making the games part of a city wide project for the benefit of all residents. In Sydney with there being no planning within the park for a mix of social housing, thus not benefiting the community at all and also having little post games planning for the facilities within the park thus precluding the local community from engaging with these facilities post games as being negative impacts. These are all lessons London can learn from and this paper has highlighted just one group of residents who have their own social impacts to be considered within the Games planning. This paper has also highlighted the complex dimensions of the projects needed in order to clear this site before construction can begin with the associated costs involved never being fully transparent.

### **References**

- Beadnell, M. (2000). Sydney's homeless to be removed for Olympics. Retrieved November 7, 2006, from [www.wsws.org/articles/2000/feb2000/olymp-f03.shtml](http://www.wsws.org/articles/2000/feb2000/olymp-f03.shtml)
- Beckhoven, E., Boxmeer, B. & Hollmqvist, E. (in press). Social mix policies in large housing estates: a comparison of the Netherlands, Sweden, and Spain. In E. Beckhoven (Ed.), *Decline and regeneration. Policy responses to process of change in post WW11 urban neighbourhoods: Utrecht, Koninklijk Nederlands Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*.
- 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.
- Curtin, P (2007). Interview with former Mayor of Auburn City Council, Sydney, Australia.
- Felli, G. (2004, May). *Setting the stage for hosting a major sporting event*. Paper presented at Sport Accord Conference, Lausanne.
- Fredline, L., Jago, L. & Deery, M. (2003). The development of a generic scale to measure the social impacts of events. *Event Management*, 8, 23-37.
- Gamesmonitor.org (2008) Hackney Travellers Relocation Project Millfields Road depot – Frequently Asked Questions, Retrieved March 25, 2008, from [www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/412](http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/412)
- Gold, J. R. & Gold, M. M. (2007). (Eds.), *Olympic Cities*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

- Hall, C. M. (1997). Mega-events and their legacies. In P.E. Murphy (Ed.) *Quality Management in Urban Tourism*, (p. 81). Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hamilton, K. (2000). The rent race: Sydney's new Olympic Sport. Retrieved October 31, 2006, from [www.reportage.uts.edu.au/stories/2000/jun00/rent.html](http://www.reportage.uts.edu.au/stories/2000/jun00/rent.html)
- Harrison, D. (2007, 8th April). Olympic needs a tsar or legacy will be chaos. London: *Sunday Telegraph*.
- Haynes, J. (2001). *Socio-Economic Impact of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*. Seminar of the International Chair in Olympism, Centre d'Estudis Olímpics I de L'esport, Barcelona: CEO-UAB.
- Headliners. (2007). How will the Olympics affect us? Hackney Traveller boys interview local councillor about the plans for their site. Retrieved March 16, 2008, from [www.headliners.org/storylibrary/stories/2007/hackneytravellerboys.htm](http://www.headliners.org/storylibrary/stories/2007/hackneytravellerboys.htm)
- 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.
- Hughes, H.L. (1993). Olympic tourism and urban regeneration. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 1, 157-162.
- International Olympic Committee. (2003). *Conclusions and recommendations from the International Symposium on Legacy of the Olympic Games, 1984-2000*. Lausanne, IOC.
- Lenskyi, H. J. (2002). *The best Olympics ever? Social impacts of Sydney 2000*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- London 2012 Candidate File. (2005a). *Theme 1- Concept and Legacy*. London: London 2012.
- London 2012 Candidate File. (2005b). *Theme 5 – Environment and Meteorology*. London: London 2012.
- London Development Agency. (2006). *Homerton road, London: Design and access statement*. London: LDA.
- McWilliams, C. (2000). Kicked out: 60 days notice after 30 years loyalty Retrieved October 31, 2006, from [www.reportage.uts.edu.au/stories/2000/jun00/kicked.html](http://www.reportage.uts.edu.au/stories/2000/jun00/kicked.html)
- Mackay, D. (2000). *The recovery of the seafront*. Barcelona: Aula Barcelona.
- Malfas, M., Theodoraki, E. & Houlihan, B. (2004). Impacts of the Olympic Games as mega-events. *Municipal Engineer*, 157(ME3), 209-220.
- Monbiot, G. (2007, June 12). Everywhere they go, the Olympic Games become an excuse for eviction and displacement. London: *The Guardian*.
- Olds, K. (1998). Urban mega-events, evictions and housing rights: The Canadian case. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1(1), 2-46.
- Olympic Delivery Authority (2006, December). *The Key Benefits and Opportunities from London 2012*. Paper presented at 'Countdown to London 2012: How Will the Games Deliver for the Country?' Westminster Briefing, Westminster London.
- Ritchie, J.R.B (1987). *The Impacts of the 1988 Winter Olympics on Calgary: A tourism perspective*. Paper presented at the 18th Annual Conference of the Travel and Tourism Research Association. Seattle, WA, USA.
- Ritchie, J.R.B. & Smith, B.H. (1991). The impact of a mega-event on host region awareness: a longitudinal study. *The Journal of Travel Research*, 3(1), 3-10.
- Ritchie, J.R.B. (2000). Turning 16 days in 16 years through Olympic legacies. *Event Management*, 6, 155-165.
- Searle, G. (2002). Uncertain legacy: Sydney's Olympic stadiums. *European Planning Studies*, 10(7), 845-847.
- Vigor, A., Mean, M. & Tims, C. (2004). *After the gold rush – a sustainable Olympics for London*. London: IPPR-Demos.

- 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*, (p. 86). Sydney: Australian Society for Sports History.
- Waite, G. (2001). The Olympic spirit and civic boosterism: the Sydney 2000 Olympics. *Tourism Geographies*, 3(3), 249-278.
- Walker, A. & Porraz, B. (2003). *The case of Barcelona Spain*. In Global Report on Human Settlements – The Challenge of Slums. London: Earthscan/UN-Habitat. Retrieved January 20, 2008, from [www.ucl.ac.uk/dpu-projects/Global\\_report/pdfs/Barcelona.pdf](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/dpu-projects/Global_report/pdfs/Barcelona.pdf)
- Walliser, A. (2004). A place in the world: Barcelona's quest to become a global knowledge city. *Built environment*, 30(3), 213-224.

## About the Authors

Deborah Sadd is a PhD scholar in the School of Services Management at Bournemouth University, researching the urban regeneration legacies associated with the hosting of mega-events and in particular leveraging the legacy for London 2012. She is using both Sydney and Barcelona as case studies to develop a model of best practice for London 2012. Deborah completed a Tourism Management and Planning Masters degree in September 2004 with distinction, the research for her Masters was undertaken in Weymouth and Portland, Dorset, prior to the successful 2012 Olympic Bid. Her research interests include social impacts of events, urban regeneration opportunities from events, legacy planning and in particular the opportunities to be gained from the hosting of London 2012 not just for the communities hosting the games in London, but also for the host community of Weymouth, the nearest Olympic venue to Bournemouth.

Ian Jones is Associate Dean Sports and Leisure, within the School of Services Management at Bournemouth University. His teaching interests are based largely around the Sociology of Sport, Sports Management and Research Methods for Sport. He has two main research interests, these being firstly sport fan behaviour, and secondly the idea of 'Serious Leisure' as applied to sport participation. He has published in a variety of sport and leisure related journals, and was co-author of *Research Methods for Sport Studies* (Routledge 2004). He has also co-edited two volumes, *Leisure Cultures: Investigations in Media, Technology and Sport* (LSA 2003) and *Serious Leisure: Extensions and Applications* (LSA 2006). He is a member of the advisory board for the *Journal of Sport & Tourism*.



## Call for Papers – LJTSCI Volume 1 Edition 2 Autumn 2008

London is one of the world's most heterogeneous and cosmopolitan cities. It is a quintessential 'global city' located at the interface of manifold networks and flows. *The London Journal of Tourism, Sport and Creative Industries* (LJTSCI) seeks to publish articles on a variety of related topics which encapsulates this diversity and the nature of its local-global intersections.

A **general call for papers** is now being made for the second edition of the journal.

**Abstract deadline: June 20th 2008**

**Full paper deadline: September 19th 2008**

Any queries relating to the journal please email the editor at [ljtsci@londonmet.ac.uk](mailto:ljtsci@londonmet.ac.uk)

# Editorial Policies

## Submission of Manuscripts

The range of articles that can be presented in this journal is wide and varied. The following guidelines should enable authors looking to submit their manuscripts a framework for submission. Articles are encouraged to be readable to a wide audience (academics, students, practitioners) that have some knowledge of the field.

## Research Articles, Research Notes, and Works-in-Progress

Manuscripts should be submitted to the editor via email through MS Word (2000 or later) to [ljtsci@londonmet.ac.uk](mailto:ljtsci@londonmet.ac.uk). Each manuscript should be in English approximately 3000-4000 words in length (longer articles from more qualitative methods will be accepted up to 8000 words) and prefaced with an abstract of no more than 200 words, and including up to 6 key words. The abstracts are compulsory for publication. Manuscripts advancing theory will also be considered in this category.

## Case Studies

Case studies should be submitted to the editor via email through MS Word (2000 or later) to [ljtsci@londonmet.ac.uk](mailto:ljtsci@londonmet.ac.uk). Case studies can be presented through a research format or be presented from a practitioner focus. The research format should include abstract, introduction, methodology, results and analysis and conclusions. The practitioner focused articles should begin with an executive summary stating the primary focus of the case and discuss the results or outcomes achieved. Each manuscript should be in English approximately 2500-4000 words in length and prefaced with an abstract of no more than 200 words, and including up to 6 key words.

## Position & Discussion and Rejoinder Pieces

One of the aims of the journal is to encourage debate amongst scholars, practitioners, policy makers and general readers. Discussion pieces on relevant topics are most welcome. Manuscripts should be submitted to the editor via email through MS Word (2000 or later) to [ljtsci@londonmet.ac.uk](mailto:ljtsci@londonmet.ac.uk).

## Book Reviews

Book reviews should provide full details to the publication and should be no longer than 1500 words. Please discuss the proposed review with the editor before submission, upon submission they should be sent to the editor via email through MS Word (2000 or later) to [ljtsci@londonmet.ac.uk](mailto:ljtsci@londonmet.ac.uk).

## Style of Manuscripts

Figures and tables should be at the end of the document and figures should also be included as jpeg or TIFF files. Manuscripts submitted (where possible/relevant) must follow the American Psychological Association (APA) style.

A guide to the APA style can be accessed via <http://library.curtin.edu.au/referencing/apa.pdf> (you will need a .pdf viewer to access this page [www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html](http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html)). Following these style guides can assist the editorial process.

Case studies, book reviews and discussion pieces may not rely heavily on external sources hence where references are used the above guidelines should be followed. Authors are responsible for providing full details on names, affiliation, corresponding authors and contact addresses and short biographies with their submission. Adherence to the referencing system is appreciated.

## Editorial Process

Upon submission the Editor will then distribute the manuscripts to two members of the editorial board for the review process. All papers submitted to the Journal will be put through the review process, no papers will be rejected outright. The review process is blind but consists of a 'light-touch' review system. The reviewers will inform the Editor of the status and relevance of the manuscript along the following categories;

- Accepted as is
- Acceptance pending on revisions
- Rejected

The Editor is responsible for making final edits to manuscripts, but if significant changes need to be made to manuscripts to follow the style guide the paper may be returned to the author for these changes to be made. Manuscripts submitted to the Journal should not be under the review process at any other journal or have been previously published.

## Publication Frequency

Biannually, Spring (April) and Autumn (October)