

‘London’s local Olympic legacy: Small business displacement, ‘clone town’ effect and the production of ‘urban landscapes Duignan, M.

Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University’s Repository

Original citation & hyperlink:

Duignan, M 2019, 'London’s local Olympic legacy: Small business displacement, ‘clone town’ effect and the production of ‘urban landscapes' *Journal of Place Management and Development*, vol. (In-press), pp. (In-press).

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JPMD-05-2018-0033>

DOI 10.1108/JPMD-05-2018-0033

ISSN 1753-8335

ESSN 1753-8335

Publisher: Emerald

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author’s post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.



London's local Olympic legacy: Small business displacement, 'clone town' effect and the production of 'urban landscapes'

Journal:	<i>Journal of Place Management and Development</i>
Manuscript ID	JPMD-05-2018-0033.R2
Manuscript Type:	Academic Paper
Keywords:	Legacy, Place development, Host community, Sports mega-events, Small business sustainability, Clone town and urban landscapes

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

London's local Olympic legacy: Small business displacement, 'clone town' effect and the production of 'urban landscapes'

Abstract

Purpose: London's Candidature bid projected an irresistible legacy of lasting benefits for host communities and small businesses. Yet, local post-Games perspectives paint a contrasted picture – one of becoming displaced. This article draws on event 'legacy', specifically in relation to rising rents, threats to small business sustainability and impact on place development by empirically examining London's local '*embryonic legacies*' forming across one ex-hosting Olympic community: Central Greenwich.

Design/methodology/approach: 43 interviews with local businesses (specifically, small retailers and hospitality businesses), local authorities, London-centric and national project actors and policy makers underpin analysis, supported by official London 2012 archival, documentary, and media reports to add texture and triangulate primary and secondary data sources.

Findings: Juxtaposing ex-ante projections vs. emerging ex-post realities, this article reveals a local legacy of small business failure fuelled by rising commercial rents and a wider indifference for protecting diverse urban high streets. Embroiled in a struggle to survive, and barely recognised as a key stakeholder and contributor to legacy, small businesses have and continue to become succeeded by a new business demographic in town: monochromatic global and national chains. Typifying the pervasive shift toward 'clone town' spaces, this article argues that corporate colonisation displaces independent businesses, serves to homogenise town centres, dilute place-based cultural offer and simultaneously stunts access to a positive local development legacy. This paper argues that such processes lead to the production of 'urban landscapes' that may hamper destination competitiveness.

Originality/value: Examining event legacy, specifically local legacies forming across ex-host Olympic communities is a latent, under-researched but vital and critical aspect of scholarship. Most event legacy analysis focuses on longer-term issues for residents, yet little research focuses on both local place-based development challenges and small business sustainability and survival post-Games. More specifically, little research examines the potential relationship between event-led gentrification, associated rising rents and aforementioned clone town problematic. Revealing and amplifying the idiosyncratic local challenges generated through an in-depth empirically driven triangulation of key local business, policy, governmental and non-governmental perspectives, is a central contribution of this article missing from extant literatures. This article considers different ways those responsible for event legacy, place managers and developers can combat such aforementioned post-Games challenges.

Keywords: Legacy, Small business sustainability, Place development, Landscapes, Rising rents, Clone town, Sports mega-events, London 2012, Host community.

Problematising London's Olympic legacy

Lord Coe, Chief Ambassador of the London 2012 Games heralded that 'legacy is absolutely epicentral to the plans for 2012. Legacy is probably nine-tenths of what this process is about, not just 16 days of sport' (The Guardian, 2006). Host communities – existing local residents and small businesses – sat at the heart of London's 'technically polished' legacy vision (MacRury and Poynter, 2009). This was reflected in the House of Lords (2013) legacy inquiry 'it is the local people who should stand to gain most from the Games (...) a major plank in the promised legacy' (2013), by bringing 'people, businesses, other institutions and the city together to focus on long-term development of the city' (Work Foundation, 2010: 45). Raco and Tunney (2010) noted that 'from the outset, one of its [London 2012] key stated objectives were the creation of 'development legacies' (...) and the 'establishment of lasting benefits for local communities' (2010: 2074). Indeed, London's emphasis on legacy closely aligned with the International Olympic Committee's (IOC) strategic aims and objectives outlined in the 'Olympic 2020 Agenda' and Olympic Charter (IOC, 2018) stating that candidates must 'promote a positive legacy from the Olympic Games to host cities and host countries' (2018). Therefore, legacy narratives have become an 'increasingly prominent part of the dossiers of cities bidding to host them since the 1990s' (House of Lords, 2013: 21) and 'an integral part of the Games preparation from the very start' (Jacques Rogge, President of the IOC cited in DCMS, 2012: 7). Whereas legacy sits at the forefront of Olympic rhetoric, Hiller (2002) notes that 'Olympic planning must now be viewed as almost synonymous with urban planning' (2002: 102) - an increasingly central, rather than peripheral, element of urban modernity (Vigor et al, 2004) – and so closely intertwined that Bourdieu and Wacquant (2001) claim that legacy 'seems to have sprung out of nowhere [but] is now on everyone's lips' (2001: 2). Yet, although serving as an ideal(istic) 'catch-all' term for (mainly positive) social and economic outcomes of events, achieving such virtuous outcomes is no easy feat. Fraught with ambiguity, contestation and potentially negative place and local development challenges for those residing in ex-Olympic communities (Duignan, Pappalepore and Everett, 2019) – this paper reveals the very real implications of a local legacy on one specific place: Central Greenwich.

Helping to justify significant public expenditure, legacy demands that cities can no longer be solely concerned with delivering a 'well-executed' event (Coaffee, 2011) - and must, as a simultaneous objective, focus on the longer-term welfare of host communities. Yet, all being said, the House of Lords (2013) claims that gentrification poses a genuine risk to the survival of existing small business communities and claims that there is a wider 'perception of insufficient long-term benefits, or even adverse long-term consequences for cities and countries having hosted the Games' (2013: 21). As opposed to development for and with local incumbents, the report argues longer-term implications may result in gentrification on ex-host communities - colloquially described as the 'Olympic effect' (House of Lords, 2012). Although significant analysis, both academic and policy analysis has examined a range of social, economic and environmental legacies (i.e. grassroots sports participation, right through to residential gentrification and increasing house prices) – little emphasis focuses on small business impact and sustainability, and place-based management and development challenges that specifically occur within impacted urban areas in the longer-term, post-Games.

Indeed, it is important to recognise that legacy, in its broadest sense, goes beyond just 'place' and 'community' development effects to involve a whole plethora of different longer-term impacts, including: social, economic, environmental, educational, sporting, technological et cetera (DCMS, 2012). Yet, whilst being the case, the purpose and contribution of

1
2
3 this article is to provide an in-depth analysis of one ex-Olympic place and small business community grappling with the
4 very real implications of such effects, problematising legacy by unravelling the inherent inconsistencies, contradictions and
5 tensions between a legacy rhetoric of inclusion vs. realities of exclusion – an under-researched (qualitative) aspect of event
6 impact analysis. As detailed across the Analysis section, this article reveals that for locals, London's legacy represents an
7 invisible, cancerous inhabitant - a fait accompli with little to no panacea to resist what is perceived to be inevitable
8 displacement of small independent businesses, and the on-going corporatisation and homogenisation of local place and
9 diversity of the high street offer that follows. Throughout, this paper argues that sports mega-events (SME) (legacies) often
10 fail to recognise the critical role local communities play in collectively contributing to local identity and strengthening the
11 cultural offer (Hawkins and Ryan, 2013; Duignan et al, 2017; Maheshwari et al., 2011). And although events and the
12 portfolio of activities that derive from such event-led urban policy often (ideally) play a part in constructing a more holistic
13 destination development (Richards, 2017), through both a mixture of bottom-up community and top-down cultural
14 programming (e.g. Christou, 2017) – findings from this article contrast such view.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Whilst typified as a 'long-term' and '10 year project' (e.g. House of Lords, 2013), it is important to note that London's
22 (local) legacy still remains in its infancy. As such, this article draws on '*embryonic legacies*' – defined as the 'rudimentary and
23 immediate emergent forms of [post-Games] impacts bequeathed with the potential for further development' (Duignan et
24 al, 2018: 4). Six years on, re-visiting London's ex-ante projections vs. ex-post realities emerges critical as ever. Yet, such
25 analyses remain latent in extant literatures (both at an academic, policy and practitioner level), with little place-based in-
26 depth empirical investigation driving theoretical development and practical implications of legacy at the local ex-host
27 community level. As a result, this has led to what the authors believe to be a somewhat superficial understanding of
28 localised legacies. Generating qualitative insights and examining local idiosyncrasy emerges a critical factor in the analysis
29 of event impact and legacy as complex local effects can be often overlook and evaluation becomes decontextualized
30 according to Pappalepore and Duignan (2016). This article contributes by unpacking such localised embryonic legacies
31 emerging from a single, in-depth qualitative case study.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 In response to aforementioned challenges, and arguments throughout this article, the study was guided by the following
39 research questions:
40
41

42 **Research question 1:** How do London's ex-ante projections, and ex-post developmental realities arising in the
43 context of post-Games Olympic legacy differ from one another?
44
45

46 **Research question 2:** Can we identify any emergent embryonic legacies forming at the local level, and what are
47 the potential ramifications of such developments on existing small businesses and their business environment?
48
49

50
51 Structurally, the article starts by defining and conceptualising the idea of legacy, particularly in the context of SMEs, and
52 illustrates how gentrification and the pervasive concern surrounding 'clone town' effects pose a risk to the longer-term
53 diversity, vitality, sustainability and survival of small businesses (specifically those in ex-Olympic communities) on the high
54 street. An overview of the methodology follows, outlining methods and approaches taken and the key theoretical foci
55
56
57

1
2
3 under investigation, specifically event legacies and ‘clone town’ developments related to small businesses and place
4 development. In this of such challenges, the article shifts its focus toward the case of London 2012, specifically the
5 empirical examination of Central Greenwich’s ex-Olympic community, and closes with key conclusions and
6 recommendations for policy, practice and future academic study foregrounding implications related to place management
7 and development legacies.
8
9

10 11 **Olympic legacy: Concepts and challenges**

12 SMEs create exceptional and extraordinary conditions to stimulate and mobilise new and existing policy to fast-track urban
13 change at the macro and micro level (Muller, 2017). Widely regarded as the world’s most complex of mega-project (Vigor
14 et al, 2004), they amass a complex and eclectic series of stakeholder interests together toward a ‘unified’ will to re-think
15 and re-engineer the socio-economics of the host city (Chalip, 2017) – creating ‘Olympic legacies’. Olympic legacies are an
16 enigmatic and widely contested phenomena largely down to their ‘indirect’ and ‘subtle’ nature (Getz, 2007) that make them
17 ‘hard to measure accurately or with any confidence’ (Preuss, 2007: 207). In an elementary form, they have been described
18 as a ‘tangible or intangible thing handed down by a predecessor; a long-lasting effect of an event or process, and the act
19 of bequeathing’ (Mangan, 2008: 1869). Critics argue that little examination is placed on evaluating the legacy of SMEs
20 (Duignan, Pappalepore and Everett, 2019) as ‘nobody has been prepared to commit the research resources required to
21 carry out scientific study of the net legacy benefits’ (Mangan, 2008: 1871) – leading to a superficial assessment and
22 understanding of legacy (Furrer, 2002). Yet, ironically prospective cities continue to bid and project a legacy agenda that
23 remains ill-defined, poorly measured and unpredictable (Preuss, 2015). Zimbalist (2015) states that SMEs constitute an
24 ‘economic gamble’ – offering an illusion of control – without a guaranteed favourable end.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Understood as a multidimensional construct, the concept and related theoretical attributes of legacy has been examined in
33 significant detail. For the purpose of this article, we draw on Preuss’s (2007) Legacy Cube as it has received little empirical
34 analysis yet provides a use conceptual frame to use as a backdrop to case study findings. The cube conceptualises legacy
35 as five inter-related dimensions required to provide the ‘holistic evaluation’ of event legacies ‘necessary to identify all
36 legacies’ (Hiller, 1998), including: (1) ‘planned vs. unplanned’, (2) ‘positive vs. negatives’, (3) ‘tangible vs. intangible’, (4)
37 ‘short vs. long term’, and (5) the ‘spaces’ affected by these structures (e.g. physical, and mental (e.g. brand enhancement)).
38 Preuss (2007) states that ‘irrespective of time of production and space, legacy is all planned and unplanned, positive and
39 negative, tangible and intangible structures created for and by a sport event that remain longer than the event itself’ (Preuss,
40 2007:211). This paper argues that an in-depth analysis of legacy is critical going-forward in light of criticisms that event
41 organisers tend to (overly) focus on the more ‘planned, positive, tangible’ (Cashman, 2006: 15) sub-cubes of impact and
42 legacies, especially during pre-event bid construction and bidding phases. Amongst today’s global and elite cities, in order
43 to win a competitive host bid, on one hand voters must be convinced by the scope and ambition of the proposed project,
44 whilst on the other hand, promises made, should idealistically be met: ‘constructing messages that resonate with both
45 audiences, and also distinguish it from the other bidding cities’ (Vigor et al, 2004: 13). It is therefore concerning that mega-
46 event bid teams tend to overpromise, and propose unrealistic, somewhat overly ambitious plans – including wildly
47 inaccurate costings (Horne and Manzenreiter, 2006), claiming a ‘fantasy world of underestimated costs, overestimated
48 revenues, underestimated environmental impacts, and over-valued economic development effects’ (2006: 10). Once again,
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 this serves to problematise the notion of event legacy, justify study of this phenomenon by engaging in place-based critical
4 evaluation of longer-term development effects.
5
6

7 **Local economic (legacy) challenges**

8 The OECD (2008) argues that if effectively planned, large scale cultural and sporting events like the Olympics and FIFA
9 World Cup can generate significant social and economic regional and local benefits. However, they note that such
10 interventions can frequently produce uneven and inequitable developmental outcomes. Though legacy rhetoric demands
11 that 'the Games should leave a host community and the city environment better, rather than worse off' (Cashman, 2002:
12 12), previous case study analysis reveals they can have at best neutral if not negative impacts for host communities
13 (Matheson, 2006). McKay and Plumb (2001) and Kavestos (2012) argue that rising rents real-estate costs stemming from
14 the longer-term structural economic effects of the Olympics frequently lead to gentrification and displacement effects.
15 Such effects serve to exacerbate unequal developmental legacies, largely as a result of 'showcasing' effects (Faulkner et al,
16 2001) – and the post-Games valorisation of urban space (Nitsch and Wendland, 2017). Such outcomes are closely linked
17 to the strategic intention of host cities to showcase and promote flattering domestic images of the city via physical,
18 traditional and digital platforms to attract and retain high calibre mobile capital, businesses, people and visitors (Hall, 2006),
19 (re)establish or (re)define host spaces as key tourism destinations (Gratton et al, 2005), and more specifically 'tourist
20 bubbles' (Silk and Amis, 2006). Threats of rising rents – both residential and commercial - may lead to the 'pricing out' of
21 existing incumbents as argued by the Work Foundation (2010) prior to the hosting of London 2012 as structural economic
22 changes can reduce the competitiveness and displace existing small businesses without the economic capital to participate
23 (OECD, 2008). Historical analysis illustrates the likelihood of such effects. For example, the Centre for Cities (2012) claim
24 how Barcelona's 1992 legacy of gentrification and displacement 'changed the social mix' of ex-host communities as house
25 prices 'jumped by 250% between 1986 and the start of the Games', and the Work Foundation (2010) illustrates how
26 Sydney's prices rose '7% above inflation' (Work Foundation, 2010: 46). Interestingly, although much analysis focuses on
27 gentrification effects on residents, as highlighted in the introduction – little emphasis is placed on small business
28 sustainability and the related local effects on place development legacies.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Unequal developmental outcomes are argued to be an outcome of an Olympic *modus operandi* governed under the
41 (flawed) logic and assumption that by virtue of hosting SMEs opportunities naturally 'flow back into the community at
42 the end of the Games' (Cashman, 2006: 15). Furthermore, little to no two-way meaningful dialogue between Games
43 planners and targeted host communities are in part to blame as event managers conceive their role as 'merely informing
44 people about plans rather than truly seeking input about these plans from the ground up' (Cashman, 2002: 104).
45 Pappalepore and Duignan (2016) argues this scenario leads to a lack of localism, both in the immediate and longer-term
46 outcome of legacy, and Smith (2008) claims the very communities in need of positive local developmental effects rarely
47 benefit from them. Yet, host community perspectives are encouraged in the earlier phases of project justification to
48 legitimise policy objectives (Foley et al, 2011) – local interests and narratives are frequently marginalised in the lead up,
49 during, and after the live staging of SMEs. Critics suggest that host communities, and their urban spaces are conceived as
50 a blank slate ready for 'wholesale demolition' (Shin, 2013: 7) – a canvas that reflect and (re)produce the neoliberal
51 imaginations around how 'good' cities should look, feel and function (Davies, 2012). By doing so, Mean et al (2004) stresses
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 that SMEs unify consumption and take a narrow view that 'fails to be responsive to wider interests and long-term
4 community needs' (2004: 130-131), undermining pluralism, alternative-local stakeholder interests (Raco and Tunney,
5 2010). It is therefore of no surprise that numerous authors call for a greater excavation beneath the 'immediacy' of the
6 event, a deeper empirical examination of legacy, and of socio-economic relations and contestations that typify post-Games
7 development in ex-host communities (Cashman, 2002, McGillivray and Frew, 2015, Pappalepore and Duignan, 2016).
8
9

14 **Clone Towns and the threat of 'blandscapes'**

15
16 As detailed in the methodology, small retailers and hospitality businesses form the key stakeholder group and unit of
17 analysis for this study. Yet, pertinent for this study and in light of aforementioned challenges associated with rising rents,
18 Weingaertner and Barber (2010) claim that smaller food and drink businesses are particularly susceptible to increasing land
19 values, rents and rates due to lower operating profit margins. As a result, this has historically (and continues to) lead to a
20 shifting of business demographics in favour of corporate chains (UK Government, 2015). As illustrated across the Analysis
21 section, this is a specific challenge drawn out in the context of London 2012.
22
23
24

25
26 The process of replacing of independent businesses, alongside diluting the individuality of place with a 'monochrome strip
27 of global and national chains' is referred to as the 'Clone Town' effect (NEF, 2010: 6). Here, the basic proposition is that
28 as chains enter, smaller stores (especially those vying for the same market), in many cases, are forced to close – a well
29 evidenced, observed process underway across – and beyond - UK high streets. Duignan et al (2018) argues that the UK
30 (alongside other European and global gentrified cities) is witnessing a physical and cultural shift from 'slow towns' (i.e.
31 spaces with a larger % of independent, small businesses) to 'clone towns' – a scenario that reflects a wider indifference for
32 the long-term sustainability and survival of small (independent) business communities. Specifically, the place-based
33 adjective of 'clone' (town) refers to homogenisation effects that causes uniformity, reducing diversity across – and vitality
34 of – the high street. NEF (2010) describes how, in the UK, 'real local shops have been replaced by swathes of identikit
35 chain stores' (...) 'making high streets up and down the country virtually indistinguishable from one another' (...) 'retail
36 spaces once filled with a thriving mix of independent(s)' (...) 'are becoming filled with faceless supermarket retailers, fast-
37 food chains, and global fashion outlets' (...) [many town centres have] 'lost their sense of place and the distinctive facades
38 of their high streets' (2010: 5). As a product of this case and discussed in the latter half of this article, I describe this as the
39 creation – and production of – '*urban blandscapes*'. Such processes, inevitably, pose a critical challenge for urban economies.
40 This is particularly so as Raco and Tunney (2010) notes a close-knit, vibrant micro and small business community play a
41 central role in the wider social and economic vitality of urban economies, as well as place identity and competitiveness
42 (Everett, 2016).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Relatedly, as argued by Maheshwari et al (2011) a community driven place marketing and city branding outlook plays a key
52 role in creating sustainable community growth strategies – helping to (re)position and differentiate places between one
53 another. Developing a strong, localised brand identity is central to creating and maintaining destination competitiveness
54 and value propositions, to put a place on the map, and encourage tourists to visit (Buultjens and Cairncross, 2015). As
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 argued by Hawkins and Ryan (2013) fostering a strong local identity and collective grassroots community offer is central
4 to creating an authentic, unique and deeper cultural offer – which, according to London’s 2012 legacy narrative was a
5 central aspect of the role of the city’s SME for London and local host community place development strategies (Mayor of
6 London, 2007). Such view corroborates one of Richard’s (2017) central arguments around the fundamental role events –
7 and an event portfolio of holistic cultural programming – can play in generating a strong local community place and
8 cultural offer as a result of bottom-up community-driven initiatives and top-down cultural programming (Christou, 2017).
9 Yet, as evidenced in the Analysis section, fostering a positive local legacy of community inclusion and promoting a diverse
10 destination offer appears to be under-threat from clone town effects post-Games. Indeed, the shift to clone – potentially
11 supported by post-Games rising rents – represent a darker side of (exclusive) local economic and place development
12 challenges. According to NEF (2010) such effects ‘undermines democracy’ (...) ‘attacks our sense of place and belonging’
13 (...) pulling apart that ‘which our livelihoods and the economy depend’ (...) where ‘clone towns imperil local livelihoods,
14 communities and our culture, by decreasing the resilience of high streets to economic downturns and diminishing
15 consumer choice’ (2010). As a result of such urban transformations, specifically in the context of the UK, NEF’s (2010)
16 seminal report: *‘Clone Town Britain’* suggests that:
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 ...we are reaching a critical juncture: We can choose to take action that will lead to thriving, diverse, resilient
25 local economies across the UK; or, we can do nothing and condemn ourselves to bland identikit towns dominated
26 by a few bloated retail behemoths. The choice is ours (NEF, 2010: 3).
27
28
29

30 In response to such conceptual and practical challenges, the article shifts from a problem-based approach, to a solutions-
31 based approach to consider practices, policies and future areas of study required to illuminate – and tackle - such challenges
32 in the context of SMEs. It is with this in mind, this article turns its focus toward London’s localised Olympic legacies,
33 specifically those present within the event case study of London 2012 and place-based challenges posed for the ex-Olympic
34 community of Central Greenwich.
35
36
37

38 **Methodology**

39 Drawing on the concept of legacy, this paper examines embryonic legacies forming across London, specifically ex-Olympic
40 community of small (retail and hospitality) businesses situated within Central Greenwich. Utilising Preuss’s (2007) Legacy
41 Cube as a backdrop for empirical analysis, this article examines issues related to small business sustainability, place
42 development and pervasive place-based challenges associated with the so-called ‘clone town’ effect.
43
44
45
46

47 As identified in the introduction, a key contribution of this case is to provide an in-depth, qualitative case study of event
48 legacy. Indeed, this article provides a detailed analysis of idiosyncratic and localised embryonic legacies, (epistemologically)
49 difficult to access without appropriate methods. Therefore, empirical analysis is underpinned by 43 in-depth interviews
50 across four separate stakeholder groups (SGs) (see Table 1) with local businesses, local authorities, London-centric and
51 national project actors and policy makers. Primary material is supported by official London 2012 archival, documentary,
52 and media reports to add texture and triangulate primary and secondary data sources. Adding to the complexity, the paper
53 argues that legacy can – and perhaps should – be understood, ontologically speaking, as a subjective socially constructed
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

phenomenon accessible via interpretivist-phenomenological study. This article, and researchers studying such phenomenon, must therefore consider – or at least acknowledge - legacy as *verbesten* (to interpretively know) – and ‘*depending on one’s perspective, rather than to be offered as singularity successful for all*’ (Hiller, 1998: 50). Such view corroborates, once again, the critical importance of taking a place-based and qualitative approach to offer a detailed examination of legacy in specific localised context and through the eyes of those ‘lived experiences’ at the heart of such (perceived and actual) legacy outcomes.

All interviewees were chosen either based on geographical positionality (i.e. small businesses positioned directly in the town centre of Central Greenwich), and purposively based on their knowledge of project governance or policy making which was supported by a snowball sampling method. Central Greenwich was chosen for a number of key reasons. First, Central Greenwich formed 1 of 5 key official Olympic boroughs in London chosen to host sporting events. Second, the town centre contains a high density of retail and hospitality businesses - the key unit of analysis for this study. And third, several accounts including the official Federation of Small Business (FSB) (2013) ‘Passing the Baton’ report specifically identified small businesses within Central Greenwich as specifically disrupted during and after the Games.

Insert - Table 1 - Stakeholder Group 1 – 4: Interviewees

All textual data was coded using NVivo 10, and theoretical ideas were developed through adopting Attride-Stirling’s (2001) Thematic Networks Analysis (TNA) approach. Key themes were developed that subsequently underpin the following Analysis section: i) lost and forgotten local legacies, ii) legacies of rising commercial rents, small business failure and displacement, iii) shifting business demographics – from slow town to clone town. As outlined earlier and in the following Analysis, this article recognises the inherent complex, localised and subjectivist nature of legacy – and the subsequent deployment of subjectivist philosophical paradigms, and qualitative methods required to generate and amplifying local perspectives within and beyond Central Greenwich. The article specifically intended to collect data 2-3 years after the Games (2014 – 2015) to allow for embryonic legacies to form. It is however important to note this study represents a snapshot in time of (embryonic) legacies that inevitably represents an ambulatory character (Gold and Gold, 2008).

Analysis: London’s embryonic legacies

London’s local legacy narratives – lost and forgotten?

Across 2005 – 2012, a series of planned, long-term legacy ambitions were published – placing local ‘community’ and ‘inclusivity’ at the heart, outlining positive ‘community benefits’ with economic growth at the centre offering opportunities Londoners, specifically local businesses could leverage (House of Lords, 2013). Legacy narratives were finely crafted at the heart of London’s ‘technically polished’ bid (MacRury and Poynter, 2009) - serving to legitimise the very existence of the project, whilst sustaining – and increasing - the need for public sector funding. Wider national and host city visions closely aligned with those projected by the local authority: the Royal Borough of Greenwich (RBG), focusing on achieving ‘a lasting legacy for the local economy from hosting the Games’ (...) [and] ‘increasing the competitiveness of local businesses’ (RBG, 2012). Yet, local (negative) perspectives, as highlighted across the article and below, juxtapose positive legacy

narratives – highlighting how, on the contrary, post-Games small business sustainability at the local level appears to be under threat.

In the lead up, during, and following the Olympics, questions over London's legacy were raised. Firstly, concerns over limited legacy oversight, incoherent governance and strategy. A Senior Manager at the London Assembly remarked that 'well, one of my criticisms of the Olympics is that we haven't really given enough thought about legacy stuff' (#8 (SG4)), emphasised by a member of the House of Lords claiming that those responsible for overseeing legacy had 'taken their eye off the ball' (...) 'I think the planning of SMEs is very much focused on the event itself (...) my worry [as also expressed in the House of Lords (2013) inquiry] is that they drop the ball and that there's nobody with a clear ownership of it' (#1 (SG4)). Findings illustrate a conflict between the planned vs. unplanned nature of legacy (Preuss, 2007). Concerns around a lack of planning and resources required to effectively deliver on legacy were raised on numerous occasions, firstly by a Senior Manager at the British Olympic Association (BOA):

I don't believe a mayor ever has enough money to do it properly, and so the problem is that what it becomes, if we're not very careful, is a whole range of disparate ideas where private finance is put in (...) the mayor has to have a role here, but the government need to stay involved, and because it actually does need investment by the government (#6 (SG4)).

And by a member of the House of Lords:

I mean as far as the Mayor's Office is concerned, yes, they still talk the legacy talk, but the reality is that the Mayor's mind has moved on to other things – to Westminster and so on (...) [and that] DCMS perceive a legacy responsibility in terms of sport but there's no overarching responsibility for the regeneration of East London (#1 (SG4)).

The Federation of Small Businesses (FSB) and the London Chamber of Commerce corroborated this view – claiming little to no funding to assess a small business legacy, and indicated passive, laissez-faire approach to the scrutiny of legacy. A Senior Manager at the London Assembly even described Games planning, and the UK political-economic environment as 'a bit too neo-liberal at the moment' (#9 (SG4)). Analysis illustrates a public project ready to install legal and financial structures to create exceptional and ideal conditions to host a global sporting and commercial event and emphasise legacy benefits to justify the intervention, but rather ironically not fully prepared and committed to execute, examine, and evaluate the efficacy of said legacy promises. An underfunded and under examined legacy focus contradicts widespread view of legacy as a 'long-term' and '10 year project' (House of Lords, 2013), and the Royal Borough of Greenwich (2012) view that such local legacies can 'only be judged fully over time for the local economy' (2015: 25). Indeed, in light of this, and the critical challenges outlined across this case, this article argues that continual scrutiny and examination of embryonic legacies forming at the local level is fundamental if the project is to be held accountable to its virtuous legacy ambitions.

1
2
3 Interviewees claimed a lack of government intervention is giving rise to a legacy of private interests, and a focus on
4 international development in the area. A Senior Manager at RGB expressed this as a hoped-for outcome of London 2012
5 stating that ‘...it has bought confidence to developers and investments. Enquiries from hotel developers, office developers
6 are going up, and people are investing in major chains’ (#19 (SG2)). Small businesses highlighted that external companies
7 were starting to see more ‘potential in the town’ (#26 (SG1)). Although such investment presents developmental
8 opportunity, Raco and Tunney (2010) they can be pursued by local authorities with either limited knowledge – or an
9 indifference for – longer-term implications on existing communities. Echoing this point, interviewees stressed RGB was
10 encouraging big businesses into development of the borough as a result, at the expense of displacing smaller businesses –
11 describing how ‘small businesses suffered. That was it. Big time. It was all about big business and nothing about small and
12 medium sized businesses at all’ (#35 (SG1)) and that ‘[the council] is trying to get the big companies in and get all of their
13 money out of them. Most of the borough is horrified about what is happening’ (#18 (SG3)). Repeatedly, this position was
14 explicitly raised across all SGs.
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 The point about the larger corporates is they tend to deliver more potentially than some of the smaller businesses
22 and, unfortunately, that may be, but that is the way it works’ (...) yet ‘if they don't think about what the impact
23 is going to be on the surrounding areas, it won't work’ (#1 (SG4)).
24
25
26

27 Risks around urban reengineering processes were raised, stated by one Senior Manager at the London Assembly that
28 ‘inevitably [Games development] was going to lead to a high degree of creative destruction (...) the Games themselves, I
29 think, was a big risk, really, to be honest’ (#2 (SG4)). Locals highlighted feeling neglected and barely recognised as a key
30 stakeholder in the project, as a result of Olympic planning – their interests swiftly superseded by big business.
31
32
33

34 ...the council did not help us at all. They were not for us, they were all for big corporates – we were completely
35 pushed aside and the council made that obvious [during the Games] as well (...) they [the council] are not very
36 good [at supporting small firms] I am afraid – not with local businesses anyway – they prefer the big companies,
37 they are pushing the big companies in here (...) they could have benefited small business who have been keeping
38 Greenwich here for years instead of big corporate companies who come in and gets everything (#34 (SG1)).
39
40
41

42 Creative destruction, and resultant effects of rising rents and more competitive business environments were described as
43 a certain outcome for small businesses. A Senior Manager at the London Assembly noted that London’s legacy focused
44 on ‘inject[ing] new life into the economy to try and get more businesses into the area. Actually, if that is going to succeed
45 there is going to be a certain amount of randomness and creative destruction in that a lot of the old businesses will be
46 screened out, their rents will go up and unless they can improve their margins and their business offer some will go to the
47 wall (#9 (SG4)). Findings indicate a scenario where uncompetitive small businesses become casualties for the greater good
48 of a local legacy.
49
50
51

52
53
54 I'm not sure the business communities will look the same, there may be different communities and businesses
55 (...) that might be private, local economy which is a completely different context from the one in ten years or
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 even five years before, an economy which is sustainable. That would be legacy. What happened to business X?
4 Well, the answer is well they may have disappeared (...) that may be a very different thing to what you've got at
5 the moment... and may be quite unpopular in the short-term (#1 (SG4)).
6
7

8
9 The view that certain stakeholders emerge more desirable than others rapidly reached saturation. A Senior Manager in
10 Newham Borough, directly responsible to welfare of small businesses drew on Marxist sentiment with respect to the
11 'haves' and 'have not's as existing local businesses are...
12

13
14 ...all slowly but surely being unfortunately forced out of their locations because land value has started to increase
15 as people... as the "haves" push out the "have not's" (...) residential prices have jumped 100 per cent (...)
16 ultimately what it amounts to is that people are priced out of formally rich areas (...) and I think it is East
17 London's turn (#20 (SG2)).
18
19

20
21 *London's local economic (legacy) challenge: Development-turn-displacement*
22

23 The House of Lords (2013) claimed 'we heard concerns that the "Olympic effect" would increase house prices still further
24 in surrounding areas, leading to 'convergence' being achieved through gentrification, rather than improved outcomes for
25 current residents' (2013: 68). Here, findings reveal the conflict between positive, planned legacies vs. emerging negative,
26 unplanned legacy (Preuss, 2007). As identified earlier, showcasing effects and the intended outcome to enhance the
27 desirability of ex-Olympic communities was at the epi-centre and 'gentrification would be a symptom of that change, so
28 you improve the infrastructure and that makes it a more attractive area, it means rents go up, it means that different people
29 move in' (#1 (SG4)). Despite associated threats, Chief Executive of the London Legacy Development Corporation
30 (LLDC) claimed that one measure of increasing house prices could be seen as an outcome of successful regeneration'
31 (House of Lords, 2013: 68). The Work Foundation (2010) illustrated tensions between developments with and for vs.
32 gentrification [forced up] on - existing communities, arguing the challenge for London was 'capitalising on its strengths as
33 a global knowledge city in order to grow the economy, and managing the risk that some individuals and places in London
34 will be left behind without intervention (2010: 4) (...) [as the games project has the propensity to] displace individuals from
35 communities (2010: 42). Interviewees repeatedly echoed this view claiming that 'some change to existing communities was
36 always inevitable, and those are the communities which are changing all the time (...) It's [gentrification] is not necessarily
37 a bad thing in itself (...) if you wanted to see greater economic development, that would probably have led to gentrification'
38 (#1 (SG4)). Effectively, the over-riding view – and outcome - is that...
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 ...a lot of the old businesses will be screened out, their rents will go up and unless they can improve their margins
47 and their business offer, some will go to the wall (...) we wanted to inject new life in to the economy to try and
48 get some new businesses into the area (...) there is bound to be a re-juggling of the business mix in the area, it's
49 inevitable! (#9 (SG4)).
50
51
52

53 Sources claimed that 'what we are going to find, once the carnival has moved on, is that very few people who live in the
54 area and need housing are going to be able to afford to live in the neighbourhood' (New York Times, 2012); and that 'I
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 have no idea how the country is going to deal with that but we are pricing a whole generation of people out of London'
4 (Local councillor cited in House of Lords, 2013: 68). UK landscape of rising rents and fiscal changes in the business
5 environment relating to local business taxation (i.e. business rates) – compound legacies of gentrification and displacement.
6 Duignan et al (2018) notes that between 2010–2017 rates have risen overall by £654m, and the UK has the highest rates
7 across Europe and more than France and Germany combined (FSB, 2013). Specifically, official Olympic boroughs and
8 venue areas has witnessed the largest uplift in real-estate prices (London Assembly, 2017).
9
10
11

12
13 Away from the everyday small high street business, emphasis was placed on high-growth, creative, hi-tech and service
14 industries – as key SMEs to fuel a productive legacy. Aside from local businesses themselves, very little emphasis was
15 raised by SG2, 3, and 4 with respect to the importance of those high street businesses situated at the heart of this case
16 study. There was an overarching positionality around how 'creative industries and high-tech firms are key for East London
17 growth – the challenge for East London is that existing local businesses are often tired and run down' (#3 (SG4)), and
18 that 'the sort of business that would be attractive post-Olympics would be far more service economy end' (...) 'which is
19 why we did the Olympics' (#9 (SG4)). Findings illustrate an indifference for existing small high street businesses –
20 pejoratively seen as a block on economic progress - in favour of a new demographic. Indeed, such sentiment was raised
21 during the Games too as Vlachos (2015) outlined the specific ways small businesses became side-lined and unable to access
22 event visitor economy related benefits, pointing to a poster in a local Greenwich pub window stating: 'LOCOG [London
23 Olympic Committee for the Olympic Games]: Licence to Kill a Town Centre' (see Vlachos, 2015: 183 for the specific
24 image).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 It's [London 2012] critical for the future of the East End to attract creative and hi-tech firms – these are key for
34 economic prosperity and employment – perhaps more important than dying high street sectors and local retail
35 (...) the introduction of Westfield was a corporate bonanza but although it may overshadow businesses and
36 detract local custom – the place has employed over 2000 Newham residents (...) gentrification is welcomed.
37 Although it is difficult for local people and businesses, it enhances an area, brings significant employment benefit
38 and better for the wider development of an area (#4 (SG4)).
39
40
41

42
43 In the next section, the paper assesses the embryonic (legacy) place development fall out of such gentrification and rising
44 rents, namely, the production of what is earlier referred to as the clone town effect and the creation of urban landscapes.
45
46

47 **Old spaces, new faces: Clone town legacies and the creation of London's urban landscapes**

48 The post-Games period was a time of growing uncertainty for small businesses, embroiled in a struggle to survive, as
49 gentrification and associated rising rents served to displace existing small businesses. Local perspectives reflect on
50 London's legacy as an invisible, cancerous inhabitant – a fait accompli with little to no panacea to resist what appears to
51 be inevitable displacement resulting from aforementioned rising rents. Virtually every interviewee stressed this process
52 posed a threat to longer-term business survival. A Senior Manager at organisation: Business in the Community (BITC)
53 argued 'rising rents and gentrification has had a detrimental effect on the traditional businesses (...) they must be facing
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 increasing pressures for the increased charges they will inevitably face when they sign their tenancy agreements (...) it's a
4 feeling through speaking with people in the area' compounded by 'business rates going sky high' (#17 SG3). Landlords,
5 looking to maximise commercial returns, increasing rents across valorised ex-Olympic spaces are predominantly to blame.
6
7

8
9 Interviewees claimed that the Olympics transformed the mind-set of landlords with an indifference for the survival of
10 existing, smaller businesses, claiming that 'owners of them [commercial properties] are trying to get much higher value as
11 a consequence of the Games. That's the danger of the Games, of course, and even more so because of what's happened
12 since – which is the property prices go up! That remains a real danger, that people get priced out (#6 (SG4)), and that 'you
13 have the landlords that know the site will be developed, and you will find gentrification and they will put up their rent as
14 the market price and land values are increasing (...) and the type of appliance that they can attract for their sites will change
15 and that will have an impact on the high street' (#19 (SG2)).
16
17
18
19

20 Findings reveal that the Olympics helped create a permanent exception of unaffordable high rents out of reach for existing,
21 smaller businesses, stating that 'they [Greenwich Hospital] are putting the rent up - renting out for Costa, two double
22 shops to Costa, for like 90,000 a year - which is a ridiculous amount of money. And no independent can afford to pay
23 that. So they are going to come back and say well we can get this for the shop, so... (#25 (SG1)); and 'rates and rents
24 [have been put] up for many of the local businesses. And since Jamie Oliver's restaurant has popped up they won't lower
25 them' (#34 (SG1)). This was seen as a direct cause of small business displacement and encouraging big business into
26 commercial spaces they once occupied. Repeatedly, the theme of winners, losers, and the inevitability of casualties were
27 noted as 'prices around Olympic areas will (!) rise, have to rise, and yes this poses problems, but this is the changing face
28 of the high street. But again, legacy is a longer-term concern and there have to be winners and losers in this game (#4
29 (SG4)). Although qualifiers over whether this is a direct impact of the Games was raised here, with another arguing that 'I
30 do not know whether that [gentrification and emerging corporatisation of the high street] is because of the Olympics or
31 whether just general policy and town centres changing' (#35 (SG1)). Our findings reveal that although gentrification effects
32 and subsequent small business displacement is an existing concern, the Olympics serves to catalyse such economic
33 processes as perhaps both an intended and unintended legacy outcome (Preuss, 2007).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 To what extent to which this [local economic changes] provides an opportunity for local players or the extent to
42 which it is a colonial exercise which outside bodies tend to muscle in is the major question (...) so do I think the
43 community businesses the area were meant to benefit from the games? Well, it's some of the existing ones had
44 to go, others were potentially going to get the opportunities (#9 (SG4)).
45
46
47

48 At the intersect of showcasing (Faulkner et al, 2001), resultant gentrification, displacement and changing business
49 environments, several interviewees stated that 'people think that it's a desirable place to be in East London, so they want
50 to start a business here and start living, so it pushes rental values up, which means that only big business can afford them'
51 (#21 (SG2)); resulting in 'a change in the business base in the area' (#2 (SG4). This view was emphasised repeatedly:
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ...they [Greenwich hospitality trust, the landlord] have quadrupled the rents, they put the rents up by four fold
4 – driving all the small businesses out (...) I expect the rents to increase further (...) they are driving them [existing
5 businesses] all out, turning them into flats to rent them out (...) Café Sol had the business for 40 years and he
6 was paying so much they obtained his building and put rent up four-fold (#34 (SG1)).
7
8
9

10 Realities of gentrification and business displacement emerge largely determined by how close individual businesses were
11 to contractual renewal. For those close to renewal, exclusionary realities started to reveal – a sensitive and emotional topic
12 for those on the brink of business failure. Exclaimed by one small retailer, *'well, my days are numbered ultimately. I am on*
13 *borrowed time (...) they [Greenwich Hospital Trust, the local landlord] are going to put my rent up (...) sooner or later they will get us'* - #25
14 (SG1) – a local voice that reveals and represents the plight of one small business, and reflects the wider sentiment felt by
15 the entire community. The idea of legacy as a ticking timebomb of inevitable displacement was echoed throughout the
16 data, illustrated by another local trader below who claimed:
17
18
19
20

21 We are lucky we are tied into a long-term lease but this is due to renewal soon, and the effect is yet to hit us.
22 However, we know that some rents here have gone up 300% - some rents in Central Greenwich were £10000,
23 and now are looking at £30000. That is pretty much central London [prices]! (#38 (SG1)).
24
25
26

27 Resultant effects indicate, what the article discusses earlier, as the shift from 'slow towns' to 'clone towns' – and the
28 production of urban blandscapes. Locals argued that 'with rent going up there are many restaurant chains coming [into
29 Central Greenwich] (...) more chain of restaurants are coming to the area' (#39 (SG1)), and when 'Greenwich Hospital
30 put the rents up (...) it [the Olympics] did a lot of damage in the process, and took a lot of the community. They've taken
31 away a lot of our shops and, as I say, some have closed. It's [the community] is incredibly socially divided' (#29 (SG1)).
32 Others described Central Greenwich as 'sadder. It's sadder, because it's so - some people closed (...) when I first came
33 here they were thriving, and it was more bustling and they [small firms] had a lot of character' (...) we mourn all the shops
34 that had to go' (#29 (SG1)). Albeit only briefly touched upon, sentiments were shared across Vlachos's (2015) assessment
35 of the immediate impact of London 2012 on small Greenwich based businesses, with one business stating: 'I don't want
36 anything to do with the Olympics, it's put me out of business, it's destroyed this town, it's shit' (Vlachos, 2015: 186).
37 Repeatedly, qualitative evidence across this study illustrated these local perceptions, of whom frequently pointed to
38 objective-physical evidence on the high street to qualify their point.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Those businesses in Greenwich where it was really tough and for some went to the wall after the games itself
46 and whether as a result of the games was the final nail in the coffin (#12 (SG3)).
47
48
49

50 As remarked by the study's key, local gatekeeper:

51
52 A lot of the shops in the town - a lot more shops have closed since the games because they couldn't stomach the
53 impact (...) for them having their business decimated for a period of time, they couldn't even hang on by their
54 fingernails (...) so a lot of closures happened in the town centre and if you wander down into the town centre,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 you'll probably see that there's still quite a few that are empty now. This is prime town centre kind of tourist-ville
4 but they couldn't hang on (#15 (SG3)).
5
6

7 Now, locals describe London's legacy as 'corporate', 'horrific' and a major 'bugbear of a lot of residents' that represent the
8 'destruction of artisan culture' (#24 (SG1)). Others claimed 'in another 10 years [Central Greenwich] will be
9 unrecognisable' (#15 (SG3)), case of 'Greenwich Council slowly but surely destroying the old artisan culture' (#18 (SG3))
10 as a result of a corporate colonisation dominated by national 'American chains'. Chains now rival independents, noted by
11 a local café owner: 'Greenwich Hospital have just let Costa Coffee onto the island which is a shame not just because we
12 are a coffee shop, just because it is the first chain on the island (#25 (SG1)) – a point repeatedly corroborated. Locals
13 describe 'it is much worse (...) it's more corporate, we have more corporates now than we did before (#32 (SG1)), and
14 that 'the competition has become slightly bigger, slightly better (...) in years to come individual businesses will succumb
15 to bigger franchises' (#30 (SG1)). Replaced by a monochromatic landscape of chains and the shift toward an urban
16 landscape across Central Greenwich, many interviewed for this study have now been displaced.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 ...yes we really have been [taken over by corporations]. You got your Nandos, Zizzi and Jamie Oliver – bigger
24 companies are starting to come in you know (...) independents are beginning to be pushed out' (#35 (SG1)), [as
25 a result] 'it's just going to be corporates now, before we didn't have any, we've now got Nando's, Zizzi's,
26 Starbucks, Costa's, we even have a McDonald's (...) It is just corporates that can afford everything now' (#34
27 (SG1)).
28
29
30

31 What appears to be left is a legacy of resentment, of local loss, and of a project that afforded this to happen. 'We didn't
32 get anything from the Olympics (...) they have not left any [positive] legacy here' (#35 (SG1)) - a statement echoing the
33 sentiment of an embattled small business community – of whom now deride their local post-Games urban environment
34 as 'quiet and dull' (#34 (SG1)) – helping to metaphorically and practically illustrate and justify the resultant urban
35 landscapes forming over the colourful, characterful artisanal place image and destination offer of Central Greenwich.
36
37

38 The sports were great – but everything around it just fell apart. (...) How many lifestyles did they corrupt and
39 bend there. (...) it was great for all the sportsmen and women who were part of it – but for anyone outside of it
40 – suffered (...) they suck off every individual community they land on (#37 (SG1)).
41
42
43

44 **Conclusions: London's embryonic legacy of small business (un)sustainability, clone town effects and urban** 45 **landscapes**

46 This article has illustrated, empirically, the link between Olympic event-led urban gentrification, rising rents and so-called
47 embryonic legacies forming across Central Greenwich concerning clone town effects and the production of urban
48 landscapes. Evidence generated across London, and specifically within Central Greenwich corroborates NEF's (2010)
49 wider argument that processes associated with the production of clone town, monochrome spaces serves to potentially
50 undermine diverse and vibrant local communities, erode place identity and dilute the local, cultural offer. This article
51 builds on Duignan et al's (2018) concern that such structural economic and place development effects has the propensity
52 to reduce destination competitiveness. Here, SMEs may well be seen as just one of the multivariate factors producing the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 urban landscapes that continue to pervade, displace and erode urban diversity, vibrancy, authenticity and deeper cultural
4 offering across the UK (NEF, 2010; Duignan et al, 2018) – and beyond. Although bottom-up community events often
5 play a key role in constructively supporting small business sustainability (Richards, 2017), SMEs, in this case illustrate the
6 potentially destructive nature of (top-down) SMEs may well pose gentrified futurities as opposed to the utopian
7 developmental opportunities as initially projected. Both objective evidence alongside subjective accounts illustrates these
8 pervasive processes post-London 2012, and feeds into a wider narrative amplified in the UK media (e.g. The Guardian,
9 2017) and government policy narrative (e.g. UK Government, 2015) about the structural economic challenges posed by
10 rising rents and business rates on micro and small business survival more generally. In terms of current managerial and
11 policy implications, this is a critical space of research, related to associative clone town effects, that will be undertaken by
12 the New Economics Foundation (NEF) across 2019 – 2020 according to recent Personal Communication (2018) between
13 the author of this paper and the Principal Director for Communities and Localities at NEF.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Indeed, findings reveal that SMEs – and those responsible for managing them, including local authorities – may well fail
21 to acknowledge local interests (Cashman, 2002), recognise the potentially critical role local communities play in collectively
22 contributing to local identity, vibrancy (e.g. Raco and Tunney, 2010), and strengthening the local cultural offer (e.g. Everett,
23 2016; Hawkins and Ryan, 2013; Maheshwari et al., 2011). As a result, this article argues that a community driven place
24 marketing and city branding outlook is required to not only support the sustainability of small business communities but
25 create a portfolio of event activity (e.g. Richards, 2017) to help ex-host Olympic communities (re)position and further
26 differentiate their local destination offer and localised brand identity – a key aspects of urban diversity London's 2012
27 project wished to demonstrate (Mayor of London, 2007). Yet, in light of current evidence, the paper agrees with Raco and
28 Tunney's (2010) sentiment that:
29
30
31
32
33

34 Local firms [of whom] have found themselves on the receiving end of the process of remaking this part of
35 London and the production of new spaces in which they have no part (2010: 2082).
36
37

38 As a result these critical insights, a key question raised by this case is the extent to which findings are reflective of a wider
39 indifference for protecting local, independent small businesses that contribute to the cultural diversity of UK high streets
40 – and beyond. This is particularly true in the place-based context of an artisanal destination like Central Greenwich that
41 by and large depends on cultural diversity (alongside a rich, cultural heritage) as a unique selling point and destination
42 attractor for stimulating the visitor economy and touristic consumption. Do such outcomes represent, from a broader
43 place management and development perspective, an oversight by place managers to represent and protect the image of
44 destination – both within the melee of SME lifecycles, and more broadly across neoliberal cities, towns and spaces?
45 Perhaps, as raised by Duignan and Wilbert (2016), this is a normal – and naturalised - outcome stemming from the
46 privatisation of Destination Management Organisations (DMOs) and tourist boards, particularly across the UK, that may
47 be seen to appear to chase profit over place – ignoring the rich, plural and diversity that underpin vibrant urban
48 environments. An indifference for small business survival appears to be a by-product of a wider reticence to protect
49 elements of localism – as host communities themselves become leverageable resources to be commoditised and colonised
50 by global, corporate chains. Conceptually, this article illustrates that changing business demographics, in this case:
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 independent small businesses to corporate chains, is a latent by vitally important dynamic to be absorbed under the
4 definition of the so-called 'Olympic effect(s)'. This is particularly so as such shift serves to undermine alternative and plural
5 narratives at the heart of community, but simultaneously erode an existing local-cultural offer, urban vibrancy, and 'reduce
6 diversification' (#7 (SG4), also see Everett, 2016) that underpins a competitive, and unique urban destination to visit, work
7 and play as denoted by perspectives at the heart of this study claiming:
8
9

10
11 ...you will [be able to] go anywhere and it will be the same (...) will people still want to visit it? I do not know'
12 (#15 (SG3)); and 'it's [Central Greenwich] always been a bit quirky (...) largely untouched and it's developed its
13 own little subculture (...) with artists, poets, musicians (...) it's like Frankie and Benny's and these American
14 chains going in there all with their like neon signs and stuff (...) slowly but surely Greenwich Council is destroying
15 the old artisan culture (#18 (SG3)).
16
17
18
19

20 Rising rents, both residential and commercial, are clearly identified as a core risk to existing small businesses illustrative of
21 the changing nature of 'spaces' affected by legacy structures as identified earlier by Preuss (2007). An emerging question,
22 related to both the conceptual and practical aspects of delivering a 'local legacy' is whether gentrification (and somewhat
23 inevitability of rising commercial rents) is a planned or unplanned outcome of SMEs? This is a key, structural aspect of
24 legacy addresses by Preuss (2007). As discussed in the literature review, alongside case study evidence presented, various
25 bodies including the House of Lords (2013), Work Foundation (2010) and OECD (2008) all point to the systematic
26 challenges and likelihood of such local economic effects post-Games. Therefore, can we assert that such local economic
27 development legacies be conceived of a planned aspect of SMEs? And, more specifically and pertinent to this study: Are
28 place managers, those in the visitor economy and local and (host) city wide tourism boards perceptive to the potential
29 challenges of gentrification and shifting business demographics on place image and destination competitiveness? Although
30 one would imagine such developmental outcomes are not an ideal outcome for place managers, the loss of local diversity
31 and cultural offer as a result of small business displacement emerges as a very real, tangible outcome of London's legacy.
32 Indeed, this case illustrates the ever ambiguous, contradictory, highly contested aspect realities of legacy (Getz, 2007;
33 Preuss, 2007; Zimbalist, 2015) – with implications on small business sustainability and place developments that appears to
34 strip away the culturally-colourful artisanal character and reducing a diverse set of small independent business, toward a
35 monochromatic urban landscape of global and national chains.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 London's local embryonic legacies appear to be a far cry away from the virtuous aims of positive local development that
45 drove London's legacy narrative in the first place and across the lifecycle of the project. Indeed, beyond London as host
46 city – it is pertinent to critique whether aforementioned local developmental outcomes are congruent to the wider,
47 supranational aims of the Olympic 2020 Agenda, and, the Olympic Movement. Indeed, this article argues that such ex-
48 ante projections vs. ex-post realities appear somewhat opposed – thus, begging the question for practitioners, policy
49 makers and academics: How can the interests of wider Olympic policy, SMEs within specific host cities, and soon-to-be
50 impacted local communities be better aligned to close the dichotomies gap between rhetoric and reality? Although the
51 catch all concept of legacy is, as Bourdieu and Wacquant (2001) suggests on everyone's lips – this article argues that legacy
52 provides an ideal narrative to pay lip service and divert attention away from the inevitable structural challenges and
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 inequalities fostered by SME projects (Duignan, Pappalepore and Everett, 2019). A legacy of lost, forgotten and
4 invisibilised small businesses at the margins of post-Olympic host communities and their legacies illustrate the power of
5 legacy as an ideological fetish – to obfuscate structural and systematic socio-economic challenges at the local level (Zizek,
6 2008). It feeds into existing notions of SMEs as entrepreneurial gambles (Zimbalist, 2005), representing a bread and circus
7 character – a scenario whereby ‘the circus succeeds [in this case, the SME] even if the bread [i.e. legacy] - is lacking’ (...)
8 the triumph of image over substance is complete’ (Harvey, 1989: 14). The ‘legacy fetish’ – in this respect – affords the
9 invisibilisation of aforementioned challenges, local narratives, and the exclusionary Olympic effect(s) that manifest across
10 the legacies of SMEs.
11
12
13
14
15

16 As a result, a key managerial and policy implication of this study is the extent to which local authorities and governments
17 may well intervene in protecting existing small businesses against some of the – what seems to be – inevitabilities of
18 gentrification that occur systematically within ex-Olympic post-Games spaces. One Senior Manager at the London Legacy
19 Development Corporation (LLDC) argued how ‘...regarding the risks of gentrification and rental increases, this is a major issue for
20 the East End. The LLDC and I need to consider how we can use our planning powers to maintain the fabric of businesses in the local area’
21 (Interviewee #3 (SG4)). Yet, if we look at local developmental effects so far in Central Greenwich, little intervention –
22 and protection – has been offered to secure intended positive small businesses legacies as described earlier. Subjective
23 accounts revealed in the analysis illustrate how small businesses felt unsupported with little protection against the post-
24 Games economic inevitabilities that threaten their success, survival and sustainability. Effectively illustrating the scenario
25 whereby small businesses must either ‘improve margins’ or ‘go to the wall’. This supports earlier arguments that SME led
26 development frequently leads to gentrification on, as opposed to development for and with existing communities (House
27 of Lords, 2013). And yet, the ‘hard outcomes of neoliberalism’ as Hall (2006) typifies as a consequence of SMEs awkwardly
28 contrasts and undermines London’s initial virtuous legacy objectives. Indeed, the article builds on the concern that the
29 rhetorical allure of inclusion, quickly and frequently results in a local reality of exclusion, where Olympic-led urban
30 development may...
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 ...degenerate not regenerate (...) brushes it [existing local culture and respective communities] aside for a
39 corporate sports day (...) it [the legacy] boils down to 1000s upon 1000s of individual lives that are now forever
40 changed for three weeks of a brand fest (Sinclair, 2012).
41
42
43

44 As outlined in the introduction, little qualitative, in-depth examination of the idiosyncratic aspects of local legacy rise to
45 the surface of both academic and policy event impact analyses. As a result, the very real objective place transformations,
46 alongside local perceptions of how local communities physically change post-Games, become forgotten – or as Raco and
47 Tunney (2010) argue – communities become invisibilised. London’s clone town legacies and the pervasive transition
48 toward urban landscapes emerge as just one of the many nuanced legacy outcomes affecting local livelihoods at the heart
49 of ex-Olympic host communities. As a result, this paper builds on Pappalepore and Duignan’s (2016) call that more
50 idiosyncratic place-based analysis of legacy is needed to reveal the full extent – objective and subjective outcomes of SME
51 legacies.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The critical positionality of this study lends itself to development of both policy and managerial implications – highlighting two core themes. Firstly, re-thinking the geography of Olympic activity - hosting both sporting and commercial events outside of densely populated suburbs in one isolated site is a simple, direct way of negating challenges raised. Secondly, protecting local cultural offer and producers of culture – critical for urban diversity, vibrancy and identity – emerges vital to maintain destination competitiveness, and, more pertinently, delivering on the local legacy promise. Clearly, actions are to be taken to dampen negative and/or negate against demise and/or displacement, for example by controlling rents, public subsidy, and/or creating a strategic portfolio of grassroots events to generate visitor economy returns – vital for the sustainability of small businesses (Duignan et al, 2018). Philosophically and methodologically speaking this article calls for future researchers, event practitioners and policy makers engaged in event impact and legacy analysis to engage in deeper, empirical excavations of the contextual, messy legacies – and exclusions – of less visible stakeholders at the margins of SME led urban development – to build and generate theory, directly from the horse’s mouth.

References

- Attride-Stirling J (2001) Thematic Networks: An Analytical Tool for Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Research*. 1, 385-405.
- Buultjens, J. and Cairncross, G. (2015), “Event tourism in remote areas: an examination of the birdsville races”, *Journal of Place Management and Development*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 69-84.
- Bourdieu P and Wacquant L (2001) New Liberal Speak: Notes on the New Planetary Vulgate. *Radical Philosophy*. 105, 2-5.
- Cashman R (2002) Impact of the Games on Olympic Host Cities [pdf online]. Available at: <http://ceo.uab.cat/lec/pdf/cashman.pdf>. [Accessed on: 11 October 2012].
- Cashman R (2006) *The Bitter Sweet Awakening - The Legacy of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*. Sydney: Walla Walla Press.
- Centre for Cities (2012) A Marathon Not a Sprint? Legacy Lessons for London. [pdf online] Available at: http://www.centreforcities.org/assets/files/2012/12-09-10_Olympics.pdf. [Accessed on: 2 February 2013].
- Chalip L (2017) Trading Legacy for Leverage. In: Britton I, Boccaro, J, Byers, T and Swart, K (eds) *Legacies and SMEs: Fact or Fairy Tales?* London: Routledge, pp 25-43.
- Christou, A. (2017), “Bottom-up placemaking in a time of crisis, by the people, for the people: case study of Arillas, Corfu”, *Journal of Place Management and Development*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 173-182.
- Coaffee J (2011) Urban Regeneration and Renewal. In: Gold, J., and Gold, M. 2008. Eds. *Olympic Cities: Regeneration, City Rebranding and Changing Urban Agendas*. Geography Compass.
- Davies L (2012) Beyond the Games: Regeneration Legacies and London 2012. *Leisure Studies*. 31, 309-337.

1
2
3
4 DCMS (2008) Before, During and After – Making the Most of the Games [pdf online]. Available at:
5 [http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.culture.gov.uk/images/publications/2012LegacyActionPlan.p](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.culture.gov.uk/images/publications/2012LegacyActionPlan.pdf)
6 [df](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.culture.gov.uk/images/publications/2012LegacyActionPlan.pdf). [Accessed on: 26 October 2012].
7
8

9
10 DCMS (2012) Beyond 2012 The London Legacy Story [pdf online]. Available at:
11 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/77993/DCMS_Beyond_2012_Legac](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/77993/DCMS_Beyond_2012_Legacy_Story.pdf)
12 [y_Story.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/77993/DCMS_Beyond_2012_Legacy_Story.pdf). [Accessed on: 7 February 2014].
13
14

15
16 Duignan, M.B., and Wilbert, C (2016) Embedding Slow Tourism and the ‘Slow Phases’ Framework: the case of Cambridge,
17 UK. In: Clancy, M. 2016. Eds. Slow Tourism, Food and Cities: Pace and the Search for the ‘Good Life’. London:
18 Routledge.
19

20
21 Duignan, M.B., Everett, S., Walsh, L. and Cade, N. (2017), “Leveraging physical and digital liminoidal
22 spaces: the case of the #EATCambridge festival”, *Tourism Geographies*, Vol. 1, pp. 1-22.
23
24

25
26 Duignan M.B, Kirby S, O’Brien D and Everett S (2018) From clone towns to slow towns: Examining festival legacies.
27 *Journal of Place Management and Development*.
28

29
30 Duignan M.B, Pappalepore I, and Everett S (2019) The ‘summer of discontent’: Exclusion and communal resistance at
31 the London 2012 Olympic Games. *Tourism Management*. 70, 355-367.
32

33
34 Everett S (2016) *Food and Drink Tourism: Principles and Practices*. London, SAGE.
35

36
37 Faulkner B, Chalip L, Brown G, Jago L, March R and Woodside A (2001) Monitoring the Tourism Impacts of the Sydney
38 2000 Olympics. *Event Management*. 6, 231-246.
39

40
41 Foley M, McGillivray D and McPherson G (2011) *Event Policy: From Theory to Strategy*. London: Routledge.
42

43
44 FSB (2013) Passing the Baton: How Small Business Have Been Affected by the London 2012 Games [pdf online].
45 Available at: http://www.fsb.org.uk/policy/rpu/london/assets/passingthebaton_fsb_final.pdf. [Accessed 26 April 2013].
46

47
48 Furrer P (2002) Sustainable Olympic Games. A Dream or a Reality? *Bollettino della Societa Geografica Italiana*.
49

50
51 Getz D (2007) *Event Studies: Theory, Research and Policy for Planned Events*. Oxford Butterworth-Heinemann.
52

53
54 Gold J and Gold M (2008) Olympic Cities: Regeneration, City Rebranding and Changing Urban Agendas [pdf online].
55 Available at:
56

1
2
3 <http://www.umsl.edu/~naumannj/professional%20geography%20articles/Olympic%20Citic%20%20Regeneration,%20City%20Rebranding%20and%20Changing%20Urban%20Agendas.pdf>. [Accessed on: 11 Octobe 2012].

6
7 Gratton C, Shibli S and Coleman, R (2005) The Economics of Sport Tourism at Major Sports Events. *In: Higham, J.* 2005. Eds. *Sport Tourism Destinations: Issues, opportunities and analysis*. Elsevier: Oxford.

10
11 Hall C.M (2006) Urban Entrepreneurship, Corporate Interests and Sports SMEs: the Thin Policies of Competitiveness within the Hard Outcomes of Neoliberalism. *Sociological Review*. 54, 59-70.

14
15 Harvey D (1989) *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Blackwell: Oxford.

18
19 Hawkins, C.J. and Ryan, L.J. (2013), "Festival spaces as third places", *Journal of Place Management and Development*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 192-202.

22
23 Hiller H (2002) Toward a Science of Olympic Outcomes: The Urban Legacy. *In: IOC.* 2002. Eds. *The Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000*. International Symposium Lausanne.

26
27 House of Lords (2012) The Long-Term Legacy for the UK from the Olympic and Paralympic Games [pdf online]. Available at: www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/LLN-2012-037.pdf. [Accessed on: 15 January 2014].

30
31 House of Lords (2013) Keeping the Flame Alive: the Olympic and Paralympic Legacy. Available at: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201314/ldselect/ldolympic/78/78.pdf> [Accessed on 2 January 2014].

34
35 Horne, J., and Manzenreiter, W. 2006. An Introduction to the Sociology of Sports Mega-Events. *Sociological Review*. 54, 1-24.

38
39 International Olympic Committee (IOC) (2018) Olympic 2020 Agenda. Available at: <https://www.olympic.org/olympic-agenda-2020>. [Accessed on 17 March, 2018].

42
43 Kavetsos G (2012) The Impact of the London Olympics Announcement on Property Prices. *Urban Studies*. 4, 1453-1470.

46
47 London Assembly (2017) Housing in London report. Available at: <https://data.london.gov.uk/housingmarket/>. [Accessed on 7 December 2017].

50
51 MacRury I and Poynter G (2009) *Olympic Cities: 2012 and the Remaking of London*. Ashgate, Farnham.

53
54 Maheshwari, V., Vandewalle, I. and Bamber, D. (2011), "Place branding's role in sustainable development", *Journal of Place Management and Development*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 198-213

1
2
3
4 Mangan J.A (2008) Guarantees of Global Goodwill: Post-Olympic Legacies – Too Many Limping White Elephants?
5 *International Journal of the History of Sport*. 25, 14-19.
6
7

8
9 Matheson VA (2006) SMEs: The Effect of the World's Biggest Sporting Events on Local, Regional, and National
10 Economies [pdf online] Available at: http://college.holycross.edu/RePEc/hcx/Matheson_MegaEvents.pdf. [Accessed
11 on: 5 September 2014].
12
13

14 Mayor of London (2007) 'Five Legacy Commitments' [pdf online]. Available at: [http://www.cslondon.org/wp-](http://www.cslondon.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2008/01/GLA%20-%205-legacy-commitments.pdf)
15 [content/uploads/downloads/2008/01/GLA%20-%205-legacy-commitments.pdf](http://www.cslondon.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2008/01/GLA%20-%205-legacy-commitments.pdf). [Accessed on: 5 July 2014].
16
17

18 McKay M and Plumb C (2001) Reaching beyond the gold: the impact of the Olympic Games on real estate markets. *Global*
19 *Insights Issue 1*, Jones Lang LaSalle.
20
21

22
23 McGillivray, D., and Frew, M (2015) From Fan Parks to Live Sites – Mega-Events and the Territorialisation of Urban
24 Space. *Urban Studies*. 52, 2649-2663.
25
26

27 Mean M, Vigor A, and Tims C (2004) Minding the Gap. *In*: Vigor, A., Mean, M., and Tims, C. 2004. Eds. *After the Goldrush?*
28 *A Sustainable Olympics for London*. London: IPPR/Demos.
29
30

31 Muller M (2017) Approaching paradox: Loving and hating SMEs. *Tourism Management*. 62, 234-241.
32
33

34 New Economics Foundation (NEF) (2010) Re-imagining the High Street: Escape from Clone Town Britain [pdf online].
35 Available at: http://b3cdn.net/nefoundation/1da089b4b1e66ba2b3_v8m6b0c0w.pdf. [Accessed on: 12 November
36 2014].
37
38

39
40 New York Times (2012) Olympic Games: Social Legacy Awaits Score. Available from:
41 http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/27/sports/olympics/olympic-games-social-legacy-awaits-score.html?_r=0
42 [Accessed on: 1 March 2014].
43
44

45 Nitsch V., and Wendland N (2017) The IOC's midas touch: Summer Olympics and city growth. *Urban Studies*, 54(4),
46 971-983.
47

48 OECD (2008) Local Development Benefits from Staging Global Events: Achieving the Local Development Legacy from
49 2012 [pdf online]. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/regional/leed/46207013.pdf> [Accessed 12 November, 2012].
50
51

52 Pappalepore I and Duignan M.B (2016) The London 2012 Cultural Programme: a Consideration of Olympic Impacts and
53 Legacies for Small Creative Organisations in East London. *Tourism Management*. 54, 344 – 355.
54
55

1
2
3 Personal Communication (2018) Conversation between the author and Principal Director for Communities and Localities
4 at the New Economics Foundation, 12 October, 2018.

5
6
7 Preuss H (2007) The Conceptualisation and Measurement of Mega Sport Event Legacies. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*. 12,
8 207-227.

9
10
11 Preuss H (2015) A Framework for Identifying a Legacy of a Mega Sport Event. *Leisure Studies*. 34, 643-664.

12
13
14 Raco M and Tunney E (2010) Visibilities and Invisibilities in Urban Development: Small Business Communities and the
15 London Olympics 2012. *Urban Studies*. 47, 2069-2091.

16
17
18 Richards, G. (2017), "From place branding to placemaking: the role of events", *International Journal of*
19 *Event and Festival Management*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 8-23.

20
21
22 Royal Borough of Greenwich (RGB) (2012) A London 2012 Legacy for Royal Greenwich [pdf online]. Available from:
23 http://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/downloads/file/1480/royal_borough_of_greenwich_2012_legacy_report.
24 [Accessed on: 5 January 2014].

25
26
27
28 Shin, H (2013) London 2012 Olympics [pdf online]. Available at:
29 <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/files/2013/01/Olympics.pdf>. [Accessed on: 9 Feb 2013]

30
31
32 Silk M and Amis J (2006) Bursting the Tourist Bubble: Sport and the Spectacularization of Urban Space. *In: Gibson H*
33 *(2006) Eds. Sport Tourism: Paradigms and Theories*. London: Frank Cass.

34
35
36
37 Sinclair I (2012) *In: Vice (2012) Eds. The Darker Side of the Olympics* [video online]. Available at:
38 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IFHdZi7Pw18> (Part 1-4). [Accessed on: January 3 2014].

39
40
41 Smith M (2008) When the Games Come to Town: Host Cities and the Local Impacts of the Olympics. LERI Institute
42 [pdf online]. Available at:
43 [http://www.uel.ac.uk/londoneast/research/documents/WHENTHEGAMESCOMETOTOWNWORKINGPAPER.p](http://www.uel.ac.uk/londoneast/research/documents/WHENTHEGAMESCOMETOTOWNWORKINGPAPER.pdf)
44 [df](http://www.uel.ac.uk/londoneast/research/documents/WHENTHEGAMESCOMETOTOWNWORKINGPAPER.pdf). [Accessed on: 21 Feb 2013].

45
46
47
48 The Guardian (2006) Legacy is Central to 2012. Available at:
49 <https://www.theguardian.com/sport/2006/may/04/Olympics2012.politics>. [Accessed on: 1 July 2013].

50
51
52 The Guardian (2017), "Rates revaluation could finish off high street warns small businesses", available
53 at: [www.theguardian.com/small-business-network/2017/feb/02/rates-revaluation-could-finishoff-](http://www.theguardian.com/small-business-network/2017/feb/02/rates-revaluation-could-finishoff-high-street-warn-small-businesses)
54 [high-street-warn-small-businesses](http://www.theguardian.com/small-business-network/2017/feb/02/rates-revaluation-could-finishoff-high-street-warn-small-businesses) (accessed 11 July 2017).

1
2
3
4 UK Government (2015) High Street Britain: 2015. Available at:
5 http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/15_02_06_highstreet.pdf. [Accessed on 1 January 2018].
6
7

8
9 Vigor A, Mean M and Tims C (2004) *After the Goldrush? A Sustainable Olympics for London*. London: IPPR/Demos.

10
11 Vlachos P (2015) The London 2012 Olympics and small local business: a 5-year longitudinal study of south-east London.
12 In: Poynter, G., Viehoff, V., and Li, Y. Eds. *The London Olympics and Urban Development*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.176-193.
13

14
15 Weingaertner C. and Barber A.R.G (2010) Urban regeneration and socio-economic sustainability: a role for established
16 small food outlets. *European Planning Studies*, 10, 1653-1674.
17

18
19 Work Foundation (2010) *A Lasting Legacy: How can London Fully Exploit the Opportunities Created by the Olympic*
20 *Games in the Recovery and to 2030?* [pdf Online]. Available at:
21 <http://www.theworkfoundation.com/Assets/Docs/olympics011210.pdf>. [Accessed on: 11 January 2014].
22
23

24
25 Zimblist A (2015) *Circus Maximus: The Economic Gamble Behind Hosting The Olympics and The World Cup*.
26 Brookings, Washington.

27
28 Zizek S (2008) *Violence*. London: Profile Books.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table(s)

Interviewee alias	Organisation and role
Interviewee #1 (SG4)	House of Lords, Lord
Interviewee #2 (SG4)	Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), Senior Manager
Interviewee #3 (SG4)	London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC), Senior Manager
Interviewee #4 (SG4)	UK Government [Shadow Cabinet], Senior Minister
Interviewee #5 (SG4)	London Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (LOCOG), Senior Manager
Interviewee #6 (SG4)	British Olympic Association (BOA), Senior Manager
Interviewee #7 (SG4)	Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA), Senior Civil Servant
Interviewee #8 (SG4)	London Assembly, Senior Civil Servant (a)
Interviewee #9 (SG4)	London Assembly, Senior Civil Servant (b)
Interviewee #10 (SG4)	London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC), Small Businesses Advisor
Interviewee #11 (SG3)	Confederation for British Industry (CBI), Senior Manager
Interviewee #12 (SG3)	Federation of Small Businesses (FSB), Senior Policy Advisor
Interviewee #13 (SG3)	London Chamber of Commerce, Senior Manager
Interviewee #14 (SG3)	London Business Network, Senior Manager
Interviewee #15 (SG3)	East Greenwich Business Association (EGBA), Senior Manager
Interviewee #16 (SG3)	East London Chamber of Commerce, Senior Manager
Interviewee #17 (SG3)	Business in the Community (BITC), Senior Manager
Interviewee #18 (SG3)	Federation of Small Business (FSB), Regional Representative
Interviewee #19 (SG2)	Greenwich Council, Business Engagement Officer
Interviewee #20 (SG2)	Newham Council, Business Engagement Officer
Interviewee #21 (SG2)	Tower Hamlets Council, Business Engagement Officer
Interviewee #22 (SG2)	Waltham Forest Council, Business Engagement Officer
Interviewees #23 - #32 (SG1)	Local F&B firm(s), Owner(s)

Interviewee #33 (SG1)	Local retailer, Owner
Interviewee #34 (SG1)	Local F&B firm, Restaurant Manager
Interviewees #35 - #37 (SG1)	Local F&B firm(s), Owner(s)
Interviewee #38 (SG1)	Local retailer, Manager
Interviewees #39 - #43 (SG1)	Local retailer(s), Owner(s)

Table 1 – Stakeholder Group 1 – 4: Interviewees