

BP1 / LLV IMPACTS + BEYOND

Games Monitor [Briefing paper on London 2012 Olympic Games]

Games Monitor, December 2015 (fifth edition)

– replacing previous background papers and extensively revised

Other papers in the series:

BP 2 / Finance, profit + infrastructure

BP 3 / Apparatus (state + media)

http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/contact_media_centre

Games Monitor was founded in 2005 to raise awareness on issues around the London 2012 development process. We can be contacted at info@gamesmonitor.org.uk. Questions on the background papers specifically should be addressed to Carolyn Smith projectmimique@gmail.com.

CONTENTS

1. Loss of habitat and Common Land	7
1.1 Wildlife casualties and habitat destruction	7
1.2 Loss of Common Land, historic landscape and open space	8
Lammas Lands	
Exchange land (Hackney Marshes)	
Greenwich Park	
Wanstead Flats	
Leyton Marsh	
Drapers Field	
2. Clearance of settlements, firms and local sport	13
2.1 Population displacements	13
Homelessness	
Gypsies and Travellers	
Clays Lane estate	
Students living on the Park Village estate	
Carpenters Estate, Stratford	
Manor Garden allotments	
River Lea bargees	
2.2 International context of residential displacement	19
Erasure of Roma settlements, Athens 2004	
Forced removal, Beijing 2008	
Gentrification and resistance, Vancouver 2010	
Clashes and inadequate infrastructure, Sochi 2014	
Repression in the favelas, Rio 2016	
2.3 Local economy: displacement of small businesses	23
2.4 Sporting losses and targets	25
Grassroots sport	
Cycling	
Football (soccer)	
Swimming	
Cuts to sports finance	
Sports participation	
3. Contamination fears and impact of construction	27
3.1 Radioactive contamination and hazardous waste	27
3.2 Air pollution associated with construction	28
3.3 Impacts of construction on local residents	29
3.4 Sewage contamination	29
4. Policy evaluation	30
4.1 London 2012: the 'greenest Olympic Games'?	30
Carbon neutrality	
Sustainability criteria (Stratford precinct)	
Wind turbines	
Air pollution associated with Olympic construction	
London's air quality	
Locally sourced and seasonal food	
Bibliography	33

Dedicated to the memory of Katy Andrews 1958–2015

The wind searched in the forest grass and found a word, / it sounded like unsayable life / but it was a name
the biggest stone gave / to the smallest twilight butterfly. / Too hard to remember says the wave. / Too fine to
be said flickers the wind.

(From *Chickweed Wintergreen* by Harry Martinson [Tartet: Bloodaxe Books, 2010])

ACRONYMS

Common to all background papers.

ABAC	Association of British Athletics Clubs
ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers
AI	Amnesty International
AOTU	Art on the Underground
ASA	Amateur Swimming Association
ASBO	Anti-social Behaviour Order
ATCSA	Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001
BCCLA	British Columbia Civil Liberties Association
BOA	British Olympic Association
BOCOG	Beijing Organising Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games
BTCV	British Trust for Conservation Volunteers
C6/C7	Sixth century/seventh century etc
CABE	Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
CARP	Carpenters Against Regeneration Plans
CBC	Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
CCHP	Combined cooling heat and power
CCTV	Closed-circuit television
CLM	Consortium managing London 2012 construction: CH2M Hill (environmental evaluation), Laing O'Rourke (construction), Mace (project management)
CLO	Community legal observer
COHRE	Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions
CPET	UK Central Point of Expertise on Timber
CPO	Compulsory Purchase Order
CSIS	Canadian Security Intelligence Service
CSJ	Centre for Social Justice
CTRL	Channel Tunnel Rail Link
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government
DCMS	Department for Culture, Media and Sport
DDOS	Distributed denial of service
DLR	Docklands Light Railway
DPU	Development Planning Unit (UCL)
ECJ	European Court of Justice
EDAW	Consultancy, now part of AECOM, responsible for Olympic masterplanning
EIC	Environment Industries Commission
ELL	East London Line
EU	European Union
FA	Football Association
FIFA	Fédération Internationale de Football Association
FOI	Freedom of information
GMB	General Municipal Boilermakers and Allied Trade Union
GLA	Greater London Authority
JPAT	Joint Planning Authorities Team
HCA	Homes and Communities Agency
HLF	Heritage Lottery Fund
HMUG	Hackney Marsh User Group
IOC	International Olympic Committee
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IT	Information technology
IWW	International Workers of the World
LBH	London Borough of Hackney
LBN	London Borough of Newham

LBTH	London Borough of Tower Hamlets
LBWF	London Borough of Waltham Forest
LCR	London and Continental Railways
LDA	London Development Agency (1999–2012)
LGTU	London Gypsy and Traveller Unit
LED	Light-emitting diode
LLDC	London Legacy Development Corporation (2012–)
LLV	Lower Lea Valley
LLW	London 'living wage'
LOAR	London Olympic Association Right, dates from London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Act 2006
LOCOG	London Organising Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games (2005–2014)
LRO	Legislative Reform Order
LRRA	Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act
LTGDC	London Thames Gateway Development Corporation
LVRPA	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
MDC	Mayoral development corporation
MGS	Manor Gardening Society
MLBG	Marshgate Lane Business Group
NAPO	Formerly the National Association of Probation Officers
NEF	New Economics Foundation
NLL	North London Line
NLLDC	New Lammas Lands Defence Committee
NMP	Newham Monitoring Project
NOGOIE	No to Greenwich Olympic Equestrian Events
NRF	Neighbourhood Renewal Fund
NRMM	Non-road mobile machinery
NSNO	No Second Night Out (homelessness initiative)
ODA	Olympic Delivery Authority (2006–2014)
ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
OLD	Olympic Legacy Directorate, part of the LDA
OPLC	Olympic Park Legacy Company (2009–2012)
ORN	Olympic Route Network
PwC	PricewaterhouseCoopers
RSL	Registered social landlord
SMEs	Small and medium-sized enterprises
SOCOGE	Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games
TFL	Transport for London
TMA	Team Member Agreement
TMO	Tenant management organisation
TUC	Trades Union Council
UAV	Unmanned aerial vehicles
UCATT	Union of Construction Allied Trades and Technicians
UCL	University College London
UEL	University of East London
UPPs	Pacifying police units (Brazil)
US	United States
VANOC	Vancouver Organizing Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games
WFSGI	World Federation of the Sporting Goods Industry

1. LOSS OF HABITAT AND COMMON LAND

1.1 Wildlife casualties and habitat destruction

Much of the information in this section is sourced from statements by ecology consultant Annie Chipchase, a specialist on the Lower Lea Valley, and Anne Woollett, chair of Hackney Marsh User Group (HMUG). Other sources are stated in the text.

Olympic proposals will destroy all the existing habitat, and thus the associated wildlife. Proposals to provide mitigation in terms of translocating species, and providing alternative habitat, are unlikely to be successful. Only legally protected species will be the focus of such work. The waterways of the Lower Lea provide a unique place for wildlife and people in a dense urban area. Destruction of these habitats for an elite sporting event should not be contemplated.

Annie Chipchase (2005). Statement for the No London 2012 press conference, February 14

Location of the Olympic precinct could not be worse in terms of environment in the Lower Lea Valley (LLV). The river Lea system is designated a Site of Metropolitan Importance¹ for nature conservation, and is an important passage and migration route for birds. The area also contains statutory Sites of Borough Importance: the former Eastway cycle circuit and Bully Point nature reserve, plus the Greenway and Old Ford Nature Reserve. These, with the Carpenters Road Nature Area, Arena Field and White Hart Field are Common Land and supposedly protected by legislation.

London Development Agency (LDA), London 2012 and the Mayor of London's office, backed up by a chorus of press commentary, portrayed the environment of the Lower Lea and Bow Back rivers as largely contaminated and polluted. 'Remediation will be a massive challenge. There are considerable amounts of contamination,' said Gareth Blacker, then LDA director of Olympic development (Romanowicz 2006). The environmental statement produced by masterplanners EDAW as part of the 2004 planning application described the waterways as 'corridors of dereliction'. However, local residents have long enjoyed flora and fauna among its reedbed, scrub and grassland habitats, and birdlife nesting in the very many mature trees. Annie Chipchase described London 2012 proposals as a 'kick in the teeth for the thousands of volunteers', who, for more than 25 years, had contributed much time and labour to improving habitat. Species protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), threatened by Olympic developments, included bats, common lizard, kingfisher and nationally scarce black redstart, which frequented the brownfield areas around Marshgate Lane. More common bird species frequently sighted in and around the Hackney Marshes – coot, moorhen, mallard, mute swan, green woodpecker, grey wagtail, great-crested and little grebes, dunnock, tits, sand martins and kestrel – had protection only in the nesting season.

Disuse and neglect of the brownfield areas had considerable benefit for wildlife. Waterways and associated wetlands, former industrial sites and left-over parcels of land are important habitats. Extensive areas of sparsely vegetated or open ground are especially valuable for rare and uncommon invertebrates (English Nature 2005). Development of brownfield land is a contributing factor to the extinction of vital pollinating species according to insect conservation organisation Buglife (2013). Former industrial sites may be 'the last wild habitats' in some areas.

Olympic construction destroyed all trees in the Stratford precinct and many mature trees in the former Eastway Sports Centre (for the velodrome). Construction of the land bridge to East Marsh, and coach and car park on East Marsh (too far away from the precinct area to aid disabled drivers, despite this designation on the plans), destroyed a fine row of 25 ash trees and many other trees, including pear, willows, many varieties of ash, and black poplar trees, including several 110-year-old rare native black poplar along the New Spitalfields Market edge of East Marsh (for road and parking). East Marsh was a feeding ground for gulls, starlings, green woodpeckers, thrushes and fieldfare. Arena Field, close to Wick Village and the Trowbridge Estate, has been lost permanently to a loop road, concrete batching plant, sports facilities and the media centre (see Inglis 2014: 82–83). Grassland and scrub around the former Eastway cycle circuit were also important wildlife habitat. This, with Bully

¹ Sites of Metropolitan Importance for nature conservation are those sites which contain the best examples of London's habitats, sites which contain rare species, rare assemblages of species or which are of particular significance. They have the highest priority for protection. Identification and protection of metropolitan sites is necessary not only to support London's wildlife, but also to provide opportunities for people to have contact with the natural environment. Sites of Borough Importance are significant to a local authority area; damage to these sites would represent a significant loss.

Point nature reserve and Manor Garden allotments, was flattened for a concrete pathway taking people from car and coach parks to the Olympic precinct, although hockey pitches originally planned did not materialise. White Hart Field – lost under the land bridge – was a buffer zone and wildlife corridor between Hackney Marshes, the Eastway circuit and Bully Point, and home to over 204 species of invertebrate including six Red Data Book and 17 nationally scarce invertebrates, as well as the spectacular rose chafer (*Cetonia aurata*), its much smaller relative *Trichius zonatus*, and UK BAP species, the brown-banded carder bee. Environmental impact assessment undertaken as part of the initial planning applications, published in January 2004, only covered the area to the south of the Hackney Marshes.

Olympic proposals included lowering towpaths and construction of land bridges. Chipchase suggested that the effect of the number and size of the bridges would be to virtually culvert the waterways, and shading effects would prevent regrowth of plant life, both on land and in the water. Effectively, the network of waterways has been fragmented and the habitat corridor (that is, continuity) lost. 'Proposals to landscape the bridges are ... problematic, but do not replace the river environment' Chipchase said. Many land bridges remain in place. Shading effects of the main stadium, which rises to 53m (UK Government undated), on surrounding land and waterways will be significant. Moreover, Henniker's Dyke (or more officially, Channelsea River, northern section) which flowed through the former Eastway cycle circuit and around the area formerly occupied by Bully Point nature reserve, was dammed up for construction. Katy Andrews (2006/1) of the New Lammas Lands Defence Committee (NLLDC) had obtained a verbal promise from a representative of consultancy EDAW that Henniker's Dyke would only be partly covered and then restored after the Games.

One threat to the delivery timetable is the prominence of Japanese knotweed (*Fallopia japonica*) and giant hogweed (*Heracleum mantegazzianum*) within the 312ha development area. Weed control companies warned Horticultural Week (Culf 2006) that it could take three years to bring these rampant species under control. Japanese knotweed is one of the world's 100 most invasive species, and new growth can force through asphalt and breeze blocks even after land is cleared. Giant hogweed, sprouting to more than six metres can cause burns, severe blistering, and purplish or blackened scars. Alisdair Mason of Languard Vegetation Management in Leicestershire told the magazine: 'From what I have seen, all the invasive weeds they have would fill all the landfill in the south of England.'

1.2 Loss of Common Land, historic landscape and open space

– *Lammas Lands*

Text below was taken from a statement by Katy Andrews, vice chair of NLLDC, for the No London 2012 press conference on February 14, 2005.

Hackney, Walthamstow and Leyton Marshes are former Lammas Lands. This means meadows upon which parishioners had the common right to graze cattle from Lammas Day (the Celtic Midsummer Day, August 1) following the hay harvest, until Lady Day (old New Year's Day, March 25). These rights date back to before the Norman Conquest, and possibly predate the Roman era. Following the arrival of the railways in Hackney during the 1840s, Lammas Grazing Rights declined in economic importance and by the 1880s were little used in Hackney and Leyton, except on Hackney Downs (where an attempt at stopping commoners grazing led to a fierce pitched battle). Lammas Lands on Hackney Marshes were subsequently purchased by the Settlement of St Mary Eton, in about 1890. The Settlement had been prompted by a manifestation ... of the Blessed Virgin Mary at Eton College. [It was founded] to benefit the poor children of the area ... and [resulted in] the setting up of what became ... Eton Manor Athletics Club. This was also the start of amateur football and other team sports being played on Hackney Marshes. In June 1894, the new Parish of Hackney Marsh was established, and Eton Manor gave the marshes to the people of Hackney in perpetuity for recreational use as open space. Eton Manor settlement also acquired some adjacent land in Leyton, [later] occupied by the Eastway Sports Centre, and Eton Manor became active in Leyton as well as Hackney Wick. Eton Manor Athletics Club still exists and [prior to the Olympic developments was] based at Eton Manor Cottage in Marsh Lane, Leyton. The original sports grounds on Ruckolt Road were subsequently purchased by the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA), set up in 1967. All of the former Lammas Lands of Hackney and Walthamstow Marshes fall within the Lee Valley Regional Park. Most of Leyton's former Lammas Lands (except Seymour Fields, owned by the London Borough of Waltham Forest [LBWF]) are also within the regional park's boundaries. All of these areas are designated as Metropolitan Open Space. Since the regional park was established, Hackney Marshes (although not Leyton or Walthamstow Marshes) have been registered as Common Land under the 1965 Act. This includes Arena Field, East Marsh and White Hart Triangle.

– *Exchange land (Hackney Marshes)*

Why did London 2012 say they would not take any of the marshes, when, in fact, they have? And they are taking more at the moment. It's scandalous.

Laurie Wortley, local environmental campaigner; vice chair, New Lammas Lands Defence Committee

Grampian conditions attached to the planning applications stated that LDA must provide exchange land for Common Land and open space taken up by Olympic developments, a procedure required under the Acquisition of Land Act 1981. However, NLLDC were told by Hackney council cabinet member for regeneration, Guy Nicholson, at the end of 2005, that planners were defaulting on this obligation. A clause was inserted in the London Olympic and Paralympic Games Bill 2005 to remove this imperative (Andrews 2006/2), and confirmed by the LDA in January 2006 (Woollett 2005). However, Anne Woollett has argued that LDA were still legally

obliged to find exchange land for areas taken, noting also: 'It appears that [they] have simply lobbied to legislate away their own statutory obligations.' There are fears that this seizure of Common Land has set legal precedent. Refusal to provide exchange land has impacted particularly on the footballers of the Hackney and Leyton Sunday League (see §2.4).

- No exchange land was offered for redevelopment of a former maintenance depot on Homerton Road E9, deemed necessary as a replacement site for Travellers formerly resident at Waterden Crescent and displaced by the Olympic precinct proposals. The depot was designated as Common Land as it had been built specifically for council operations on Hackney Marshes. In contesting the planning application, HMUG, which runs a tree nursery next to the site, pointed to statutory designation of the site as Metropolitan Open Space, its siting on a flood plain, and to habitat value, including destruction of mature trees (HMUG 2006).
- LDA commandeered open land to the south of Marsh Lane E10, to resite Manor Garden allotments on a temporary basis (see §2.1). Marsh Lane Fields were once Lammas Lands and purchased in 1899 by the Great Eastern Railway Company after several years of negotiation with (the historic) Leyton Lammas Lands Defence Committee on behalf of the Commoners of Leyton (Andrews 2006/3). The relocation was highly contested by residents local to Marsh Lane who complained of lack of consultation over decontamination work, and pointed the land out as a dump for second world war bomb rubble and, thus, inappropriate for vegetable growing. In 2014, in a surprise manoeuvre by London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) and Waltham Forest council, the allotment site at Marsh Lane Fields was made permanent with preferential plot allocation to new residents of the Olympic park. Campaigners regard this implicit change in planning conditions as 'possibly unlawful' (personal conversation 2015).

– *Greenwich Park*

Text below is taken from a leaflet (published January 7, 2010) by No to Greenwich Olympic Equestrian Events (NOGOE), formed in 2008.

We are told that English Heritage and the Royal Parks would not allow any activities that would put the buried historical environment of the park in jeopardy, but we are not convinced that they have the power to prevent them. They appear to have settled for a series of compromises, [for example, in] the route for the equestrian cross-country event. This crosses the area between the Roman temple and flower gardens three times, although both the London Organising Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG) and English Heritage are aware that there is evidence of Roman structures lying immediately under the turf. The potential for further accidental discovery of buried features is high, and ground disturbance may bring further evidence to light. Indeed NOGOE is aware of an area where structural remains are being revealed by ordinary erosion, proving that anything can turn up at any time ... We are unconvinced by promises that the turf will be strengthened to prevent penetration since this is dry acid grassland and has protected status. It encourages biodiversity and the government is signed up to enhancing biodiversity in London. Attempts to strengthen it by irrigation, as is being proposed, are likely to result in its deterioration. Greenwich Park contains one of the last remnants in the borough of this once widespread natural grassland which cannot be reinstated once damaged. The C6–C7 Saxon barrows on the western side of the park have been skirted by the cross-country route but no provision has been made to secure them from erosion under the feet of massed spectators. This is another area of rare acid grassland that should be protected from fertilisation or undue irrigation and cannot therefore be 'strengthened'. Both Roman and Saxon sites are important enough to have Scheduled Ancient Monument status and deserve the highest levels of protection.

Danger posed by the underground conduits: The conduits or tunnels under the park were built in the early C18, but there is also likelihood of earlier Tudor and medieval conduits. LOCOG says that it is aware of the conduits and [that] the course [is being] designed around them. Dr Per von Scheibner probably knows more than anybody else about these tunnels. He has studied the tunnels, and (15 years ago) entered them] using access points which are only lightly covered over. His conclusion is: 'They're pushing their luck.' The weight of a horse and rider landing on two legs is similar to driving a pole into the ground. [Von Scheibner] says the [most] important [question] is that no one knows where all the conduits are nor where the air shafts (access points) are. So how can a track be designed around them? Is this scaremongering? It's quite possible that there may be no access points on the cross-country course, but the jumps pose a special danger from the exceptionally high density of foot traffic gathering around them. NOGOE feels that, although no holes in the ground have emerged within the park, there is a history of this activity in adjacent roads (Blackheath Hill, Crooms Hill), and [while they] might only pose a small risk to public safety ..., along with other risks mentioned, the choice of an Olympic venue should not be based on chance ...

NOGOE has been in correspondence with the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) about the fact that Royal Parks has no legal right to close Greenwich Park for these events. LOCOG is also proposing to use Circus Field on Blackheath for stabling, training and services. Building a compound on Blackheath would be unlawful, as two NOGOE supporters have claimed since they discovered the existence of the Metropolitan Commons Act 1866 and the Scheme for Blackheath under the Metropolitan Supplemental Act 1871, prohibiting any enclosure to be allowed or entertained. LOCOG has stated that they are seeking the necessary permissions. But how can one obtain permission to do something unlawful?

In a press release the following month, NOGOE (2010/2) pointed out that closures of the park would be worse than expected: reinstatement of acid grassland would lead to areas being fenced off for five years, while the area of the 23,000-seat stadium would be closed for a further two years, and the cross-country track for two-and-a-

half years. They suggested that the secretary of state did not have the authority to make such closures. Regarding alternative sites, they noted that Windsor in Berkshire had been considered but not visited, and charged that LOCOG had made misleading statements on this issue.

Daily Telegraph (Rayner 2012) suggested that parts of Greenwich Park (45 acres according to LOCOG) were liable to be closed until summer 2013, thus missing the end-of-2012 deadline. Queen's Field remained a fenced-off mud bath, and a habitat conservation area in the park was also damaged. Roots of 'ancient' sweet chestnut trees may also have been affected. Local residents told the paper that LOCOG had employed too few staff to return grasslands before the winter. Circus Field in Blackheath (described by the paper as resembling 'a battlefield') lost a wildflower meadow on acid grassland. NOGOE charged that ecosystems in both Greenwich Park and Blackheath had been damaged irrevocably. LOCOG had hoped to complete rehabilitation work by spring 2013.

NOGOE also funded the video Saving Greenwich Park, available to view on YouTube.

(1) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VcxOZ1ZWVZY>, (2) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t2R9MsyVy0Q>

– *Wanstead Flats*

Plans by the Metropolitan Police to site a temporary security enclosure on Wanstead Flats, part of Epping Forest, were leaked to the Evening Standard in June 2010 (Blowe 2012/1). The Muster, Deployment and Briefing Centre was erected for three months in 2012 around the Olympic event (ibid 2010/1). Construction required amendment of the Epping Forest Act 1878, which mandates City of London Corporation as 'conservators' to 'at all times keep Epping Forest unenclosed and unbuilt on as an open space for the recreation and enjoyment of the people'. The Act was passed after battles over grazing rights (ibid 2010/2). Campaigners against the planning application noted 'a dangerous precedent' in the proposals for future enclosure of Wanstead Flats (ibid 2010/1). The amendment to the 1878 Act – known as the Legislative Reform Order (LRO) – was passed with little debate in August 2011 under the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act (LRRRA), enabling legislation dating from 2006 (ibid 2012/1). The LRRRA itself has been criticised for arbitrary powers inhibiting parliamentary scrutiny (ibid 2011/1). Kevin Blowe of Newham Monitoring Project (NMP), one of the instigators of Save Wanstead Flats Campaign, unearthed statements from lawyers for the Met who suggested that undertakings made under the LRRRA are only enforceable in parliamentary process not in 'the world at large'. At the time of passing, the government stated that it did not intend the LRRRA to be used to force through controversial legislation. Blowe commented (ibid):

And when, you may also wonder, is a 'clear undertaking' by the government to resist using powers in controversial circumstances not really an undertaking? As far as the Metropolitan Police's lawyers are concerned, when an issue is challenged by members of the public. So much for the government's 'localism' rhetoric ... As for [the] second statement by the Met's lawyers, it's simply: the LRRRA was allegedly designed to 'remove or reduce burdens' – but there is absolutely nothing in it about these burdens needing any constitutional significance. Key to this case is the requirement that ministers consult widely before making an LRO – and Dr Pelling and ... Save Wanstead Flats Campaign argue that the consultation was ... misleading, based upon a reading of the Epping Forest Act that even the Home Office admits was flawed. What this case has shown is the real dangers of using ... draconian legislation like the [LRRRA] to drive through decisions simply for the sake of convenience – especially when it involves a prestige government project like [London 2012].

Save Wanstead Flats Campaign was set up to contest the planning application in July 2010, with another public meeting in October (ibid 2010/3, 2012/1), after which the campaign 'issued a 'pre-action' warning to home secretary Theresa May, reserving the right to take legal action by way of judicial review. Residents were given three months in September that year to comment on the LRO. In July 2011, local resident, Dr Michel Pelling, started proceedings for judicial review of the amendment, with the campaign backing him up as 'interested party'. This was turned down initially in October 2011, with (Blowe reports) spurious arguments on transparency of the planning application. On December 5, 2011, leave to present the case was refused (ibid 2012/1).

Institutional response to local controversy was swift but muted. Blowe reported the launch of a media offensive by police as early as August 2010, and appointment of public relations consultants (ibid 2010/4). Official consultation on the planning application itself ran for a mere six weeks and the authorities also toured a public exhibition around Wanstead and Leytonstone (but not Forest Gate). Metropolitan Police spent £50,000 on their publicity campaign trying to justify their enclosure of the Flats (Olympic Borough blog cited by Dowding 2010).

The campaign predicted the arrival of 'thousands of police officers, 375 vehicles, around 54 horses', police dogs, 'chaos on the roads and friction with local people' (Blowe 2010/1). Blowe (2010/3) touted the possibility of police holding cells in the base, and later, up to 3,500 police personnel 'on the busiest days of the Games' (ibid 2012/2). City of London Corporation proposed to charge the Met a mere £170,000 rent for (now) four months use of the Flats (ibid 2011/2). The Met clarified its requirement – for 90 days – in September 2011 (ibid 2011/4). Information on the Met's proposals was sparse, and Blowe hints that disinformation was posted by others on the campaign's Facebook page, itself monitored by the police (ibid).

Redbridge council passed the application in December 2011 'with little consideration for objections' and stated that any survey to find alternative sites would have been outside of its remit (ibid 2011/3). Neighbouring local authorities Newham and Waltham Forest objected to the Metropolitan Police proposals. The campaign had collected 1,800 signatures in opposition.

Kevin Blowe's photography documenting construction of the muster base (Blowe 2012/3, 2012/4) has an eerie quality, the functional 'boxes' housing facilities are clinical (hygienic) and the space of the enclosure itself is empty of human presence. There is evidence of groundwater saturation after the event as late as November 2012 (Blowe 2012/5, 2012/6). For more detail, see Random Blowe: <http://www.blowe.org.uk>.

Save Leyton Marsh campaign and former activists of London Occupy! protested the construction of temporary basketball courts on this section of marshland (north of Leabridge Road) from January 2012. Activists suffered severe intimidation, prosecution, disproportionate fines and legal costs awarded against them. Several spent time in jail. In this edited version of her 2013 essay 'One year since the "reinstatement" of Leyton Marsh', campaigner Caroline Day details this intensive and traumatising experience. The full text can be found at: <https://saveleytonmarsh.wordpress.com/2013/11/03/one-year-on-since-the-reinstatement-of-leyton-marsh>

[T]he struggle to save Leyton Marsh [began] with [a] mass photo protest taking place before excavation, locals linking arms around the fences and decorating them with a huge 'NO' sign ... A local campaign group had formed in the run-up to the planning committee meeting. At first the focus was on taking out an injunction but ... this was abandoned on the basis of legal advice about potential costs ... We staged weekly protests – more accurately, soggy picnics – as the extent of the impending destruction was being revealed. Even if construction was inevitable, we wanted to make our opposition to destruction of the marsh as vocal as possible. One brave local resident, an ... artist called Jane, whose beautiful illustrations of the marshes decorated our newly established website, began stopping lorries coming on to the marsh alone and inspired many others to do the same. Games of boules were played by locals, early in the morning, on the sandy path leading to the marsh, disrupting and delaying the lorries headed for the site for hours at a time ...

Locals posted their views and memories of the marshes along the fences surrounding the compound swallowing most of Leyton Marsh [now silent] ... One of the most touching ... was from a mother recording days with her children [by] how many herons they had seen ... Newspaper cuttings about our campaign were laminated and placed alongside banners created by locals and campers ... Our community support camp was well supported ... many ... came by with supplies and warm words of encouragement, including local councillors. [By now,] the lorries had ceased even coming to the marsh ...

Early one morning, the camp was paid a visit by Chris Allison, in charge of 'counter terrorism' at the Olympics, and Robert Reed, chief civil servant. They didn't deign to talk to us, much like LVRPA who had offered the land for development, and the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) who had [also] refused any kind of dialogue with us. We knew that despite their reticence to talk to us, significant people in powerful state organisations were observing our protest and had plans for stopping it.

These plans manifested themselves rudely one night, delivered by a court official to a lone camper ... while we were busy planning an Easter activity day ... A double injunction, one for possession of the land against the camp, and the other against [us] halting works ... In a way the first injunction, the possession order, had been expected. However, the second injunction had a nasty sting, since ... a claim for £335,000 costs [was attached] for two weeks [of] stoppages on site against 'persons unknown'. Well-versed activists knew it was an attempt to scare locals from further protest. The figure, substantially higher than the total £135,000 paid to LVRPA [by the ODA as land] rent ... represented the average house price of a property in London. Little did we know that this financial intimidation, supported and rubberstamped by the state, would continue to pursue us ...

[W]e became familiar to the high courts. The possession order was heard within 48 hours, giving the campaign no time to seek and acquire any legal representation, and the judge declaring shamelessly that he had Olympic basketball tickets! It was issued on the Orwellian basis that the camp, well supported by [those] locked out of ... Leyton Marsh by the 'development', was causing inconvenience and disruption to the public right of way! [Easter holidays were followed by] eviction and I remember it vividly as a strange mixture of brutality and hilarity ... I stood by, uncharacteristically ... mute ... a legal observer (... not [wishing to] lose my house ...), other colourful characters performed ... mischievous and yet ... important act[s] of dissent ... Rob offered us ginger nut biscuits as he was carried off to the edge of the possession order zone ... Jason quipped in his gentle scouse accent for ... bailiffs to observe health and safety as he tapped on a stringless guitar. [Again and again], campers were carried ... off site, only to run back onto the marshes again ... Local resident Rowena sang 'A Change is Gonna Come' beautifully at the last standing tent before crawling under a stationary lorry ... Some of the group got inside the compound ... and sat upon diggers, [talking] to workers about ... health and safety hazards and held up banners about ... toxic material stored on site. The morning was one of high theatre but it came with a serious price tag ...

[F]our people were arrested for the 'crime' of sitting with their backs to a lorry attempting to deliver concrete ... They were fast-tracked to ... court ... Three of them pleaded guilty ... Another protestor, Connor, who pleaded 'not guilty' was given conditional bail ... He was banned from an area within a one-mile radius of Leyton Marsh. By this time ... construction work had accelerated and ... concrete foundations for the temporary building were being laid ...

On release from jail, Simon Moore was presented with the first Olympic anti-social behaviour order (ASBO) prohibiting him from protest at the Olympics: a draconian blanket ban on pretty much the [entirety of] east London ... Bailiffs were now permanently stationed on the Leyton Marsh site, along with violent police dogs ... The second hearing of the injunction was, to all appearances, more 'civil' than the acrimonious affair of the possession order, but the outcome was not. Rowena Johnson, the local resident who had taken part in good-humoured and theatrical dissent on the day of the eviction, was added to the costly injunction proceedings despite [neither] being part of the campaign group [nor] arrested, [and] complying with the police when they had asked her to move from underneath the lorry. After a shameful piece of 'stitch-up journalism' in the Evening Standard, Rowena [was forced] to hire an expensive lawyer to defend herself against [an] injunction that ... could [have] result[ed] in the loss of her family home. The agreement she came to with ODA to avoid this ... cost this single mother thousands of pounds and her

freedom of speech. Due to the gagging order, our campaign was unable to broadcast the injustice [against] her during the [entire Games timeframe], and she was intimidated into keeping apart from ... people who would have supported her most.

The feeling of repression [was pervasive]. Visitors ... were filmed by ... bulky men in fluorescent ... suits, who often hid their faces. Helicopters circled over the site regularly, including military Chinooks ... A low point came with the arrest of Mike Wells, a journalist from the Games Monitor website, who was ... on the marsh filming *London Takes Gold*, an alternative narrative about the consequences of the Olympics. [Mike was] attacked and injured by an excavator driver ... physically restrained, dragged to a police van and arrested. [We] tried frantically to track Mike down and, at first, all local police stations denied his [incarceration] ... [Later, at] his bail hearing ... [the prosecution] declared ... falsehoods about his activities and arrest, claiming [that] he had been part of a 'violent orchestrated protest' and ... had breached an injunction banning him from the Lea Valley area ... Mike ... had spent months documenting the effects of the Olympics, [after he was] evicted from ... Clays Lane estate to make way for the Olympic park. [T]he injunction [had not, in fact, named Mike] and only covered the stopping of works on site ... Mike was denied bail ...

Meanwhile, rain became ceaseless, the camp dwindled, exposure to traffic was relentless for the remaining ... campers and [there were] ugly spy rumours ... on the internet ...

[T]he very first Occupy banner to find its home on our marsh declared 'This is just the beginning' and we were to discover the prescience of that statement. During a brief burst of summer sunshine, we ... protested successfully ... to get the asbestos-contaminated waste removed from site, after collecting [another] petition of 1000 signatures[, this time] including legendary Olympic athlete, John Carlos, who declared 'If it's right, I'll sign it' and was true to his word ... Determined to squeeze some actual beneficial legacy from the ODA, I wrote requesting that they ... invest in local [basketball] courts in parks in ... Hackney and Waltham Forest. We recruited the help of British basketball athlete Carl Miller and asked if the ODA would visit the courts to offer legacy. I was unceremoniously 'uninvited' from this meeting that I [had] arranged! ...

[T]he campaign had transformed from a local environmental issue into [one] asserting its very right to exist [free] from state repression. It was in this context [that] we organised a ... meeting to Defend the Right to Protest, [headlining] those who had been victimised in [the policing of] protest or were representing victims of harsh policing of [dissent]. The meeting gave renewed vision and vigour to our campaign, contextualising it within the wider struggle to maintain our right to peaceful resistance to decisions so detrimental to our livelihoods and freedoms ...

As the Olympics drew nearer and cheerleading for the event reached fever pitch, the sense of enclosure and restriction for those of us left on the outside, grew ever larger. In the nights leading up to the Olympic opening, many of us became insomniacs, driven to distraction by relentless circling helicopters. Dreaming of exploding tower blocks and ... sinister Wenlocks [with Mandeville, one of the London 2012 mascots], I would wake in a frenzy wondering if, like the retired graffiti artists, I would be arrested in an ill-conceived pre-emptive raid. I gave a rousing speech about our struggle at our alternative Counter Olympic torch relay and bravely escaped into the country the very next day ...

[P]osters for [our campaign benefit were] torn down by council officials. The promoter [received] a call from the police and [was] told to expect police presence on the night ... [T]he entire proceeds (plus many loans and donations from generous ordinary locals in the campaign) all went to paying ODA costs ... (our punishment for taking out a judicial review against Waltham Forest council for the decision to build on protected Metropolitan Open Land). We are not allowed to disclose the amounts involved in this offer we were forced into making while facing a colossal £24,000 bill for a case that the judge didn't even allow to proceed to a hearing ...

Recently we were named by local blogger, Archipelago of Truth, as 'campaign of the year 2012', (to quote) 'not for anything we achieved but for being right'. In a sense this was true, we [had] lost the battle to stop the [basketball] courts being [constructed], lost all our legal challenges, were subject to unwarranted surveillance and punishment without viable redress. Yet we had been proven right about the whole ill-conceived project. The LVRPA and ODA, in response to our protests, had repeatedly claimed that the land would be restored to 'its original condition by October 15' and this was also the [original planning] condition ... granting permission ... The land was not restored to public use until mid November and even then it was a shambolic mess; recycled construction waste replaced the original soil and monoculture turf was laid on top of compacted topsoil ...

- Drapers Field

Drapers Field in Leyton, a recreational area with children's sports facilities, was covered in tarmac for 'back of house' facilities to supply the athlete's village. Local school governor, Stephen Pierpoint, commented: 'It's an amazing contradiction that in trying to promote sports they are preventing our pupils from playing sports' (Cheyne 2010/1). Since the event, the park has been returned to young people's recreational use.

2. CLEARANCE OF SETTLEMENTS, FIRMS AND LOCAL SPORT

2.1 Population displacements

Previous Olympic developments have produced a 'gentrification' effect on the housing market in areas surrounding Games locations. This is caused by anticipated and actual improvements to those areas arising from massive infrastructural investments ... In east London it is those who live, often in overcrowded privately rented accommodation under short-let tenancies, who are most vulnerable. With rents rising in a boom market they are likely to experience rent increases above the average for London and/or be given notice by landlords seeking to profit from property values rising faster than regional rates. This population already has an annual 'churn' rate of 40 per cent ... I am not aware of the LDA having in place policies to monitor or ameliorate the effects of this gentrification during planning and construction phases ... Possibility of ... displacement of poorer tenants [renting privately] needs to be properly evaluated and addressed at the earliest opportunity to avoid us all becoming spectators of [this] downward pressure ... which occurred [also] in Beijing, Athens, Sydney, Atlanta and Barcelona.

Martin Slavin (2006). 'Probable impacts of the Lower Lea Valley developments (particularly the Olympic phase) on tenants in privately rented accommodation', statement to the Olympic planning inquiry, September 25

– Homelessness

In 2009, bylaw enforcement measures used in London included issuing ASBOs to homeless persons (with threat of prison for contravention), designation of dispersal zones, and the practice of 'wetting down' doorways in the City of London through the Corporation's Operation Poncho (begun in April 2008), run in partnership with the police and homelessness charity Broadway (Conway 2009). Umbrella group Housing Justice was concerned that these methods were becoming more prevalent and would drive the homeless out of London and away from services (Community Care 2009). Around the same time, there was also a drive to prohibit the homeless sleeping on London's bendy buses. Games Monitor expected a rise in criminalisation of the homeless in the run-up to London 2012 and generic use of more informal techniques to prohibit rough sleeping. However, homelessness charities have been more optimistic (see Swain 2012). Director of projects at Housing Justice, Alastair Murray, commented: 'There was a political priority to end homelessness in London for the Olympics, led by the Mayor of London [who] introduc[ed] the [initiative] No Second Night Out (NSNO). Contrary to the fears of activists this did not involve arresting everyone who was street homeless and putting them in camps outside London (as had happened in previous cities including Beijing) but it did involve greater investment in outreach and helping people off the streets. NSNO helps coordinate borough outreach and is a useful extra resource in London and now around the country' (by email 2015). However, the Guardian (Cook 2012) reported Waltham Forest council securing 'bed spaces in Doncaster and Peterborough due to "lack of hotels and other temporary accommodation" in London'. LBWF responded that they would 'move people out of this ... and [back] into ... Waltham Forest as soon as possible'.

Local authorities engaged in what has been termed 'creative compliance'; that is, adjusting criteria to reduce statutory responsibilities. In February 2010, Inside Housing reported that the London Delivery Board, set up to eradicate rough sleeping in the capital by 2012 (specifically ahead of the Games), was considering redefinition of the term 'rough sleeping' in order to meet its targets (Twinch 2010). This 'could see some rough sleepers left out of the figure used to track progress towards the target – although street counts w[ould] still record every homeless person [found]'. During the Games, there was a nuance of stigma. The Guardian quoted (Cook *ibid*) Thames Reach 'worrying' about a rise in people soliciting money. The charity told the paper that 'there have been reports of Roma gangs organising family members to beg on streets'. Camden council underlined the negative rationality of their preparations (homeless persons as potential public nuisance): "'Our planning is based on a possible increase in street activity, which includes begging, street drinking, street-based drug activity, street-based sex-working as well as rough sleeping due to the higher footfall in the borough expected during the Olympic period,'" their press office told the paper.

NMP's Kevin Blowe and Estelle du Boulay (2013: 12) reported harassment of homeless persons in and around Stratford during the Games. Incidents involved, variously, the Metropolitan Police's mobile public order unit, the Territorial Support Group, seizure of sleeping bag and possessions by Transport for London (TFL) security, the arrest of a homeless person who had been assaulted, and police refusing to assist a homeless person who had collapsed (leaving NMP's volunteer legal observers to help the person access shelter).

In December 2004, LDA promised Clays Lane caravan site residents, who define themselves as Romany Gypsies, that new land for their homes would be identified by the following June. The final relocation site was described by spokesperson Tracie Giles as making them feel 'like animals in a zoo' (Campbell 2007). Residents moved in October 2007 after much prevarication and 12 postponements of removal. In April that year, families living on sites at both Clays Lane in Newham and Waterden Road in Hackney had gone to the high court to challenge a decision made in December 2006 by Alistair Darling (then secretary of state for trade and industry) to confirm the LDA compulsory purchase order (CPO). Lawyers for Lisa Smith, Mary and Julia Reilly contested the decision under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 which provides for a right to private and family life. Sadly, they lost the case (timescale of Olympic developments took priority), although the judge said that ordering the families to move to new sites involved a 'very significant interference' with their human rights. Some 15 families lived on the Clays Lane site and another 20 Irish Traveller families were based at Waterden Crescent. Debby Kennett of the London Gypsy and Traveller Unit (LGTU) which supported the families, said that LDA had refused to give an undertaking not to evict residents unless there were alternative sites to go to. 'It is disappointing that the families have been left in a position of enormous insecurity while the LDA timetable for providing alternative sites is continually slipping and slipping,' she said (Williams 2007). Demolition of Clays Lane Peabody Estate began while the families on the caravan site were still living across the road, causing significant dust, despite a commitment that contractors would not start work until everyone had moved. Several residents reported suffering later from asthma (see also §3.1). LDA claimed that the agreement only applied to demolition of the former University of East London (UEL) tower blocks (known as Park Village estate). Newham mayor, Sir Robin Wales, wrote to Gareth Blacker (LDA director of Olympic development) to complain about the way the families had been treated (Brown 2007).

We are 15 Traveller families, tenants of the Newham council-run site for 40 years. We live where the Olympic village is being built. Over two years ago, we heard we would have to be relocated. Since then, our lives have been made hell. We have been a political football between the [London] mayor, the LDA, ODA, and Newham council. We believe that if we lived in bricks and mortar we would not have been treated in this way. We support the Olympics and last year we were looking forward to a new site to be built by the LDA on land they promised us. But then they withdrew it for political reasons, which we believe was to do with the real value of the land, and instead, with Newham council, [they decided] to build our [new] site on a children's park. With local people we fought to save the park for families and even went to the high court but we lost. While waiting for the new site to be built we have, since February, been living on the biggest building site in Europe. Only feet [away] from our homes there is demolition, noise, heavy traffic and dust, and the impact is unbearable. LDA said it would move us to the new site at the end of July. But since then they have changed that date 12 times. We've been living out of packing cases for two months. Our mail has stopped, our phones are cut off, the street lights are gone and now we have an infestation of rats due to the demolition. Yesterday, the ODA brought the largest piece of machinery in the UK through our site road, ready to demolish tower blocks just behind us. They said the blocks won't come down while we are here. With all the power and money the Olympics has, we find it shocking how we have been treated.

Tracie Giles (2007). 'The Olympics have made our life hell', letter to Guardian, September 29

Later, Tracie Giles told the Guardian (Barkham 2007) that the new site at Parkway Crescent was still under construction when they were forced to move in, with 'flooded bathrooms and kitchens, and patio doors hanging off. It's ridiculous. The amount of pressure we've been under to be ready to move and they have moved us to a site that wasn't ready'. Initially, residents of the Clays Lane caravan site were offered only one relocation option, at Jenkins Lane, Barking, near a giant sewage works, gas works and perilously close to the Thames. This location was refused by at least one company also displaced by London 2012 (Bedrock). LDA also suggested as prospective relocation site a car park under a flyover in Beckton (LGTU 2006), reminiscent of 'apartheid-style' statutory provision accorded Gypsy and Traveller settlements in the past.

Irish Travellers at Waterden Crescent were relocated to sites on Homerton Road, Wallis Road and Millfields Road (next to a waste transfer station), all within the London Borough of Hackney boundary (LDA 2007) (see §3.2 for further developments at the Millfields Road site).

– Clays Lane estate

The statement below was written in March 2008 by Julian Cheyne, former resident of the Clays Lane Peabody Estate (previously a self-governing housing co-operative).

Clays Lane was closed on July 23, 2007. During the last couple of weeks there were still about 50 of the original 425 residents on the estate. In the final days politicians complained that residents were holding up the relocation programme. In reality, some residents were only offered housing during the last two weeks, even though they had been engaging with the programme for months, some for more than a year. Other residents were trying to sort out problems with their new homes which delayed their moves. A few had to go into emergency accommodation for several weeks, including staying in hotels and hostels. Those in hostels had to make several further moves. About 25 residents were put into temporary accommodation, including those who had already made emergency moves, and those residents are now slowly finding their final places. Most of those in this group are still in temporary accommodation.

Clays Lane residents were first approached by LDA during the autumn of 2003 to discuss their possible relocation. One of the ideas put forward was for residents to move as part of a community. A survey was conducted by Fluid [architects] in August 2004. Residents were then asked if they would like to make

a community move and by extrapolation it was determined that about half ... around 200 people, would be interested in such a move. In the event nothing was done to prepare for this until the spring of 2006.

By that time, people were already being relocated and it was apparent [that] a community move would involve two moves. A project of this complexity needed time and resources if it was to work, and LDA simply failed to do what was required. Two small groups are still negotiating for group moves but the one which has been trying to make such a move in London has found that costs, planning restrictions and the lack of suitable sites have made this extremely difficult. After over a year and a half of negotiation only one viable site has so far been proposed and that was next to a four-lane highway. So far [there has been no group move] although some have ended up living on the same estate.

Sustaining communities was supposed to be a goal of the LDA. The LDA spent a lot of time dismissing Clays Lane's amenities and housing. We were assured the housing we would move to would be of higher quality than at Clays Lane. For some that has been the case, others have moved into damp and poorly maintained properties. Housing at Clays Lane was perfectly sound, but LDA insisted it was of low quality even though the estate was only 25 years old. As CBHA (a Peabody subsidiary, managing the estate) predicted, there have been winners and losers! Clays Lane residents had the use of a community centre, free car parking, two day and night buses, and a large semi-wild open space at the Eastway. Nearest shops were about eight minutes walk away. Stratford shopping centre was a short bus ride, and the nearest tube at Leyton under 15 minutes walk. None of this impressed the LDA. During the CPO inquiry the LDA tried to claim, on the basis of the Fluid survey, that very few were concerned about the loss of access to a green space. Indeed, LDA said residents were 'isolated' by this green space. The survey results were deliberately misrepresented. In fact, over 75 per cent had expressed concern about living next to a green space. Many residents have not received amenities to match those at Clays Lane.

Most Clays Lane residents were living in shared [housing] and most of them were happy to be offered a flat in exchange, which was why LDA was confident most residents would be better off in terms of space. However, 50 residents already had flats or bungalows, and for these there has been little or no improvement in housing. Some are worse off and now have smaller flats. Despite being told that they could choose where they wanted to live, many residents found they were unable to find homes in their preferred locations and were told to broaden their search areas often ending up in completely unexpected places.

Clays Lane was a very inexpensive place to live with low rents, cheap energy and plentiful heating, and hot water from community boilers. Council tax was included in the rent. Most residents are at least £30 a week worse off, some much more, and many in low paid jobs or on benefits are now struggling with dramatically increased rents and bills. LDA offered £1,555 to mitigate these increased housing costs. This was supposed to be spread over three years. In most cases this has already been spent. Total compensation offered was £8,500, which included a £4,000 home-loss payment which is not expected to be used for relocation costs. [A sum of] £320 was offered for loss of amenities after LDA finally acknowledged residents' feelings on this score[, and] £2,625 was allocated for disturbance costs. In reality, most have spent more than this on refurbishing their flats, buying furniture, carpeting, white goods, etc. Attempts to point out the inadequacy of compensation were simply dismissed. More recently, we have heard that LDA is now considering claims for those who have overspent on disturbance costs and has settled a couple [of claims].

One group of tenants, who had 'no access to public funds' and were not eligible for local authority housing, were told by CBHA and Peabody Housing Trust, our landlords, that they had no right to be rehoused in any social housing. We believe this group may have numbered around 70-80 people and an unknown number, who were misled by this, moved into private accommodation. It has since been discovered that some are now impoverished and attempts have been made to follow them up and offer them housing. Peabody had, and still has, a legal obligation to rehouse these tenants. Other housing associations could also provide them with accommodation. The 'rescue' programme seems to be proceeding rather slowly.

LDA had set out a series of timelines for the relocation programme in the Fluid report, all of which it missed. It was supposed to create a rehousing alliance of housing providers, starting in the autumn of 2004. In fact this only met for the first time in July 2005 and then fell apart. Arrangements for rehousing seem to have been made with individual housing associations as the programme got under way ... Poor preparation [meant] almost no help was available for those who wanted to move to more distant parts of London or to other parts of the country, even though this had been promised. Tenants were often told they had to sort this out for themselves and, unsurprisingly, those moving out of London usually ended up in private accommodation. Even moves to boroughs like Barnet have proved to be extremely difficult and ... residents [have been forced] to make temporary moves while further opportunities are sought.

According to the Fluid survey, Clays Lane had certain unique features. It was a very sociable community and provided a network of support for a variety of people who were described as 'vulnerable'. The interviewers noted how the courtyard layout had facilitated social interaction and included discussion of how this could be replicated in a future community move in their report. The estate had been established to provide housing for single, sometimes homeless, people, a valuable resource which has now been lost. It was a very diverse community. We counted over 40 different nationalities present at Clays Lane. Creating diversity was supposed to be a key goal of the LDA but in our case the maintenance of such a community was just a nuisance. Concerns were expressed by residents for the vulnerable members ... and they remain. Residents have lost their community, and it is a frequent complaint that they are now isolated and lonely in their new homes. Interestingly, it was the LDA's contention that the community was isolated from neighbouring areas which was used to justify the demolition of the estate and [destroy] the community. It wasn't true then but they have made it so now!

Extraordinarily the [former] chief executive of the LDA, Manny Lewis, was reported, in an interview in the Voice in September 2007, as saying that residents had been rehoused in three blocks of purpose-built flats.

Who knows what he was talking about! It is an indication of the lack of care or proper oversight that the head of the organisation responsible for our relocation could make such a demonstrably false statement.

Update from Julian Cheyne (posted on Games Monitor, June 8, 2010).

Clays Lane Former Tenants Association discovered, to its astonishment, that LDA had deducted money from compensation paid to 40 tenants relocated under the Olympic CPO. Eleven of these had received no [money] at all. During the relocation, tenants were told that all those [forced to move] would receive full compensation, although rent arrears could be deducted by agreement. These newly discovered deductions were made in individual discussions with housing officers. Other tenants and their advisors were unaware [of this practice], and it seems that these tenants were unaware that they were getting less compensation than others.

In freedom of information (FOI) responses, the LDA has agreed that there was no policy allowing for deductions and [that there had been] no consultation ... with tenants or their advisors. Apart from those tenants who received no compensation, deductions, not including arrears, vary from a ridiculous £3 to an extraordinary £2,200. LDA claims that most deductions arose from storage or relocation costs, but has provided no details, and this explanation certainly does not cover the more substantial deductions. It has said that tenants could have complained if they were unhappy, although this is a classic Catch 22, given that these tenants do not seem to have received any support or information about their rights when confronted with these demands from housing officers and no one else knew this was happening.

Compensation packages for compulsory purchase are made up of statutory payments, to cover home loss, and other negotiated or discretionary [sums], to cover disturbance and other costs. In response to one tenant, who has since complained about the deductions from his compensation, LDA claimed that 'discretionary' meant that it was entitled to make whatever payment it wanted to whom it wanted. However, this is not what discretionary meant in this context. It simply meant 'not statutory'. These payments are agreed after negotiation but apply across the board [after that]. At no time were tenants told that they would be subject to these deductions. In the minutes of a staff meeting held in September 2006, also obtained through an FOI request, the LDA's lead officer told staff administering the relocation that 'all tenants leaving the estate should be paid the full compensation entitlement'. When this was pointed out to the LDA, it simply denied that this represented a policy, although it acknowledged that there was no other policy.

It is unclear whether the LDA actually knew what was being done by housing officers from CBHA, the registered social landlord (RSL) managing the process. In the previously mentioned case, LDA has made different statements about the circumstances of the tenant that complained, which [were modified] when they were contradicted by the tenant. It also claimed that he had signed a document agreeing to the deduction, indicating his consent, when in fact the document was not signed.

In the 2005 Fluid survey report, the LDA said: 'LDA is committed to the relocation of all Clays Lane residents, and therefore will maintain a high degree of responsibility over the process in order to ensure that all residents are rehoused. No matter which RSL is in charge of the housing allocations, they will be accountable to the LDA. The LDA will steer the process and judge it according to regulatory "benchmarks" to ensure its commitment to residents is carried out.'

– Students living on the Park Village estate

Julian Cheyne (2005) reports: Over 400² UEL students, living on Park Village estate next to Clays Lane, were given notice by UEL in April 2005 that the estate was to close in advance of the bid decision in July that year. The notice to quit expired on June 19 at a time when some students were finishing exams or organising exhibitions for their degrees. While most students would normally leave when their studies ended or for the summer vacation, some always stayed on to find jobs or to continue with postgraduate studies and were forced to look for alternative accommodation at a stressful time of the academic year. UEL then warned students that locks on their flats would be changed on June 20. This represented an illegal eviction. UEL claimed that the estate was to be transferred to the LDA on that day, which was not true. The university later withdrew its threat to change the locks but continued to exert pressure by telling students they would be liable for any legal costs if they didn't move immediately.

Cheyne notes (email of November 29, 2015) that UEL maintained the Park Village estate at only 70–80 per cent of capacity, and that his understanding was that it could have housed around 1,000 people. The estate was acquired before the Olympic bid result was announced on the pretext that regardless of outcome, LDA had a (non-Olympic) redevelopment plan in place for the area. Later, FOI requests established that this was not the case. Cheyne also notes that the estate was 'in perfectly good condition' and demolition was in no way justified. LBN scotched his attempt to get the (now vacant) Park Village estate utilised as accommodation for the homeless before it was demolished in 2007.

One student described UEL's rather vicious use of the court system on Cheyne's Inside Housing forum posting of August 4, 2005. Elifaz100 and two other students were taken to court on July 25, 2005. He was the only one to attend. Despite the judge wishing to let him stay for longer, UEL suggested that it needed vacant possession before July 31 or it would be liable for payments for the next quarter (around £250,000). Elifaz100 notes that LDA had not asked for vacant possession and that UEL retained the lease until July 2006. The university had controlled the site rent-free since 2004, and had taken the opportunity to terminate the lease with the agreed three months notice. UEL attempted to impose costs on Elifaz100 of 'nearly a thousand pounds', but the judge decided to impose a payment of only £100.

² Mahon (2007: 10) suggests 550 students were evicted. Most were forced into more expensive private rental accommodation.

Residents on Newham council's Carpenters estate have been subjected to many redevelopment proposals since 2000 (LBN in LLDC 2015) with the first masterplan published in 2005 (Frediani et al 2013: 13). The estate has been described by one consultant (Campbell in Frediani et al: 7) as 'masterplanned to death'. Flats on the estate have been incrementally decommissioned since around 2007 (LBN *ibid*), with less than 47 residents remaining in three massive tower blocks ([Frediani et al *ibid*]) by March 2015 (LBN *ibid*). The blocks each previously housed 434 persons, with additional residents in lower-rise maisonettes and three-storey apartment blocks. During the Games, Newham council rented out floors at the top of Lund Point and Dennison Point to BBC News and Al Jazeera (Frediani et al *ibid*). In November 2011, University College London (UCL) announced plans for a £1 billion extension of its Bloomsbury campus on the 23-acre site (*ibid*: 14), promising 2,320 research, teaching and support jobs, plus 500,000 square feet of non-UCL housing (*ibid*: 17) alongside accommodation for staff and students. Residents feared that they could not afford to return to the area after redevelopment. The proposals were criticised heavily by UCL's Development Planning Unit (DPU) for disrupting livelihoods, social solidarities and the emotional well-being of residents (many of whom were elderly or recent migrants, or with English as a second language) (Frediani et al).

After talking to more than 50 residents, Frediani et al dismissed consultation by UCL as 'technocratic and expert-driven', leading to the 'creation of a democratic deficit' (*ibid*: 30). They charged that the university and Newham council risked 'turning ... [residents] into atomised, passive, alienated and marginalised individuals' (*ibid*: 31). Consultation was (they suggested) 'tokenistic', and focused upon 'predetermined options and ... (frequently delayed, poor quality) information (*ibid*). Participation at meetings for the Stratford masterplan (predating UCL's proposals) was ludicrously biased towards council employees (21 staff present on March 23, 2010, facing three residents). Discussing consultation around UCL proposals, tenants interviewed by DPU claimed that LBN representatives 'deliberately manipulated people's fears and vulnerabilities to persuade them to leave' (*ibid*: 28). One resident was told on his doorstep that he would be living in a 'ghost town' if he did not agree to move. Another discovered that the entire estate was to be demolished for UCL's proposals when visiting the architect in Bloomsbury, and had to break the news to other residents. Frediani et al also report leaseholders 'subjected to debt collection measures for minimal financial arrears' (*ibid*). One tenant management organisation (TMO) board member commented: '[We] did not know much about the plans so we couldn't tell the residents much. This made it seem [as if] we were conspiring with the [c]ouncil' (Frediani et al: 28). Despite the presence of around 100 residents at a TMO-organised meeting on September 24, 2012, LBN failed to send senior representatives (*ibid*: 27).

Ten years of uncertainty – regeneration scenarios shifted with every iteration of masterplan – transformed previously cordial residents into tenure-based interest groups, riven over time with hostility and suspicion (*ibid*: 28). Residents who had been involved in consultation and resistance told the DPU researchers that they felt pushed to extremes of exhaustion, anxiety and disengagement (*ibid*), that they feared being penalised for opposing the plans, and (to BBC) of being severely 'demoralised' (Bush 2012). One elderly resident, Mary Finch, who had moved into the estate in the 1970s, suffered a heart attack, in part brought on by stress around forced removal (*ibid*). Activists of Carpenters Against Regeneration Plans (CARP) were repeatedly degraded by council representatives as irrational, and specifically excluded from official discussion forums. Joe Alexander noted to Guardian blogger Dave Hill (2012), that: 'We voted for a mayor and got a dictator.' CARP commissioned planning coalition Just Space and the London Tenants Federation to work on a plan defined by the remaining residents, and on alternative proposals with students, as well as organising several viewings of abandoned tower blocks and walkabouts on the estate, public meetings and workshops (CARP 2013). In November 2012, between 40 and 50 UCL students occupied the university's administration in solidarity with the residents, only to be evicted by high court possession order threatening three of them each with legal costs of £40,000 (*ibid*; Bush *ibid*).

Frediani et al (*ibid*: 14) also charge LBN's approach to housing management and policy with 'serious limitations': 'In our view, the lack of recognition of the more intangible dimensions of housing ... renders the current approach to regeneration inadequate to achieve "mixed and balanced communities".' They cite tenant adviser Tony Bird, who described LBN's cavalier attitude as 'social cleansing' (rare for a housing professional). One resident was so distressed that he told researchers that 'residents ... feel that they are no longer desired ... [in] Newham', others that the council was ambiguous around increasing rent levels for those who exercised the 'right to return'. Frediani et al describe promises of 'like for like' offers by housing officers as 'disingenuous', and claim that '[Newham] council [had failed residents] in its duty as social housing provider, neglecting strong attachments to their homes, neighbours and friends, and the surrounding area. Frediani et al state (*ibid*: 18): 'in spite of the rhetoric, we believe that ... demolition of the estate is not in the best interests of the Carpenters community and that redevelopment plans and the new UCL campus will displace Stratford's current population'.

Newham council itself claims (LLDC *ibid*) that 70 per cent of residents have been rehoused in the E15 postcode, and that cost of refurbishing the blocks was prohibitive (£25 million per block). Greater London Authority (GLA) refused to fund local authority rehabilitation proposals in 2006/07, and the 2008 financial crash confirmed the cancellation (lack of investment finance). LBN cited problems engendered by new building regulations (an asbestos skeleton under the concrete 'skin' would have forced the local authority to empty the blocks during construction work), and suggested that leaseholders would have been required to finance refurbishment at a cost of £120,000 on property valued at only £110,000 (reasonably, the council considered this 'unacceptable'). Deteriorating conditions and costs of kitchen and bathroom renovation demanding exterior work were also considered too costly for owner occupiers. The council claims that the long-standing TMO also regarded every option as prohibitively expensive.

BBC News (2013) reported UCL's redevelopment proposals as abandoned on May 8, 2013. CARP chair, Osita Madu, asserted a victory for residents, noting that many had lived there for more than 50 years. 'It is

a relief,' she said, 'but we are now faced with uncertainty over what the alternatives will be. There is an intention to get a developer to come in and railroad residents out.'

– *Manor Garden allotments*

Text below is taken from a document written for LBWF's Olympic panel (October 9, 2007) by Julie Sumner, vice chair of Manor Gardening Society (MGS).

Judicial review proceedings in June, two days after the granting of planning permission for the Marsh Lane relocation site, led to an out-of-court agreement with the LDA/ODA. It was agreed that plot holders who had crops to harvest would be able to continue to have limited access from July 2 until the end of the growing season, that is September 23. A small number of helpers were also allowed access but inactive plot holders not. From the closure of the Olympic park site on July 2, around 20 plots continued to be cultivated within the allocated times of 10am–7pm at weekends and 9am–1pm on Wednesdays. We had to undergo a security procedure each time we visited. This consisted of arriving at the site office gates where the passes we had been issued were checked and we signed in. We were then driven by minibus to the allotment gates. There our passes were checked again and we went on foot to our plots. These restricted access times meant that we could not adequately water if the weather was hot ... [However, t]he summer turned out to be very wet [and] it proved impossible to keep on top of the weeding with such limited access times. If other commitments clashed with allotment times, such as Reg's three-times-a-week hospital appointments, we could not make up that time. It was very difficult to garden effectively with this regime. We were promised during our meetings with the LDA that a horticulturalist would be on hand to water or do urgent jobs. We just needed to ask. I requested help once. The horticulturalist never materialised and no response was given.

From July 2, construction workers were regularly on site and we could see each time we went back that some bulldozing had been done. It seemed reasonable at first, since in the Consent Order, we had agreed that ground investigation could take place on fallow plots. This phase of work seemed to be finished, yet as the weeks went on more and more bulldozing around and close to working allotments and sheds was taking place. This began to lead to damage to those plots. For example, Hassan Ali's front fence and huge fig tree were 'accidentally' demolished two weeks before we were evicted. This bulldozing felt very intimidating and seemed completely unnecessary given that they would be able to flatten the whole site within a couple of days of us being evicted. On some of the plots, which had been bulldozed for 'urgent' ground drilling, there was little evidence of any investigation going on, only markers for the points where drilling was to take place.

Each time plot holders arrived at the LDA site office to access their allotments they found a different arrangement. Sometimes the minibus didn't show up or was late, sometimes they had to sign in twice, sometimes three times, sometimes there was a security guard at the gate to the allotments, sometimes not. It was bewildering and confused. One plot holder arrived in August to her well-planted plot to discover it had been marked up for bulldozing. She was scolded for moving the tape. Another immediate consequence of us being inside the Olympic development site was that we began to experience systematic theft of our tools and equipment. I had a hammock and stand (only removable by vehicle), gas bottle, cooker, tools and bird boxes and many other items taken. We reported this to the security guards and the LDA who say they will investigate.

At many meetings the LDA promised substantial assistance particularly for the older remaining plot holders to dismantle, pack and carry their possessions to the removal vehicles. They promised that adequate time would be given for this process. The reality was we had two three-hour slots with a Luton van, and two or three men who didn't seem to regard it as their job to help. Plot holders worked incredibly hard and were under tremendous pressure to meet the deadline. We were told our possessions were being taken to the site office grounds and packed into containers. We were reassured everything would be kept safe. However, we discovered later that the LDA had underestimated the quantity of equipment to be relocated and had booked insufficient containers. Our tools, furniture, etc, were left out on the ground near the site office for we don't know how long until more containers came. We are yet to find out if anything more has been stolen or damaged once we open the containers at the Marsh Lane site.

During the judicial review negotiations which led to an agreed Consent Order, Gareth Blacker, [former] director of development for the LDA, stated that the Marsh Lane Fields allotments would be ready by September 23 'barring an act of God'. His colleague Andrew Gaskell stated that it was a minor piece of construction, especially compared to the Olympic work, and should be easily completed in six to eight weeks. To date the bulk of the new allotments are not ready and we cannot move on site until all work is completed. The date by which the LDA now promise all the plots will be ready to begin gardening and the containers with our tools etc arrive will be October 27. The trees, the relocation of which had been long promised but which only got lifted from our old site the day before eviction following a letter from myself copied to the solicitor, lie bare-rooted, out in the open, at Marsh Lane Fields. No help with replanting has been offered. At this stage we do not have great faith that the LDA will look after our interests without a great deal of scrutiny and pressure from ourselves, the media and outside organisations such as Waltham Forest council.

As legacy provision, and to replace the temporary allotment site at Marsh Lane Fields, the MGS was offered two separate sites a mile apart at either end of the 200ha Olympic park, with two different landlords. The site areas combined were slightly larger than the original, but allotment holders complained that they were of poor quality. MGS chair Mark Harton told the Evening Standard (2012/1): 'We feel betrayed and we certainly don't want to be split up. We lost around a quarter of our members due to the last move, and there are real concerns about the effects of splitting us up'. As of December 2015, plotters were due to move into one site in Stratford (visible from the DLR line near Pudding Mill station) with a high standard of infrastructure. However, in 2014, LBWF

decided to accede to an LLDC request to replace the area designated for allotments on the other site, in Eton Manor close to the A12 dual carriageway, with a meadow. Campaigners note that despite this decision saving significant money in terms of further remediation work at Eton Manor, LLDC has not adequately compensated plottolders at Marsh Lane Fields for the loss and inadequacy of temporary facilities constructed in the Olympic move. LLDC has, however, contributed to some of the costs still associated with flooding at Marsh Lane (personal conversation 2015).

– *River Lea bargees*

Taken from an article by Ian Griffiths, published in the Guardian, March 9, 2011.

Houseboat residents near the Olympic development site in east London are accusing British Waterways of an attempt at 'social cleansing'. They say proposed changes to rules for living on the canals before the 2012 Games could force hundreds of people from their water-based homes. British Waterways, which manages 2,200 miles of canals and rivers, has put forward changes to the mooring rules on the river Lea, in east London, that could increase the cost of living on the waterway from about £600 to £7,000 a year. Residents see the move as a deliberate attempt to drive them away. A draft note from British Waterways on December 6 2010, seen by the Guardian, says: 'The urgency ... relates to the objective of reducing unauthorised mooring on the Lea navigation and adjacent waterways in time for the Olympics' ... British Waterways says between 160 and 200 boats in the area are used as permanent residences. These boats can exploit a lack of clarity in the waterways legislation to use a 'continuous cruising' licence, costing about £600 a year, which lets owners move just short distances every fortnight. Under the new proposals, people using a continuous cruising licence would not be allowed to spend more than 61 days in a year in each of six designated neighbourhoods across 40 miles of canal network, and they would be forced to move to a different neighbourhood every 14 days. British Waterways says the changes are in line with a national policy on moorings. But residents on the Lea say they are being singled out to allow a 'cleaning up' of the waterways before the [event] next year. For British Waterways, the Lea is a high priority because of 'high demand for visitor moorings during the 2012 Olympics'. Mike Wells, a photographer and Lea canalboat resident for four years, said: 'My boat is about a mile from the Olympic park and it is almost inconceivable that the authorities would allow anything unsightly or tatty during the Games. This is social cleansing.' [Alice Wellbeloved, a freelance fashion designer, who has lived on the Lea for almost five years with her partner and baby,] said: 'People say we're using the river on the cheap. We are desperate for a permanent mooring. But there are none to be had around here – they're so scarce that the last permanent mooring near here was auctioned for £9,000 a year in rent.' Nick Brown, legal officer of the National Bargee Travellers Association, which represents the interest of boat dwellers, said: 'These are extremely draconian proposals. BW is riding roughshod over the rights of a vulnerable minority group. The objective appears to be to stop new entrants on to the river and drive away existing canalside residents.'

2.2 International context of residential displacement

In a city with no rent control, the homeless were subjected to particularly vicious ordinances and regulations (including payment of one-way tickets out of town) as part of what Mitchell (1997) argues amounts to the annihilation of their space through legal constructions.

Drew Whitelegg (2000). 'Going for gold: Atlanta's bid for fame', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24(4): 808

Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE) (2004) stated the prospects for impoverished residents in any host city bluntly: '[P]reparations for large international events often lead to thousands of people being forcibly evicted from their homes, facing increased poverty, vulnerability and marginalisation.' At an extreme, in the run-up to the 1936 Games in Nazi Berlin, Roma were sent to the Marzhan concentration camp on the edge of the city. In more recent times, around 720,000 people were displaced in preparation for Seoul 1988. Around 1,000 homeless people and four shelters were forced to move by the development of Centennial Park in Atlanta (a commercialised 'open' space dominated by sponsors). COHRE et al (2007) report 30,000 lower-income residents displaced in total for Atlanta 1996 by gentrification, demolition of public housing, rent speculation and Olympic-associated urban renewal projects. Homeless people were also reported as 'driven out' of the city boundaries for Los Angeles 1984 (Black Flag 223).

– *Erasure of Roma settlements, Athens 2004*

Forced and illegal eviction of Roma in the run-up to Athens 2004 has been documented by Theodoros Alexandridis of Greek Helsinki Monitor in a report on housing impact published jointly with COHRE in 2007. The impending event was used mainly as pretext for removal rather than as direct imperative. In only one case (Marousi) was eviction connected to the construction of Olympic-related facilities. In Aspropygos, near the capital,

on July 14, 2000, a municipal bulldozer, allegedly accompanied by the mayor and the police, demolished numerous [makeshift shelters] in a Roma settlement situated on a [refuse site] ... The [shelters] ... belonged to Greek and Albanian Roma, [and] contained the inhabitants' personal belongings. All families in the settlement ... were ordered to leave within three days ... [T]ent dwellers living in the upper part of the [site] were evicted some days before this incident, when the mayor of Ano Liosia ... offered each Roma family 100,000 drachmas (US\$266) to leave the settlement ... the municipality [then] demolished their tents. All the

Roma – the ones evicted on July 14 and [others] evicted a few days earlier – [moved to] other settlements around Aspropyrgos ... [In] September 2001, the municipal authorities of Aspropyrgos, under ... orders [from] the mayor, [destroyed] six homes and damaged others under the [racist] pretext of a ‘cleansing’ operation ... The demolition ... was stopped following the intervention of GHM and the office of the Greek ombudsman (Alexandridis: 19).

Around 200 Roma families were evicted from a settlement in the municipality of Nea Alikarnassos in Herakleion (Crete) on January 23, 2003. Here, ‘[mayor of] Nea Alikarnassos ... Evangelos Sissamakias, authorised municipal employees to break into a site designated for the resettlement of ... local [Roma] ... including forcing the entrance lock and placing iron props inside ... [P]art of the necessary infrastructure on the planned relocation site [had] already been constructed’ (ibid: 20).

Sissamakias justified his actions with aesthetic terminology (‘blemish’, ‘good taste’) and criminalised residents (‘they deal in drugs’) (ibid). The site was next to an Olympic basketball court, and the mayor proposed parking facilities as ‘good use’. The car park was never built. In 2001, the eviction notice was ruled as illegal by a court in Herakleion. The word ‘blemish’ was also used in connection with eviction of Roma in Herakleion in 1997 (ibid: 21), here in connection with the city’s image. Alexandridis notes families remaining still living in degrading conditions.

In Aghia Paraskevi (Athens), a site agreed for statutory relocation of Roma families was denied by the municipality of Spata; the authorities cited racist opposition among local (Greek) residents, the prospect of traffic congestion, and again aesthetics (ibid: 22) as justification for their refusal. The families had already agreed to the move, organised under the auspices of the Greek interior ministry Roma Integration Action Plan and funded by 49,890 Euros. The voided agreement attached conditions of ‘improvement [in] quality of life’. The plot itself adjoined an airport. Municipality of Spata concluded its statement to the Athens prosecutor’s office declaring ‘all competent authorities should see to it that this resettlement of Gypsies is not allowed’. (The author notes that the prosecutor’s office found ‘nothing objectionable’ in the letter.) Five Roma families due to move to the new site were still made homeless, as landowners who had applied for a court decision to remove them levelled their shelters. By 2006, the families were living 90km away, near Chalkida.

In Lechaira (western Peloponnese), the head of the regional town planning directorate refused permission to a local mayor for resttlement of 35 families in housing on municipal land near the national highway between Patras and Pyrgos (also main route to the historic site of Olympia) (ibid: 21-22). He justified his decision noting that the new settlement was in the ‘visual range’ of Olympic dignitaries.

In Marousi, the location of one of the main Olympic stadia, 42 Roma families in three small settlements were moved from state-owned land in 2002 (ibid: 24–26). Those who were relocated under statutory provision (ethnically Greek Roma) were forced to accept rental subsidy and rehoused in temporary dwellings. Twenty Albanian Roma families, also living in the settlements, were not offered alternative accommodation. Alexandridis notes that the families had been living on the land for 30 years. The municipality defaulted on its relocation obligations as early as August 2004, and this continued in 2007. Over one-and-a-half-year’s rental subsidy was owing in January 2006, forcing arrears and further eviction or severe hardship, and payments for food and clothing were also withheld. No permanent site for new housing had been announced, despite repeated questioning by the families. A complaint from the official ombudsman to the municipality about their treatment received no reply. Greek Helsinki Monitor filed a criminal complaint on September 26, 2003. The author notes (ibid: 24) that some families were threatened with total cessation of subsidies unless they applied for housing loans (repayable over 22 years), which the municipality itself would have used to construct new dwellings. Terms for loan finance were not written down, and families were reported as fearing that the municipality would default here also.

Other cultural events were also used as pretext in evictions of Albanian Roma by the University of Patras and local municipality from university-owned land, the proposed location of a theatre for the city’s 2006 Cultural Capital of Europe celebrations (ibid: 26–27). Residents were working away from home in other parts of Greece when the eviction and demolition took place, and the university suggested (callously) that they had abandoned their homes (the municipality preferred to criminalise the residents). The university had made no formal approach to the municipality to effect the evictions but the report states that ‘it is known that [the university had] always wanted to get rid of the Roma’ and ‘probably’ endorsed the eviction. Thirty-five families were made homeless, and the evictions took place without protocols or prior information. The families had lived on the land for four years. The 70,000m² site was later landscaped ‘for the benefit of [other] residents’. Two more Roma settlements in Patras were threatened with eviction in 2007, and the atmosphere in the town was reported as ‘virulently’ anti-Roma.

– Forced removal, Beijing 2008

COHRE (2007) named Beijing municipality and Beijing Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (BOCOG) one of three ‘housing rights violators’ of 2007 (Slavin 2007/1). Around 1.5 million people were removed in the city itself, plus another 400,000 rural migrants (ibid). Amnesty International complained of the arrest and persecution of protestors, and inadequate reparation for removal, requisition and redundancy (Macartney 2005). Lack of legal remedies to resist evictions, inadequate compensation and resettlement provided to those evicted, use of extreme force in carrying out evictions, and police brutality towards those protesting, are testimony to the Beijing municipality and BOCOG’s complete disregard for the social right to adequate housing. COHRE (ibid) states that evictions in Beijing were carried out between 2000 and 2007 in four central districts known for overcrowding and dilapidated (often dangerous) housing conditions. Large-scale evictions were also carried out in several *chengzhongcun* (literally, ‘villages in the city’), poor, informal settlements comprising housing that had not been approved for construction, did not comply with building codes and typically was not properly serviced. Forced evictions were often violent. Destruction of cheap housing and accommodation in the Fengtai district made it harder for many poor and disadvantaged people from other parts of China to seek redress for their

grievances. Hundreds of thousands of people from all over China arrive in Beijing each year to lodge petitions on issues such as illegal land seizures, forced evictions and corruption [ibid].

- Celebrated artist Ai Weiwei, designer of the Bird's Nest stadium in Beijing and, as a critic of human rights abuse, long a thorn in the side of the Chinese communist party, dismissed the Olympic event afterwards, saying: 'None of my art represents Beijing. The Bird's Nest – I never think about it. After the [Games], the common folks don't talk about it because the Olympics did not bring joy to the people.' Ai Weiwei also criticised the treatment of migrant workers who were often forced to 'squat in illegal structures, which Beijing destroys as it keeps expanding' and had suffered the brunt of Games-related evictions (Cheyne 2011).

– *Gentrification and resistance, Vancouver 2010*

Homelessness was reported to have doubled ahead of Vancouver 2010 (one homeless count in 2008 found 1,576 homeless persons in the city, up from 628 documented in 2002). Pivot Legal Society noted that 1,448 social housing units had been closed in Vancouver since the city won the bid to host the event, due to gentrification and the 'cleaning out of neighbourhoods' (Hui 2009). A tent city was prominent in the protests against the Winter Olympics, demanding an end to homelessness, gentrification and the criminalisation of poverty (Tent Village Voice 2010).

- Vancouver Sun reported (Woo 2010) that homeless people in Whistler were forced to relocate south to Squamish as the Winter Olympics drew near, a result of the 'gradual lockdown of Whistler and the corridor'. One local voluntary organisation, Whistler Community Services Society, gave bus tickets to homeless people to travel there. This led David Eby, executive director of British Columbia Civil Liberties Association, to charge Vancouver Organizing Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (VANOC) of broken promises regarding the homeless.
- Vancouver activists handed over an anti-Olympics torch to the London Coalition Against Poverty in July 2010. The torch had been used in a province-wide tour of British Columbia to herald the Poverty Olympics held in Vancouver Downtown Eastside in February 2010. This aimed to highlight the plight of homeless people and to remind politicians, VANOC, and the International Olympic Committee (IOC) of promises made when Vancouver bid for the Games. Rick Cooney, handover organiser, said that the Poverty Olympics group had spurred the province to implement a poverty-reduction strategy and emphasised related problems in British Columbia, including a nation-leading rate in child poverty and lack of social housing (Cheyne 2010/3).

In British Columbia, indigenous peoples saw planning applications associated with the Winter Olympics for ski resorts, heliskiing, catskiing and snowmobiling, despite the fact that several of these activities are forbidden in most alpine areas of Europe, and in disregard of the Supreme Court of Canada ruling of 1997 recognising Aboriginal Title. This was condemned by the United Nations as a violation of international human rights. Indigenous peoples in British Columbia have taken a 'very active' stand to protect both Aboriginal Title and lands (Billy 2002). Historically, such attacks on indigenous lands in British Columbia have forced armed confrontation.

- Indigenous rights representatives attending an international gathering in Vicam, Mexico, in October 2007, called for a boycott of Vancouver 2010. Over 500 delegates representing 'first nations' from the US, Canada, Mexico, Central and South America, met to discuss 515 years of invasion and resistance to colonial occupation, with the Olympics a central theme. The resolutions drew attention to the death of elder Harriet Nahanee, who died after she was imprisoned for protesting against the expansion of Sea to Sky Highway, primary artery to the main Games site. Delegates from Northern Turtle Island (also known as Canada) stated that defence of land and unity were central to their efforts for self-determination and freedom (Slavin 2007/2).

– *Clashes and inadequate infrastructure, Sochi 2014*

Residents of Sochi, Russia, clashed with bailiffs and police in 2008, defending their houses armed with sticks and molotov cocktails (Slavin 2008/1). Some 200 people barricaded themselves inside the house of Svetlana Droficheva, while others defended her house on the street. Police used pepper gas to disperse the crowd. Riot police were called in, but tensions were eased by the acting police chief, who gave residents ten days to appeal the eviction notice (Kommersant.com). Residents of one town 30 miles from Sochi, Nizhneimeretinskaya Bukhta, were told in August 2008 that they had three months to leave their homes, and later, after complaining about state valuations of their property, demanded independent assessments. All 119 houses in the neighbourhood, home to about 400 people, along with local shops, were to be bulldozed. The Russian parliament passed a law in November 2007 to clear the way for fast-track evictions, with the excuse that these would be needed to get venues ready on time. Around 4,000 residents faced eviction and state compensation is reported as far less than market value (Sparre 2008).

On April 10, 2008, a coalition of anti-Kremlin activists, including chess player Gary Kasparov, warned that several of the planned infrastructure sites were now dangerous due to the height of the water table. The city itself had no proper sewerage system or electricity supply. Greenpeace threatened legal action over destruction of Black Sea ecosystems (Zigfeld 2008). (See also BP3 §1.4).

Circassian diaspora opposed Sochi 2014 developments as construction would disinter mass graves from the Stalinist genocide of the Circassian minority. Radio Free Europe suggested that Sochi 2014 could be disrupted by terrorist outrage and that the Kremlin was using the event as lever for 'hasty measures that analysts [said risked] fanning tensions in the region' (Bigg 2010).

Residents of favelas (squatter settlements) in Rio de Janeiro have been suffering ‘lightning’ evictions, some by military police, particularly harsh during 2015, reports RioOnWatch. Evictions have been widely documented on social media. Demolition of homes – often still containing residents’ belongings – have taken place without warning or (what the campaign describes as ‘tenuous’ court proceedings) and ‘in [a] climate of confusion and tension’ (2015/1). RioOnWatch states that between 2009 and 2013 ‘over 20,000 families, or 67,000 people ... were removed from their homes’. Residents were severely injured, some requiring hospital treatment.

In one settlement, Favela do Metro, near to Maracana soccer stadium in Rio’s North Zone, small businesses (car mechanics and local shops) were forcibly removed. The favela had already suffered intense evictions in the three years before the World Cup in 2014, but facilities for the event were never built in the area. Rio mayor Eduardo Paes has pledged a replacement ‘automotive hub’ to relocate displaced businesses, but this has yet to materialise. Resistance was supported by students from the neighbouring Rio State University (UERJ). A court injunction obtained to prevent evictions by the city authorities, threatening fines of US\$6,300 for every dwelling demolished, arrived too late to prevent the destruction of many homes.

Residents of Santa Marta, a mountain-side favela in Rio’s South Zone, experienced the first evictions in June 2015, despite fighting off forced removal successfully since 2011. Residents were given one month warning on pretext of their homes being located in an area of ‘risk’, but evictions took place without technical surveys. In a video posted on Youtube, ‘[o]ne ... resident appeared visibly distressed, [saying:] ““Where will I keep my things? Where will I sleep tonight?” She commented that she did not wish to sleep in ... public shelter[s] offered by the government. Another resident was filmed surveying the damage after ... demolition of the house he had built himself. “This was my life, now it’s a garbage dump,” he said, pointing out his sofa, TV, wardrobe and fridge standing among the rubble in the open air’ (ibid).

In Vila Autodromo (right beside the Olympic precinct in Rio’s West Zone) residents protesting against removal were met with rubber bullets, pepper spray and batons deployed by the Municipal Guard. RioOnWatch report that several were injured and some required surgery. Owners of houses destroyed had not received full compensation from the city government. ‘[Lawyer] Maria Lucia de Pontes told newspaper O Dia: “Even if the city was acting within the law, it can’t carry out a judicial decision with such violence when there are doubts about the decision itself”’ (ibid). Resident Maria da Penha was severely injured by police, and photographed with a broken nose, bloody face and black eye. She told a video posted on Youtube (ibid): ““[The city authorities] didn’t even give one week’s notice for the family to leave. They came and said they had to leave today. All the residents ... came together [to resist].” She added that the violence was completely unprovoked: “We didn’t mess with [police], we weren’t aggressive ... But I was beaten”’ (ibid). RioOnWatch reports that ‘[t]he eviction was suspended after judicial intervention.’

Vila Autodromo has resisted forced removal for decades, and residents have been granted land title. Rio city government has been increasing pressure on residents in the favela for the last five years, and by 2015 around 600 persons (or 90 per cent of residents) have been forcibly removed. The settlement suffered further ‘lightning evictions’ by the Municipal Guard in October (RioOnWatch 2015/2), when between two to five homes were demolished. RioOnWatch cites residents’ anguish on Facebook: ““The city continues to spread terror ... We are now surrounded and nobody knows for sure what’s going on.”” The campaign notes that in March mayor Paes ‘declared eminent domain [compulsory purchase of land] and marked 58 homes for eviction’. Around 41 families remain in the settlement determined to resist. As late as August 2015, Paes had reassured residents that they would not be moved (ibid).

Rio-based non-governmental organisation, Catalytic Communities (CatComm) (2015), notes an increasing trend of intensified state repression in the settlements: ‘Since 2008, the state of Rio de Janeiro has established 37 ‘pacifying police units’ (UPPs) across the city’s favelas. Twenty-four-hour UPPs maintain a physical base in each favela or group of favelas [with the intention of eradicating guns and other weaponry and] visible manifestations of the drug trade ... making the streets safer for residents. The UPP programme represents by far the largest public monetary investment in Rio’s favelas. However, since its ... early days [UPPs have] come to represent forced occupation and torture in more recently occupied [settlements] ... [A]ccording to a study in late 2013, 37 per cent of favelas were controlled by drug traffickers while 45 per cent were dominated by militias.’

RioOnWatch.org: #EvictionsWatch <http://www.rioonwatch.org/?cat=1293>

CatComm: <http://catcomm.org>

Ibase: <http://www.ibase.br/en>

National Movement for Housing Vindication (MNLN): <http://mnlmrj.blogspot.co.uk>

- Reuters (Grudgings 2011) reported that 3,000 troops, backed by helicopters and armoured cars, had occupied Rio’s largest slum, Rocinha in November 2011, without firing a shot, on the pretext of improving security and eroding the reign of drug cartels. Rocinha overlooks some of the city’s wealthiest areas and is home to 100,000 people. The favela has been viewed as a crucial area for Rio’s 2014 World Cup preparations as well as the Olympics in 2016. Soldiers were followed by hundreds of reporters. Only one person was arrested and there were no reports of casualties. Under what they called a ‘pacification’ programme, Rio authorities claimed to be following up invasion with police, health centres, formal electricity and TV supply. Reuters noted that the areas chosen for ‘pacification’ had led to ‘criticism that the programme [was] aimed mostly at supporting the city’s real-estate boom and preparing for the sporting events.’

2.3 Local economy: displacement of small businesses

On January 30, 2006, RTPI-affiliated Planning Resource reported that 95 firms based in the southern part of Fish Island and at Pudding Lane, Stratford, had won reprieve from compulsory purchase after a redrawing of Olympic masterplan boundaries (reference lost but Rose 2006 [pages 19–20] notes reduced impact on firms and location). This revision saved the LDA £142 million and enabled the retention of 1,200 out of the 6,058 jobs that were to be relocated. The new plans meant that 80 CPO objections were dropped from the public inquiry starting in May that year. However, eastern Fish Island was still slated for redevelopment despite more modern infrastructure.

Many 'reprieved' businesses were tenants and faced the prospect of landlords hiking up rents using increased land value as excuse to refuse renewal of existing leases. This would deprive them of compensation if they had to move (including assistance with professional fees). Lance Forman, of smoked salmon suppliers Forman & Field and key mover of Marshgate Lane Business Group (MLBG), noted that land requisitioned both on Fish Island and the southern part of Marshgate Lane followed the route of Crossrail, and he wondered whether the Olympic boundary revision was intended to displace costs on to the Crossrail budget. Many of the premises reprieved on Marshgate Lane were in such a dilapidated condition that Forman felt that it was almost certain that they would be removed to enhance Olympic developments (PR Office 2006).

Forman himself settled with LDA on May 5, 2006, and moved to a site just outside the Olympic precinct on Fish Island. Reporting the closure of this long-running battle in the Guardian, Matthew Beard speculated: 'It is thought [LDA], which handles land deals for ... London mayor Ken Livingstone, agreed to hand over the land on one last-minute condition. Lance Forman ... the most high profile opponent of the CPO process, has dropped his request to cross-examine Lord Coe, the chairman of the 2012 Games organising committee, at the public inquiry this week.' (Beard subsequently republished this saga in the Independent on April 1, 2009. The original date has been checked with Lance Forman.) Forman stated that with the agreement, 50 jobs at his firm out of 65 would be safeguarded. The CPO inquiry received a total of 400 objections, although LDA claims that 80 per cent of land deals were by then completed, representing 65 per cent of employees in the affected 500-acre area.

In 2008, 208 businesses were being forced to shift and 4,964 jobs were to be displaced (Cheyne 2008/1; LDA Public Liaison Unit 2008). Hackney and Newham lost a total of 105 companies employing 1,399 staff. LDA stated that 25 businesses closed completely with a loss of 65 jobs, and a further 10 businesses employing 54 staff were unaccounted for. Most relocated businesses, 105 companies and 3,565 jobs, remained within the (then) four host boroughs, but a substantial number, 52 firms and 996 jobs, moved to other parts of London, mainly to Barking and Dagenham. Sixteen firms employing 284 staff moved out of London (most to Thurrock in Essex).

LDA kept compensation payments at a punitive level, and the bid encountered its first legal opposition in September 2004. Firms on the Marshgate Lane Estate protested that LDA CPO monies were too low – for one, Michael Finlay, ironically, director of a construction firm, 20–30 per cent less than prices paid originally for land (Muir 2004). Daily Telegraph (Patrick 2005) reported MLBG figures estimating that full cost of removal (for an earlier figure of around 284 firms) would be £1.5 billion, while their members were being offered a paltry £450 million (30 per cent of the sum required). LDA refused to agree payments in advance of the July 2005 bid decision and, the MLBG claimed, land deals sympathetic to customer and staff proximity were lost with the delay. Owen Slot (2008) asserted in The Times that in the three years since London had won the Olympic bid, 80 per cent of businesses (out of a total of 350, a figure higher than LDA calculations) were still fighting for financial settlement. LDA countered that out of 208 businesses, 102 were still negotiating.

- Newspaper wrapping and delivery firm, HMM, was preparing to take LDA to the high court. Ivor Gershfield, chief executive, told The Times (Slot *ibid*): 'I assumed that our business would be able to carry on where it left off. That is the idea of a CPO. What happened was a Mugabe-style theft of our land. We were given assurances that they broke.' Gershfield threatened judicial review and was told that LDA would spend all its resources on fighting rather than processing the case. Gershfield calculated his company's losses at £700,000 (real cost of the CPO was £1.25 million), with running profit deficit of £5,000 per week. He had only received £565,000 in total compensation when he was interviewed.
- One business, concrete recycling firm Bedrock Crushing, accepted compensation and moved to a new site, and then received demands that it move again. The issue was taken to a land tribunal (Games Monitor is not aware of the outcome). Seamus Gannon, company owner, described the experience itself as 'getting screwed'. He told the paper (*ibid*) that he had spent £180,000 clearing his site in Marshgate Lane and moving, but LDA had paid out only £75,000.
- Christine Norman of vehicle repair business T&N Commercials, with a staff of 11, told The Times (*ibid*) that they had received just over £300,000 for a move that professional advisers estimated at between £900,000 to £1.4 million. Now they had moved they were forced to operate on a break-even basis, reduced from five working vehicles to two. Norman stated that initially, the business had lost between £5,000 and £10,000 per week.
- Many deals agreed included confidentiality agreements prohibiting firms from going public about their ordeal. Payment of Balcombe Group, a loss assessment firm appointed by firms to act as intermediary, was delayed subject to legal dispute (*ibid*). In June 2008, law firm Finer Stephens Innocent were still acting for more than 80 businesses (see also BP3 §3.2).

Press revelations branded LDA as incompetent and even deceptive. It is possible that this forced their hand toward boundary revision. Mary Reilly, (then) LDA chair, is reported to have said that initial budgeted amount did not include the buying of new sites for relocated firms (Gamesbids.com 2005). Two months earlier, the Observer

(Campbell 2005) reported that London 2012 sources admitted privately that some 'costs ... were deliberately underestimated or disguised during the bidding process.' The article stated that one LDA official had said that 'the total bill (for land and decontamination) could be three times higher' than anticipated, and that ministers had awarded an extra £1 billion to the LDA covertly to ensure delivery.

Proximity to customers in central and inner London was regarded by firms as critical factor to their ability to compete, and many firms, already vulnerable, may have been thrown into a perilous situation by forced relocation. Firms forced to move to Beckton, Dagenham or Thurrock may have found themselves unable to attract customers, beleaguered by additional expense of delivery mileage, and with (often specialist, or alternatively, low-waged) staff unable to get to work or unwilling to add extra travel time to their day. Even buoyant firms were worried about fatality by compression: the cross-over period written in for rebuilding machinery in new locations was woefully inadequate. Many of the firms under threat were new to the Lower Lea Valley. Of the businesses surveyed by the LDA as part of the socioeconomic assessment attached to the planning applications, 30 per cent had arrived since 2000, over 50 per cent had been established in the LLV only since 1995, and 40 per cent predicted no expansion ahead in market reach or workforce (only 16 per cent intended to invest in standard plant, and only 32 per cent in new technology). LDA stated that 50 per cent of firms had less than 10 employees and 74 per cent of the LLV workforce surveyed lived more than two miles away (LDA 2004: 16–17).

Waste-recycling yards and refuse transfer stations may have found relocation especially difficult due to the nature of their land use. Contacts vital to trading will have been lost with the displacement of firms. Stigmatisation of the scrap economy by land-use classes may well have hindered the residential relocation prospects of Gypsies and Travellers (see §2.1 above), and operates as vicious social regulation. Meanwhile, LDA claimed that there would be no closure of firms in the waste sector, and asserted it as 'valuable for London' (personal conversation). However, many of the tiny Gypsy and Traveller businesses may well have faced unrecorded problems at a distance.

Relocation also offers employers the chance to restructure the workplace balance of power, to increase the rate of exploitation. Paucity of land compensation payments may impact on staff, leading to wage stringencies or redundancies. Increased distances for delivery vehicles and trucks owned by relocated companies are a disaster for the 'sustainable' ambitions of the Olympic proposals (and presumably not counted by official monitors). Seamus Gannon of Bedrock, interviewed by Martin Samuel (2005) estimated that a move east would require 25 more giant tipper trucks, and his yard making 400 trips daily, this would lead to vehicles making an extra 2,800 miles every day.

- Building magazine (Withers 2011) reported that LDA was still facing outstanding claims of £27 million from 109 firms affected by the compulsory purchase of the Olympic park site in 2007. Chris Allan, head of CPOs at Finers Stephens Innocent, which acted for about 100 of the claimants, said that LDA delays were crippling businesses. 'It's a double whammy killer – they've delayed on payments and they've lowballed on valuations,' he told Building magazine. 'I can't understand why they're holding on to that money. Many of our clients have been crippled by delays – a public body should not be acting in this way.' Building magazine reported that according to information obtained under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the LDA had a budget estimate of £186 million for the £327 million of claims. LDA said that it had paid out £103 million to claimants as part payments, leaving a current budget remaining in the agency's accounts of £83 million to pay for final settlements.
- Lee Navigation Canal (London boroughs of Hackney and Haringey) continues to attract planning applications for high-rise dwellings, first noted by Katy Andrews (2005/2) and opposed vigorously by NLLDC, and such developments have proliferated where the river Lea flows through Tower Hamlets. High land prices across the Olympic boroughs impact particularly on artists, Gypsies and Travellers, private rental tenants, voluntary sector organisations and co-operatives. Not-for-profit organisations such as Hackney Community Transport, which provides buses for routes that privatised companies regard as unprofitable, found in 2004 that land rental costs in Newham prohibited the expansion of their service (Blowe 2004). See also BP2 §2.1.
- Space Studios, which rents low-cost space to artists and designer-makers, also complained of the escalating cost of land (personal conversation 2005), and rising rents continue to drive out artists from studio spaces in Hackney Wick (Davies 2011). Jeremy Corbyn MP raised concerns for artists living in the host boroughs, and those due to be displaced directly by developments, in his speech on the London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Bill on December 7, 2005. Both Hackney and Tower Hamlets are renown for the numbers of artists living and working within their borough boundaries.

2.4 Sporting losses and targets

– *Grassroots sport*

As the London 2012 bid gained momentum, the ‘Olympic boroughs’ organised an afternoon of cycling events for youngsters at the Eastway cycle circuit, site of the Olympic velopark. Waltham Forest’s team of six cycle trainers refused to turn up for work. We went on strike because we recognise that our work, which is to actively promote healthy outdoor recreation for all, would not be helped but hindered by a successful London bid. In terms of funding, environment and facilities, London 2012 will make it harder for the average person to get on their bike, locally and nationally.

Ru Litherland, former cycle trainer, London Borough of Waltham Forest

Thousands of people use the Hackney Marshes, and other open areas of the Lower Lea, for informal physical recreation such as cycling, running, walking, circuit training, horse riding, canoeing, angling, kite flying and frisbee. Construction of the Olympic park has severely curtailed this informal sporting activity. Paths along the canal through former industrial areas are popular with walkers and runners. Cyclists use the canal and Lee Navigation towpaths, and (before it was demolished for Olympic developments) Eastway cycle circuit, which hosted road-racing time trials, BMX stunt cycling, and mountain biking, as well as local projects such as a cycling club for the learning disabled and training for local school children.

London 2012 developments took away 11 football pitches, breaking up the area used by the Hackney and Leyton Sunday League. Around 1,500 players used to compete here every Sunday (on a total of 88 pitches). The masterplan enclosed 10ha of East Marsh for construction of a car park to be used by 400 coaches bringing Olympic spectators in from park-and-ride schemes around the M25. Research in 2004 by London Green party showed that the equivalent of 1,500 pitches had been lost in London since 1994, a decline particularly acute in east London (Dennison 2005). Chair of HMUG, Anne Woollett (2005) charged that the break-up of the marsh pitches was commensurate to ‘a loss of community’ for the men that play. Several prominent ‘names’ in English football trained on the Hackney Marsh pitches, including David Beckham, Harry Redknapp, Terry Venables, Ray Wilkins, Rodney Marsh, Laurie Cunningham, Paul Ince, Jermaine Defoe and Ashley Cole. Bobby Moore and fellow members of the 1966 England World Cup Squad, Martin Peters, Geoff Hurst and Jimmy Greaves also trained there (Rice and Ludgate 2005). A Guardian feature on the Hackney and Leyton Sunday League (Barkham et al 2004) can be found at <http://football.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,,1221620,00.html>.

In a letter to East London Advertiser (October 17, 2007 cited in Slavin 2007/3), Michael Humphreys, chair of Eastway Users’ Group, complained about missed deadlines for relocation of the cycle circuit which had closed a year before, in November 2006. ‘[London 2012] has been nothing but a total loss for road-race, time-trial and mountain-bike cross-country, that we used to do so successfully at Eastway,’ he wrote. ‘We never did get the promised “interim circuit” in Docklands. We were promised a 34ha site as “legacy” afterwards, which is now down to less than 10 (and that includes a large velodrome and BMX [track] that come with the Games. What really worries us, is that we had a site protected by Metropolitan Open Land status which has been taken from us on the promise of a replacement after 2012, supported by planning conditions that are now seemingly ignored by the development agency.’ A replacement cycle circuit in Hog’s Hill, Redbridge, opened in March 2008, and riders gave it the thumbs up (Slavin 2008/2). However, riders were not pleased with plans for the post-Olympics velopark. Two planning applications were submitted for the velopark by the Olympic Park Legacy Company. Both featured a permanent road-racing track but the route was radically different to the former cycle circuit. Nick Bull of Cycling Weekly noted that proposals came with dangerous corners, and added: ‘It hasn’t been designed for cycling but to fit houses and flats into the area – cycling is now an afterthought. They’ve shown complete disregard for cyclists.’ British Cycling and Sport England also objected to the plans (Evening Standard 2012/2).

Local sports facilities all over London are strapped for cash and in short supply. Sport England recommend one swimming pool for every 20,000 residents. Yet in Olympic boroughs Waltham Forest and Hackney alone there is a striking deficit. In 2006, Waltham Forest had five pools (one for every 44,000 residents, making a deficit of six [Waltham Forest Guardian 2006]), Hackney had only three. Even a richer borough such as Bexley, south London, had a deficit of eight pools according to the Sport London criteria (Lydall 2006). London Assembly (2008: 18–19) noted that, according to Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) calculations, east London had the greater deficit of swimming pools (public and private) in the capital: 38 per cent less than its target of 13m² of public water space per 1,000 persons. Twenty-four London boroughs were without accessible diving facilities.

- The largest pool in Waltham Forest closed in July 2007. LBWF announced that it could not afford the £74,833 annual losses or £159,000 one-off maintenance payment required in 2007/08. The Times (Samuel 2007) reported that ‘Waltham Forest College pool is significant because it is 33m long; still 17m short of Olympic standard but superior to most council-owned leisure pools, which is why it is home to 11 local schools in winter and many swimming and triathlon clubs throughout the year, including Leyton SC, Walthamstow Tritons SC, Swim4Tri and the Gators, more properly known as the Borough of Waltham Forest SC. The Gators is a Swim21 performance club, meaning it is serious about the sport, competition and coaching, and adheres to the [ASA] demanding development model ... To maintain this status, it needs 10 hours [of] swim time each week and that is not possible in a council-run pool, which must serve a large community. Any swimmers with international ambitions will now leave ... Waltham Forest team, or may be lost to the sport entirely.’

- The main pool at Atherton Road Leisure Centre in Newham closed in September 2011, to the alarm of local residents (Peart 2011). Pool user, John McHale, accused Newham council of underhand measures, and linked the closure to more prestigious Olympic facilities. Newham placed the blame on works to the ceiling of the pool taking longer than expected. Newham had closed the leisure centre's sauna in 2010 due to funding shortages. In March 2014, the council announced a 'brand new' Atheron Leisure Centre, costing £14.7 million, to include two local swimming pools, a gym and fitness studios (LBN 2014).

– *Cuts to sports finance*

A total of £2.175 billion of lottery funding was included in the official total London 2012 budget figure of £9.3 billion (Cannon undated). An FOI response revealed also significant sums demanded from sporting bodies: Sport England £99.956 million, Sport Northern Ireland £4.192 million, Sport Scotland £13.059 million, Sports Council of Wales £7.255 million. There was no separate contribution of lottery monies from UK Sport. In addition to this, the four 'national' sports lottery distributors were obliged to grant a further £340 million from National Lottery income (this in addition to £1.085 billion being contributed from UK-wide National Lottery distributors). DCMS response (Cannon *ibid*) said that £50 million of Sport England contribution would help fund the aquatics centre, velodrome and facilities at Broxbourne. The remaining £290 million would be spent on ensuring that both elite and grassroots sport could maximise benefits from the Games being held in the UK. ODA was main recipient of monies from the Olympic lottery distributor. After the Games, DCMS hoped to repay £675 million (an additional contribution from lottery monies to the Games announced in March 2007) to 'good causes' from the proceeds of Olympic park land sales. The FOI response stated: 'Not all the lottery funding will be repaid. Repayments will not include interest based on inflation. There are no plans to take further funds from the National Lottery for the 2012 Games or Games legacy projects.'

It was feared that local sports would be cut back, impacting particularly on young people's participation. Evening Standard (Lydall 2012) calculated that cash from Sport England, the organisation tasked with promoting grassroots sport, could have provided 20 local swimming pools, 19 sports halls, 841 grass pitches or 721 games areas. The shadow cabinet accused the government of "raiding grassroots sports budgets" (BBC News 2008c in Kenyon and Palmer 2009). In November 2010, Tory education secretary, Michael Gove, slashed £162 million off sports funding for English schools, in effect ending all ringfenced sport funding (Helm and Asthana 2010). Gove's decision was predicted to threaten most after-school clubs and severely reduce the number of trained PE teachers and sports coaches. However, he did propose a new schools Olympics, costing £10 million, details of which had not been released when the Observer (Helm and Asthana *ibid*) published their article.

– *Sports participation*

While cutting sports funding to schools, in November 2010 the new Tory administration itemised £135 million of lottery funding to be spent under the Places People Play programme (Cheyne 2010/4), aiming to encourage mass participation in sport on the back of the Games. Performance indicators, such as the pledge to inspire one million people doing more physical activity (laughably including decorating and gardening), disappeared from promotional statements (Gibson 2011). Figures published in March 2011 by Sport England showed barely any progress being made towards the target of 7.815 million people playing sport three or more times a week by 2012–2013. One of the quango's Active People surveys suggested that numbers of active sportsters stood at 6.881 million, a marginal increase on the 2007–2008 baseline of 6.815 million (*ibid*). Conservative think tank, Centre for Social Justice (CSJ) slammed the legacy pledge for sporting participation in their report *More Than a Game* published in 2011. CSJ remarked the pledge as 'highly effective sales pitch that was never fully realised', adding that [t]he scale of the challenge that the Olympic organisers ... set themselves is too high for the relatively small amounts of funding and programmes that have been promised' (Sinclair 2011). Olympics minister Hugh Robertson had said that tackling the poor state of sports facilities across the country was a top priority, and a nationwide campaign to offer teenagers and young adults six weeks of coaching in the sport of their choice was also announced. CSJ said upgrading facilities would not in itself increase participation, adding that 'taster' coaching courses had failed to engage young people. The report stated: 'Limited available funding and the tendency to direct what there is into capital spending and short-term programming mean that it is difficult to see how money allocated to this can be expected to produce greater benefits for disadvantaged young people. The participation target was intrinsically flawed from the outset, not just because it was more convincing as a sales pitch than a policy objective, but also because engaging any number of additional people in some unspecified sporting activity is not the same thing as ... serious, targeted work aimed at transforming the lives of Britain's neediest people.'

- Olympic organisers were accused of undervaluing women's sports and contravening the Olympic Charter's commitment to equality. Sue Tibballs, chief executive of Women's Sport and Fitness Foundation commented: 'There is no doubt that [pricing] sends a clear message that women's sports are not valued equally. Lower price equals lower value. But this is not just a commercial event. A lot of public money has gone into it. Judgments are being made about the value of women's sport that don't reflect its value in the market: women's sport is at an all-time high' (Cheyne 2010/5).
- In November 2010, LBTH freesheet East End Life announced that the Olympic marathon had been 'stolen' – literally whisked away from under the noses of council officials and bequeathed to west and central London. Regeneration and Renewal's Tim Williams commented on the decision to reroute the marathon: 'My own sources suggest that the compelling reason for LOCOG to betray east London is a combination of new bilateral sponsorship deals being offered by individual countries seeking their "live sites" to be televised and pressure from VisitLondon to highlight mainstream tourist destinations along the route. I invite them to deny this. It smells true' (Dowding 2010/1, after blogger DiamondGeezer).

3. CONTAMINATION FEARS AND IMPACT OF CONSTRUCTION

3.1 Radioactive contamination and hazardous waste

Environmental Information Request replies from ODA have revealed that over 7,000 tonnes of material (contaminated not only with Thorium-232 and Radium-226 but also with Uranium-238 and Protactinium-231) have been reburied in a specially constructed cell beneath a road bridge near Stratford town centre. ODA consultants advised that 'Protactinium-231 ... is the byproduct of the chemical separation of uranium from uranium ore. No evidence has been found of refined uranium.'

Mike Wells (2009/1). 'Should we beware the east wind?', Open Dalston, October 2

Text below is taken from an article on Games Monitor, published February 14, 2010, by Paul Charman and Mike Wells (© Charman and Wells).

After spending hundreds of millions of tax payers' money on a high profile so-called 'clean up', it [is] clear that the 2012 Olympic park actually remains classified as a contaminated brownfield site.

Documents show that the whole area is to have as little as two feet (60cm) of 'clean' material placed on top of a warning marker layer of orange plastic fabric sheeting, of a type called Terram1000, covering almost all the park site ... While selected areas below this level have been treated, the land comes with no guarantees if disturbed as part of future development. Anything which involves digging into this separation layer will require special procedures to be followed, including protective measures for workers. Future contractors are warned that excavated material is to be considered contaminated unless proven otherwise.

The warning is well founded given that carcinogenic asbestos-laden material has been left in place in many areas, the levels being so high that the soil would be classified as 'hazardous waste' if excavated during future construction activities. The asbestos limit for 'fill' material being used in site preparation is right on the borderline of being [deemed] hazardous ... at 0.1 per cent to 20 times higher than the 'clean' material being used at the surface. Even that material at the surface has been permitted to contain asbestos five times higher than the 0.001 per cent level widely accepted as giving rise to hazard if blown into the air and inhaled.

Radioactive contamination of unknown extent has been left in place next to the main stadium, as well as in the remainder of the old West Ham Tip in the area around the velodrome and adjacent to the Olympic village. A report on preparations for the velodrome confirms 'significant residual risks' of the presence of radiological material during construction, maintenance and decommissioning, as well as other ground contaminants.

Saving on landfill charges by retaining or reusing contaminated material has led to potentially serious incidents. Near the velodrome crushed masonry was used as a road surface, but was later found to contain over four times the legal limit of asbestos and subsequently required controlled removal.

An ODA spokesperson said: 'The ODA is on track to deliver the cleaning and clearing of the Olympic park on time and well within the £364 million originally allocated in the ODA budget for enabling works. The [LDA] has contributed additional funding to the site demolition and clean-up, which includes the remediation of contaminated soil. The ODA is currently anticipating delivering over £20 million of cost savings in its enabling works budget.'

But the fact that the Olympic park remains a potentially hazardous brownfield site not only brings into question value for money of the remediation, but also has consequences for legacy use of the land. While the LDA hopes to recoup money by a post-Olympics sale of the land, use of the land will require careful monitoring. An ODA document warns that 'Future use of the site should not include the construction of private gardens or the growing of edible crops', in contrast to the claims of green, sustainable legacy communities in their publicity.

The mysterious resignation of Jack Lemley (first Olympic boss) was attributed in part to his concerns over contamination of the Olympic site, and the government's failure to listen to bad news. [These] concerns now appear well founded. As the attempted remediation of Corby steelworks and the ongoing controversy [over] the asbestos-contaminated Spodden Valley have shown, attempts to intensively redevelop sites regardless of their condition is risky unless very carefully managed. In the case of the Olympic park, there are factors of an immovable timetable and ambitious landscaping involving the disturbance of millions of tons of soil containing a whole range of contaminants, and there is evidence these are taking priority over safety.

Excavations and movement of excavated material from the Olympic site may have made the pollution problem worse by bringing toxins closer to the surface. For example, the historic West Ham Tip had previously

been covered with a substantial protective layer of over two metres of clean soil, now stripped away.

Though there was compelling evidence to suggest the site was radioactively contaminated before work started, the authorities appear not to have taken the problem seriously until contamination was found in material which had already been excavated and moved. By that time, the project was well advanced and the possibility of changing approach was probably impossible due to the Olympic deadline.

Today, as the clean-up draws to a close, documents show that more than 7,000 tonnes of radioactive waste was wrapped in plastic and buried under a pedestrian walkway, while unknown quantities of radioactive and other contaminants have been left in the ground. Because the site remains officially contaminated, and as it is now known to contain not only radioactive waste, but a variety of toxins, land in the Olympic park may prove an unattractive liability to developers. It is clearly far from demonstrating exemplary standards of remediation. Consequently, Olympic landowners, who include [LVRPA] and the LDA, could be liable for another costly and disruptive post-Olympic clean-up.

Contamination of the Olympic park is the subject of *Gold Dust*, a film by Mike Wells, featuring celebrated poet and novelist Iain Sinclair – a resident of Hackney – reading from his book, *Ghost Milk* (Hamish Hamilton, 2011), on the failure of megaevents, with a haunting score by campaigning lawyer Bill Parry-Davies of Open Dalston on saxophone. *Gold Dust* can be accessed at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X2QmYmoF1GA>.

- In another article on Games Monitor, Mike Wells (2009/1) quotes Chris Busby, an expert on radiation and health. Busby suggested that data on radioactive material in the Olympic park showed a radiation signature which ‘suggest[ed] that the contamination [was] from significant levels of uranium,’ adding: ‘This should be considered to be a serious alpha and photoelectron emitter inhalation hazard.’ Wells reports that ‘Much of the radioactive waste has been found on the site of the main stadium itself and includes radium, polonium and thorium as well as uranium ... Agencies with workers on site include the Environment Agency and the [p]olice; neither of these ... have any information on ... risk assessment for any potential radiological uptake by their staff ... One ... pathway for radiological uptake is from dust. Another document shows concerns over inadequate dust suppression on site. Residents living near the Olympic construction site have complained of dust from the site since works began in 2007 [see §3.3], yet attempts to improve poor dust management have only been implemented relatively recently.’ Significantly, Wells notes that: ‘Another request for data on radiation monitoring was refused by [ODA] who say ... cost of collating the data is too high. In another departure from normal practice, areas of the Olympic ... site that are contaminated with radioactive material are not marked with the familiar “radioactive roundel”, but rather have been marked “heavily contaminated area”.’
- Around 500 tonnes of radioactive waste from the Olympic park were dumped in a landfill site in Thornhaugh, near Peterborough, Cambridgeshire, operated by the firm Augean (Griffiths 2010). No permits were required since ODA was able to take advantage of the same exemption order which allowed it to bury waste with low levels of radioactivity on site in a bunker just 250m from the main Olympic stadium. Waste was shipped to Thornhaugh in a carefully planned two-day operation in August 2009 in a convoy of 23 lorries that shipped 460 tonnes of waste along a prearranged route with drivers under strict instructions not to stop for breaks. The landfill operator also maintained a site nearby at Kings Cliffe. In March 2010, Northamptonshire County Council rejected Augean’s application to receive low-level radioactive waste at the site after vehement opposition from local residents and Waste Watch. Augean appealed against the decision in October 2010. Games Monitor is not aware of the result.

3.2 Air pollution associated with construction

In a long-running story on Games Monitor, London 2012 green credentials came under further scrutiny as ODA continued to refuse to fit non-road mobile machinery with filters to cut particulate emissions. As such, it defied both the European Union (EU) and London mayor Boris Johnson, who required construction sites to follow his office’s best practice guidance, as well as that of the Environmental Industries Commission (EIC). ODA stalled on this for over a year. It ignored the House of Commons Early Day Motion put down in January 2009 as well as criticism from the EIC. By the time it got round to fitting the necessary filters, probably in the summer of 2010, two years after it should have acted, polluting machinery would have left the site. In the same Early Day Motion, MPs also expressed concern about failure to reduce dust emissions (Cheyne 2009). EU fines for lack of compliance were reported as around £300 million (Cheyne 2010/6)

Monitoring was only required for coarser particles. However, Cheyne notes that the most dangerous particles, PM_{2.5}, were to remain outside the monitoring regime until 2010. Citing the national air quality strategy in its FOI response of March 18, 2009, ODA (2009/1) suggested that the World Health Organisation had stated ‘a stronger association with ill-health effects’ where these particles were concerned. ODA said that it had monitored particles less than 10 microns but was not obliged to monitor smaller ones and, Cheyne notes, had claimed in discussions to have gone beyond what was required. The remediation programme was due to finish also in 2010. In another FOI response, ODA (2009/2) stated (in regard to the Early Day Motion) that ‘it believe[d] that ... requirements of the relevant planning permissions [were] being complied with’, and as such, no further action was necessary. ODA continued, it said, to monitor the situation.

3.3 Impacts of construction on local residents

Work on the Olympic site has been brought right up to the neighbouring fence – and we can see all sorts of activity going on only metres from us. Of course this has brought fresh concerns from most of the square – especially from the front three blocks. The noise at 7am hits you like the rudest alarm clock – and does not stop until 8pm. The new floodlights set up around the soil-washing plant bring daylight into our flats at night – and encourage the builders to make as much noise as they do during the height of the day. We are back to debating the old question: is having the Olympics on our doorstep worth living next to the largest construction site in Europe? The answer used to be ‘Yes’.

Leabank Square blog (2008). ‘Olympic noise and dust’, October 15

The text below is taken from an article on Games Monitor by Julian Cheyne, October 7, 2008.

So how are residents faring? Sona [Abantu-Choudhury, resident of Leabank Square] told me meetings have been held with the ODA and promises made. However, dust is still descending on the housing opposite the Olympic park. Indeed, with the dry weather in September things actually got worse! No-one had seen any sprays in action, even bowsers. The point here is that bowsers do not spray water high enough to cover the piles of earth heaped up on to the site opposite Leabank Square ...

Promises have also been made that residents would be kept up to speed with new developments on site. These have also not been kept. The large piles of soil directly opposite the estate are being moved to be washed in a soil decontamination machine, which is situated a little to the south east of Leabank Square. Until recently, this machine was working until 10pm! The noise from the machine at that time of night, when there are no other background sounds was extremely disturbing. Hackney [council], supposedly the defenders of residents’ interests, had given permission for this without any consultation with its residents ... The ODA has now agreed to restrict working until 8pm. Not a great concession. But it comes with a sting in its tail. Whereas this machine was going to be in use for another 10 months, that is until around June 2009, this has now been extended to 18 months. Frankly, I was staggered when I heard this. However, there is now another machine next to the soil washing machine, which only arrived recently. Despite the promises, no information has been provided about what it is for ...

In addition to the soil-washing operation, there is another machine, for grinding up material dug up from the site, a bit further to the south. Sona recently had a meeting with Hackney environmental health officers in his flat. To his relief, it was so noisy that they had to move the meeting. Crazy really that he should have to be relieved that it was noisy.

- In a vicious irony, in November 2010 the Noise Abatement Society awarded host borough local authorities a ‘noise oscar’ for noise management on the Olympic construction site. The Joint Local Authority Regulatory Services team of Hackney, Newham, Waltham Forest and Tower Hamlets councils together with the ODA/CLM consortium environment team won the Innovation Award in 2010 for ‘cooperation between local authorities and developers in the construction of the Olympic park’ (Charlie 2011).
- In July 2011, Hackney council applied for planning permission to run Clapton waste depot dustcarts round the clock from June to September 2012. The depot is at the east end of Millfields Road (next to one of the relocated Travellers’ sites), and surrounded by residential streets and estates. Local people already suffered the noise of dustcarts driven hard and fast outside their windows from 6.30am. Calls for a 20mph speed limit were turned down by the council as ‘unenforceable’, and the noise increased with the installation of speed cushions as drivers practised their speed-handling skills on traffic-free early morning streets. Planning conditions permitted the depot to operate only after 7.30am. However, attempts by local residents to get this enforced were stonewalled, and Hackney council then applied for an earlier, 6.30am, start time for non-Olympic working (Evans 2011).

3.4 Sewage contamination

Construction of London 2012 developments disrupted flood-relief systems, increasing the threat of major flooding in vulnerable areas, and ministers were charged to take remedial action to prevent sewage overflows contaminating the Olympic site itself (this prospect was thwarted by the building of Prescott Channel Lock). One study by Thames Tideway Strategy Group found that even a moderate summer storm would overflow drains and send sewage up the river Lea on the tide. In November 2005, the Tideway group announced that there was a ‘100 per cent chance’ of sewage overflows in the Olympic area between May and October (Weaver 2006). In any case (noted Mike Wells on Games Monitor), Deephams Sewage works in north London pumps almost a quarter of a million cubic metres of treated sewage per day into the Lea. Raw sewage overflows are discharged from Deephams into the Lee Navigation every time it rains in the catchment area. ‘Below Tottenham, the river bed consists of black rancid stinking slurry. Opposite Pymme’s Brook at the point sewage enters the Lea, it is not uncommon for boats to become stuck in the foetid matter discharged from Deephams’ (Wells 2009/2), an effect compounded by extraction of drinking water. After years of neglect, the Environment Agency began dredging the sediment, sending it for landfill at a cost of over £7 million. Wells charged that this was happening solely because of the Olympic event: ‘[D]redging will stir up years of industrial contamination to the detriment of wildlife and plants. Furthermore, a long-term solution would include effective policing of industrial pollution, reduction in the extraction of drinking water, and the elimination of sewage discharge. A fact acknowledged in the Environment Agency’s own Water Quality Framework Directive’ (ibid).

4. POLICY EVALUATION

4.1 London 2012: the 'greenest Olympic Games'?

One of the most galling aspects of the London bid was the rush of support from establishment environmental organisations and political ecologists, predicated on statements underpinning LDA development proposals for a low and renewable energy principle, intensive recycling of waste, low emissions, and 'sustainable' procurement. Jonathan Porritt, World Wide Fund for Nature, British Trust for Conservation Volunteers, Groundwork, London Wildlife Trust, and BioRegional Development Group all pinned their colours to the Olympic mast, presumably in the hope of accessing funding.

– Carbon neutrality

In an email to the Ecoactive conference dated July 18, 2005, ecology consultant Chris Church branded the assertion of a carbon-neutral Games as 'dangerous myth', pointing to planning and development processes as instrumental in the production of environmental and social inequalities. He charged the development process with lacking public accountability, and demanded the incorporation of environmental justice as definitive paradigm within development and 'legacy' arrangements (Church 2005).

Construction of facilities for London 2012 diverted monies intended to combat the capital's carbon dioxide emissions. Architects Journal (2006) commented that this left 'the Olympic environmental credo withering at the edges.' The magazine charged that '[p]lans for a £6 million "revolving fund" for investment in renewables and energy efficiency [had been abandoned] earlier [in the] year by the London Climate Change Agency – part financed by the LDA – due to "funding pressure from the Olympics".' The magazine suggested that the diversion would not 'make or break' the capital's emissions targets, but that it was 'too late anyway' to meet them. The week before, London mayor Ken Livingstone had admitted that London would miss the 2010 CO₂ emissions target and would not come close to meeting its target for zero-carbon development. Darren Johnson, leader of the London Assembly Green group raised the prospect of funding cuts impacting on other green initiatives as a direct result of the Olympic project, and criticised designs for the aquatics centre for failing to incorporate renewable energy sources into the initial proposals. Concerns remained over the 'embedded' energy of such events and the vast facilities servicing spectators. More recently, the Commission for Sustainable London demanded renewed scrutiny of the energy used in Olympic construction (Hawkes 2009; Carus 2010).

Controversy erupted at the GLA over a London Assembly report which claimed £4.5 million was being cut from climate change initiatives as LDA shelved or axed £45 million of schemes to balance its books. LDA had 'lost' £161 million after failing to keep track of around £1 billion of land purchases for the Olympic park. London mayor, Boris Johnson, denied key climate change schemes were at risk, but the London Assembly stood by its report, stating that its claims were derived from figures from the LDA itself. 'It's difficult to see how else these figures could be interpreted,' an Assembly source told the Evening Standard (Beard and Lydall 2009).

– Sustainability criteria (Stratford precinct)

London 2012 released their draft sustainability plan *Toward One Planet 2012* for stakeholder-only consultation in November 2007, with a second edition published in 2009. The initial document domesticated environmental catastrophe with a communitarian ethic. Those consulted on the proposals affirmed the functionalist paradigm. 'Stakeholders' complained that skills, jobs and 'behaviour change' had been underplayed, that interorganisational reporting cycles were neglected, and that the document lacked 'measurable targets and action plans' (London 2012 2007). Yet they felt excluded by the authorial voice (a 'topdown tone') and criticised a lack of engagement in its development. Concerns were raised about standards outlined in the document that would be anodyne by 2012, particularly those set for residential development. Also that 'a small number of significant sustainability commitments made in London's Candidate File [were] not explicitly dealt with'.

In March 2008, Jenny Jones, Green party London Assembly member, released an evaluation of sustainability criteria for the event and infrastructure construction, entitled *More Hurdles to Jump* (Jones 2008/1). The report was forthright but then withdrawn, and another was published in August (Jones 2008/2), far more muted in its criticism. *More Hurdles to Jump* itself highlighted 'evidence of backtracking on early commitments' and charged planners with a 'worrying lack of ambition'. Jones commented: 'Particularly in areas of energy and climate change, transport, fair wages, affordable housing and sports participation, the bar has simply been set too low

to achieve an exemplary sustainable Olympics.' Key criticisms of sustainability criteria in *More Hurdles to Jump* are stated below.

- Energy efficiency targets applied only to permanent venues, indicating that there were no efficiency targets for venues hosting the greatest number of spectators. The report asserted that the combined cooling heat and power system should be capable of meeting full heating demands of the Olympic park and should be biomass powered. Organisers claimed that the technology was not yet well enough developed, despite the fact that large-scale biomass-powered combined heat and power had been operational in continental Europe for some time. One example the report gave from Sweden had been powering 25,000 homes from biomass since 1994. No mention was made of microgeneration (from technology such as solar panels). The commitment for the athletes' village to be 'capable of being energy self-sufficient' was deferred until after the event.
- The report asserted that water-use targets for the athletes' village fell well below the intended level 4 standard of the Code for Sustainable Homes. In fact, proposed Olympic standards risked being overtaken by subsequent regulations. The report suggested that if 2012 organisers failed to go beyond the 20 per cent water-use reduction target, the athletes' village would fail to reach level 1 of the code.
- Despite a commitment 'to maximise timber from sustainable sources', the sustainability plan deferred to the UK Central Point of Expertise on Timber (CPET), a decision lambasted by Greenpeace who described CPET as 'a licence to wreck ancient forests', and 'an utter failure at stopping illegal timber flooding into [g]overnment building sites'. The report noted that despite another promise of 'zero Games-time waste to landfill', no new waste reprocessing or recycling facilities were planned for the site.
- The report notes questions emerging about whether legacy proposals met commitments to enhanced biodiversity. It quoted one response from Newham council to Olympic planning applications, from March 19, 2007: 'In ecological terms the legacy park does not deliver – it is a mere shadow of that stated in the 2004 application and does not deliver sustainable ecological sites or significant green corridors ... beyond the river system'.
- Car parking and traffic congestion also proved contentious. The planning application of 2004 forecast a three-fold rise in traffic in the area after the event. For the Games, permission was sought for 1,979 car parking spaces (to include disabled parking) and 631 coach parking spaces and layover bays on the main site, including a 1,300-space multistorey car park to adjoin the athletes' village. This in addition to the 5,440 car parking spaces at Stratford City and multistorey car park at the London 2012 media centre. The report also criticised the rationale behind park-and-ride schemes and restricted purview of the low emissions zone that was confined solely to the Olympic park area.

Wind turbines

- ODA scrapped plans for a functioning wind turbine on the Olympic park site in 2010. The turbine was proposed for Eton Manor in the north of the site and intended to contribute to its target of delivering 20 per cent of the Olympic park's legacy energy requirements from renewable sources from 2014 onwards when the site would be fully operational. ODA told Planning Resource (Donnelly 2010) that cancellation was the result of a shifting energy industry environment, and because the preferred supplier for the project felt 'unable to comply with new regulations before the Games and [had withdrawn] from the project'. ODA was subsequently reported to be exploring possibilities for development of a biomass gasification plant, to be sited near the energy centre on the western side of the park, and also (now) at possible locations for photovoltaic panels (BBC News 2010).
- Two days later, Paul Charman (2010) reported a scheme on Games Monitor for what he described as 'pimped-up' wind turbines (model Quiet Revolution QR5), costed at £300,000. These were largely decorative (something admitted by ODA when challenged) and would require more power to run than they actually generated. Each turbine consumes around 250 watts at average wind speeds, generates energy sufficient to power only two computers, and emits a carbon 'footprint' of around 150g of CO₂ per hour. Now in place, the turbines are decorated with coloured LED bulbs and floodlit to grab the attention of visitors. Similar turbines had been rejected as net consumers of power on a scheme at the Elephant and Castle in south London.

– London's air quality

Campaign for Clean Air for London and Professor Frank Kelly, director of King's College London Environmental Research Group, urged the GLA to impose a Beijing-style ban on cars or older diesel vehicles during the Olympics, amid fears that pollution could cost £175 million in fines and jeopardise events such as the marathon. They suggested that London might have to reduce traffic levels by more than 30 per cent over one month to meet the legally binding Host City Contract demands brokered with the IOC. This raised the possibility that TFL would enforce a car ban. Under the contract, IOC was able to withhold up to 25 per cent of the expected £700 million in broadcasting revenue if air pollution exceeded EU levels during the Games. London is one of the most polluted cities in Europe. According to ODA strategic environmental assessment, expected increases in traffic along the 600km Olympic Route Network during the Games would lead to further breaches of European pollution limits in

areas that already suffered from poor air quality. ODA contributed to the continuing failure to tackle air pollution in the capital with its refusal to fit non-road mobile machinery with exhaust aftertreatment. 'Those who remember what China – especially Beijing – was made to go through during the run-up to the Games, would call this a pleasant irony', commented China Daily (Evening Standard 2012/3; Rohrer 2008; Cheyne 2010/6; Cheyne 2010/7; Haizhou 2010).

– *Locally sourced and seasonal food*

In 2007, the Soil Association with New Economics Foundation and food and farming alliance Sustain demanded that London 2012 be a showcase for the benefits of local, seasonal and organic food, that catering at the event should help promote sustainable fish consumption, and also that food imported for the Games should meet Fairtrade standards. Their report, *Feeding the Olympics*, called for Olympic sponsors Coca-Cola and McDonald's to serve 75 per cent unprocessed, 50 per cent locally sourced and 30 per cent organic food and drink. 'Specific promises about access to healthy food for the new communities that will be developed, and the sustainable food that would be available as a result, were made in the 2012 bid,' the report noted, but added '[t]here have been few signs that these pledges are going to be honoured. Indeed the most significant food development so far is the loss of ... Manor Gardens allotment site' (Soil Association 2007) (see also §2.1). More than one in five meals served to spectators at the Games would be sold by McDonald's, reported the Daily Mail (Freeman 2009). Ruari O'Connor, head of policy at British Heart Foundation, commented: 'Health does not seem to be high on the agenda. The focus on fast food, where the primary products are high in fat, sugar and salt, means we question whether the health legacy which has been promised will be fulfilled.'

Remarkably, New Spitalfields Market, on the edge of the Olympic site in Leyton, was overlooked in LOCOG's food procurement policy. 'Despite our many attempts to connect with the relevant authorities, they have completely ignored the existence of the largest wholesale market in the UK,' Tim Williams, the market's business development manager told Fresh Produce Journal (Knowles 2009). Sandra Bell, food campaigner for Friends of the Earth, accused the food policy of 'rewarding the status quo'. 'While some of the food supplied will be British,' she said, 'there has been no real commitment to reduce the use of meat reared on imported animal feed – the production of which is destroying rainforests in South America. Three big multinational brands will profit from a large proportion of food sold, creaming off profits that should be supporting local businesses and British farmers [who] are already going beyond these standards to produce food without trashing the planet' (FOE 2009).

There was also criticism of LOCOG's Red Tractor mandatory baseline standard for chicken and pork served during the event. LOCOG's *Food Vision Paper* also refused to commit to a target for the percentage of RSPCA Freedom Food standard meat. Celebrity chef Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall championed ethical farming practices for production of Olympic food: '[It is] inconceivable that we will be watching sports people at their peak of fitness, yet being served chicken by the Olympic Games catering service that not only has an arguable lower nutritional value, but has been produced in a system that causes lameness in over a quarter of the birds. I believe that the 2012 Olympics has a role to play in showing leadership and responsibility on this issue,' he said (Hill 2009 citing a report by Estates Gazette blogger, Paul Norman).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

All URLs were checked on November 4, 2015. Please note that the *Evening Standard* redated much of its historic reportage in 2012, and authors' bylines were removed. Other articles have (mysteriously) shifted publication since first inclusion. Where possible, the bibliography notes previous date of publication.

Adelaja T (2008). 'Turning Sochi into a playground for the wealthy', *Moscow Times*, September 18. <http://www.themoscowtimes.com/business/article/turning-sochi-into-a-playground-for-the-wealthy/371026.html>

Alexandridis T (2007). *The Housing Impact of the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens: Background Paper*, Geneva: COHRE/Greek Helsinki Monitor. http://www.ruig-gian.org/ressources/Athens_background_paper

Andrews K (2005/1). 'The Hackney, Walthamstow and Leyton Marshes are former Lammas Lands ...', statement for No London 2012 press conference, February 14

Andrews K (2005/2). 'Consultation: Clapton, a sustainable neighbourhood', letter from NLLDC to Clapton Area Consultation Team, Planning Control Section, Land Use and Transportation Department, London Borough of Hackney, August 1

Andrews K (2006/1). Email to no2london_olympics2012 mailing list, February 1

Andrews K (2006/2). 'Marsh Lane and Seymour Fields – exchange lands then and now', email to no2london_olympics2012 mailing list, August 1

Architects Journal (2006). 'False start for green Olympics', May 25. <http://www.architectsjournal.co.uk/home/false-start-for-green-olympics/128869.article>

Barkham P (2007). 'On the move again', *Guardian*, October 19. <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2007/oct/19/britishidentity.olympics2012>

Barkham P, Barton L, Edemariam A, Fleming A and MacInnes P (2004). 'Hackney Marshes', *Guardian*, May 21. <http://football.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,,1221620,00.html>

Batswithbabyfaces (2009). 'Barge delivery delays cause problems for Olympics', *Games Monitor* discussion list, June 8. <https://uk.groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/gamesmonitor/conversations/messages/2627>

Batsworth C (2010). 'Bow Back rivers website', *Games Monitor* blog, September 1. <http://gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/1070>

BBC News (2008) 'BP to sponsor London 2012 Games', July 3. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/london/7486966.stm>

BBC News (2010). 'London Olympic Games site wind turbine scrapped', June 4. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/10234665> [WAS Donnelly M (2010). 'Olympic wind turbine plans scrapped', *Planning Resource*, June 3]

BBC News (2013). 'University College "Olympic campus" scheme collapses', May 8. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-22446437>

BBC Sport (2005). 'Fewer sports for London Olympics', July 8. http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr//sport1/hi/other_sports/olympics_2012/4658925.stm

Beard M (2009). 'Smokery ends Olympics site fight', *Independent*, April 1 <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/news/smokery-ends-olympics-site-fight-6101469.html> [WAS Beard M (2006). 'Smokery ends Olympics site fight', *Guardian*, May 9]

Beard M and Lydall R (2009). 'LDA will shelve climate work after "losing" £161m from Olympics budget', *Evening Standard*, October 23. <http://www.standard.co.uk/news/lda-will-shelve-climate-work-after-losing-161m-from-olympics-budget-6716884.html>

Bigg C (2010). 'Troubled Sochi Olympics draw focus on Caucasus conflicts', *Radio Free Europe*, June 5. http://www.rferl.org/content/Troubled_Sochi_Olympics_Draw_Focus_On_Caucasus_Conflicts/2062915.html

Big Lottery Refund [BLR] (2015). 'The story of the Big Lottery Refund campaign: everything we know so far', webpage. <http://www.biglotteryrefund.org.uk/background.html>

Billy J (2002). 'Regarding concerns of aboriginal elders, land users and native youth regarding the impacts of the 2010 Vancouver-Whistler Olympic bid on aboriginal people, culture, land and the environment, June 30 [published on Vancouver Media Co-op's Anti-Olympics Archive by Zig Zag as 'Sutikalh and Skwelkwek'welt

2002 submission to the IOC', February 15 2011. <http://vancouver.mediacoop.ca/olympics/sutikalh-and-skwelkwekwelt-2002-submission-ioc/6305>]

Black Flag 223 (undated). 'No Olympics in Berlin', translated from Granwacke Collective's Autonomists in the Movement, From the First 23 Years

Blowe K (2004). 'London's Olympic myths', Radical Activist. <http://www.radicalactivist.net> [no longer online]

Blowe K (2010/1). 'Wanstead Flats – register your objection!', Random Blowe, December 10. <http://www.blowe.org.uk/2010/12/wanstead-flats-register-your-objection.html>

Blowe K (2010/2). 'Met seeks permission for Olympic "military mase" on Wanstead Flats', Random Blowe, June 7. <http://www.blowe.org.uk/2010/06/met-seeks-permission-for-olympic.html>

Blowe K (2010/3). 'Save Wanstead Flats Campaign calls mass community picnic', Random Blowe, July 29. <http://www.blowe.org.uk/2010/07/save-wanstead-flats-campaign-calls-mass.html>

Blowe K (2010/4). 'Wanstead Flats – police launch media offensive', Random Blowe, August 12. <http://www.blowe.org.uk/2010/08/wanstead-flats-police-launch-media.html>

Blowe K (2011/1). 'Wanstead Flats: when is an undertaking not an undertaking?' Random Blowe, December 4. <http://www.blowe.org.uk/2011/12/wanstead-flats-when-is-undertaking-not.html>

Blowe K (2011/2). 'Epping Forest faces cuts as Wanstead Flats leased for peppercorn rent', Random Blowe, June 8. <http://www.blowe.org.uk/2011/06/epping-forest-faces-cuts-as-wanstead.html>

Blowe (2011/3). 'Wanstead Flats – a terrible precedent is born', Random Blowe, December 6. <http://www.blowe.org.uk/2011/12/wanstead-flats-terrible-precedent-is.html>

Blowe K (2012/1). 'A brief history of the Save Wanstead Flats Campaign', Random Blowe, January 12. <http://www.blowe.org.uk/2012/01/brief-history-of-save-wanstead-flats.html>

Blowe K (2012/2). 'Inside Fortress Wanstead Flats', Random Blowe, July 21. <http://www.blowe.org.uk/2012/07/inside-fortress-wanstead-flats.html>

Blowe K (2012/3). 'Wanstead Flats – join the people's picnic', Random Blowe, May 15. <http://www.blowe.org.uk/2012/05/wanstead-flats-join-peoples-picnic.html>

Blowe K (2012/4). 'Work begins on Fortress Wanstead Flats', Random Blowe, June 23. <http://www.blowe.org.uk/2012/06/work-begins-on-fortress-wanstead-flats.html>

Blowe K (2012/5). 'Scar on Wanstead Flats as Olympic fortress departs', Random Blowe, September 18. <http://www.blowe.org.uk/2012/09/scar-on-wanstead-flats-as-olympic.html>

Blowe K (2012/6). 'Wanstead Flats: I hate to say this but I told you so', Random Blowe, November 4. <http://www.blowe.org.uk/2012/11/wanstead-flats-i-hate-to-say-this-but-i.html>

Blowe K and Du Boulay E (2013). *Monitoring Olympics Policing During the 2012 'Security Games': A Report on Community-Based Legal Observing Organised by Newham Monitoring Project*, London: Newham Monitoring Project. <https://netpol.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/monitoring-the-security-games-final-report.pdf>

Brooke M (2009). 'A different class of Cultural Olympiad', Hackney Gazette, June 9 [no longer online]

Brown C (2006). 'Get off Games site', Waltham Forest Guardian, December 28

Brown C (2007). 'Olympic site – demolition work is making life hell', Waltham Forest Guardian, September 19. http://www.guardian-series.co.uk/news/1700794.OLYMPIC_SITE__Demolition_work_is_making_life_hell

Buglife (2013). 'Rare brownfield wildlife under threat', September 12. <https://www.buglife.org.uk/news-%26-events/news/rare-brownfield-wildlife-under-threat>

Bush A (2012). 'Carpenters Estate residents "face uncertain future"', December 18. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-22446437>

Campbell D (2005). 'Olympics are handed an extra £1bn as costs soar', Observer, September 18. <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/sep/18/sport.london>

Campbell D (2007). 'Travellers go to court over eviction to make way for Olympic village', Guardian, March 12. <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2007/mar/12/communities.olympics2012>

Cannon (undated). 'You contacted the ICO ...', FOI response, DCMS. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/files/FoI%20re%20Lottery%20funding%20for%20Olympics.doc>

Carpenters Against Regeneration Plans [CARP] (2013). 'A Carpenters Estate community plan', CARP newsletter, March. <https://savecarpenters.files.wordpress.com/2013/04/carp-newsletter-march-2013.pdf>

Carus F (2010). 'London Olympics 2012 could flunk golden chance to be green', Guardian, June 2. <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2010/jun/02/london-olympics-2012-green-chance-danger>

Catalytic Communities [CatComm] (2015). 'Rio favela facts', webpage. <http://catcomm.org/favela-facts>

Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions [COHRE] (2004). Housing Rights Bulletin, August [no longer online]

Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions [COHRE] (2007). Housing Rights Awards 2007, webpage [no longer online]

Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions [COHRE]/RUIG/GIAN (2007). 'Joint media statement', June 5 [no longer online]

Charlie (2011). 'Olympic "noise oscar" as Leabank misery continues', Games Monitor discussion list, February 5. <https://uk.groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/gamesmonitor/conversations/messages/4288>

Charman P (2010). 'Power-hungry Olympic wind park a triumph of spin over substance', Games Monitor, June 5. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/963>

Charman P and Wells M (2010). 'London 2012: legacy or liability?' Games Monitor, February 14. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/911>

Cheyne J (2005). 'The first evictions ...', forum thread on Inside Housing, starting May 21 [Elifaz100's comment is at August 4]. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/files/Olympics%20forum2.doc>

Cheyne J (2008/1). 'What happened to the relocated businesses? LDA FOI response', Games Monitor, July 7. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/644>

Cheyne J (2008/2). 'More 'anecdotal' complaints of noise and dust from Leabank Square residents', Games Monitor, October 7. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/704>

Cheyne J (2009). 'Dust and exhaust – ODA pollutes compliantly?' Games Monitor, April 7. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/801>

Cheyne J (2010/1). 'Sports field to be tarmaced for Olympics', Games Monitor blog, August 11. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1043>

Cheyne J (2010/2). 'LDA made secret deductions from compensation paid to Clays Lane tenants', Games Monitor, June 8. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/964>

Cheyne J (2010/3). 'The fire burns on – Vancouver anti-Olympics torch on its way to London', Games Monitor, July 8. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/991>

Cheyne J (2010/4). 'A cornerstone of lies', Games Monitor blog, November 17. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1150>

Cheyne J (2010/5). 'Low 2012 prices show women's sport "not valued equally"', Games Monitor blog, October 18. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1138>

Cheyne J (2010/6). 'ODA air quality non-compliance could raise budget with £300m EU fine', Games Monitor, February 2. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/910>

Cheyne J (2010/7). 'Air pollution – Beijing sees "pleasant irony" in London's discomfort', Games Monitor blog, September 30. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1111>

Cheyne J (2011). 'Ai Wei Wei: no joy from Olympics in Beijing', Games Monitor blog, August 30. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1346>

Cheyne J (2015). 'Clarification on Park Village estate', private email, November 29

Chipchase A (2005). 'The location of the proposed Olympic precinct could not be worse ...', statement for No London 2012 press conference, February 14

Church C (2005). 'Greenest Games?', email to ecoactive conference, July 18

Coalter F (2004). 'Stuck in the blocks? A sustainable games for London' in Vigor A, Mean M and Tims C (eds) *After the Gold Rush: A Sustainable Olympics for London*, London: IPPR, Demos

Community Care (2009). 'How the 2012 Olympics will help end rough sleeping', December 21. <http://www.communitycare.co.uk/Articles/2009/12/21/113458/how-the-2012-olympics-will-help-end-rough-sleeping.htm>

Conway J (2009). "'Wetting down' London's homeless' BBC News, December 13. http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/politics_show/regions/london/8408294.stm

Cook B (2012). 'Councils prepare for spike in rough sleeping during Olympic Games', Guardian, August 1. <http://www.theguardian.com/housing-network/2012/aug/01/rough-sleeping-during-olympics-games>

Culf A (2006). 'Horticultural aliens threaten London Olympics timetable', Guardian, July 27. <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2006/jul/27/olympics2012.olympicgames>

Davies C (2011). '2012 Olympics challenge: Hackney battles to preserve its edginess', Guardian, July 25. <http://www.theguardian.com/sport/2011/jul/25/2012-olympics-hackney>

Day C (2013). 'One year since the 'reinstatement' of Leyton Marsh', Save Leyton Marsh, November 3. <https://saveleytonmarsh.wordpress.com/2013/11/03/one-year-on-since-the-reinstatement-of-leyton-marsh>

Department for Transport (2003). *The Future of Air Transport, White Paper and the Civil Aviation Bill* December 16. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-future-of-air-transport>

Dennison S (2005). "'Olympic effect" is myth say east London sports people', statement for No London 2012 press conference, February 14

Donnelly M (2010). 'Olympic wind turbine scrapped', Planning Resource, June 3

Doward J (2011). 'London 2012 Olympics: Crackdown on brothels "puts sex workers at risk"', Guardian, April 10. <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/apr/10/brothel-crackdown-london-olympics-risk>

Dowding S (2010/1). 'Marathon mendacity', Games Monitor blog, October 6. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1122>

Dowding S (2010/2). 'Raiding the piggy bank', Games Monitor blog, October 5. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1120>

East London Advertiser (2006). 'Olympics turns homeowner dream to nightmare', August 30 [no longer online]

Elder M (2008). 'Fury of Sochi Russians being forced from their homes to make way for Winter Olympics', Daily Telegraph, October 5. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/russia/3136521/Fury-of-Sochi-Russians-being-forced-from-their-homes-to-make-way-for-Winter-Olympics.html>

Elder M and Popova N (2008). 'Investors hope for end to volatility', Moscow Times, September 22. <http://www.themoscowtimes.com/news/article/tmt/371087.html>

English Nature (2005). Fax to London Borough of Hackney from Peter Massini, regional policy officer, October 7

Evans T (2011). 'Dustcarts will wake locals all night during Olympics', Games Monitor discussion list, July 7. <https://uk.groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/gamesmonitor/conversations/messages/4633>

Evening Standard (2012/1). 'Gardeners feel betrayed by Olympics offer', April 12. <http://www.standard.co.uk/news/gardeners-feel-betrayed-by-olympics-offer-6485589.html>

Evening Standard (2012/2). 'Cyclists give revised plans for post-Games velopark a rough ride', April 5. <http://www.standard.co.uk/olympics/cyclists-give-revised-plans-for-post-games-velopark-a-rough-ride-6390898.html> [WAS Prigg M (2011). 'OPLC revised cycle circuit plans condemned as dangerous', Evening Standard, April 11]

Evening Standard (2012/3). 'Ban cars in London during Olympics to avoid EU pollution fines', April 5. <http://www.standard.co.uk/olympics/ban-cars-in-london-during-olympics-to-avoid-eu-pollution-fines-6395606.html> [WAS Murphy J (2011). 'Ban cars in London during Olympics to avoid EU pollution fines', Evening Standard, April 26]

Foster S (2005). 'Regarding appeal by Circle 33 Housing Trust to the Planning Inspectorate', letter from London Borough of Hackney Environment Directorate to Katy Andrews, September 8

Frediani A A, Butcher S and Watt P (eds) (2013). *Regeneration and Well-Being in East London: Stories from Carpenters Estate*, London: UCL. <https://www.bartlett.ucl.ac.uk/dpu/programmes/postgraduate/msc-social-development-practice/in-practice/london-based-fieldwork/carpentersreport>

Freeman S (2009). "Health message of Olympics is lost" as McDonald's plans to serve one in five meals to 2012 spectators', Daily Mail, December 8. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1234061/Health-message-Olympics-lost-McDonalds-announcesplans-serve-meals-2012-spectators.html>

Friends of the Earth [FOE] (2009). 'Olympics food vision breaks "low-carbon games" promise', press release, December 7. https://www.foe.co.uk/resource/press_releases/olympics_food_07122009

Gamesbids.com (2005). 'Buying land and relocating businesses for the 2012 London Olympics could cost twice the original estimate', November 3. <http://www.gamesbids.com>. <http://gamesbids.com/eng/other-news/london-2012-costs-could-double-but-tourism-will-benefit>

Gault L (2006). 'Camelot feels lucky ahead of the Olympics', Daily Telegraph, May 14. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/2938726/Camelot-feels-lucky-ahead-of-the-Olympics.html>

Gibson O (2011). 'Jeremy Hunt admits London 2012 legacy targets will be scrapped', Guardian, March 29. <http://www.theguardian.com/sport/2011/mar/28/jeremy-hunt-london-2012-legacy>

Giles T (2007). 'The Olympics have made our life hell', letter to Guardian, September 29. <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2007/sep/29/olympics2012.olympicgames>

Griffiths I (2010). 'Radioactive Olympic waste dumped in Cambridgeshire landfill site', Guardian, October 26. <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2010/oct/26/radioactive-olympic-waste-cambridgeshire>

Griffiths I (2011) 'Houseboaters being "socially cleansed" from Olympics area', Guardian, March 9. <http://www.theguardian.com/sport/2011/mar/09/houseboaters-socially-cleansed-olympics>

Grudgings S (2011). 'Troops occupy Rio slum in "historic" operation', Reuters, November 13. <http://uk.reuters.com/article/2011/11/13/uk-brazil-slum-idUKTRE7AC0KB20111113>

Hackney Marsh User Group [HMUG] (2006). 'Proposed Gypsy and Traveller site on Hackney Marshes', Games Monitor, December 6. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/267>

Haizhou Z (2010). 'London faces a Beijing 2008', China Daily, September 25. http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/opinion/2010-09/25/content_11342611.htm

Hardy C (2010). 'Wanstead: more than 100 gather for Flats protest', Waltham Forest Guardian, November 22. http://www.guardian-series.co.uk/news/8680303.WANSTEAD_FLATS__More_than_100_gather_for_protest/?ref=r

Hawkes A (2009). 'Olympics to prompt materials focus', CNPLus.co.uk, December 10. <http://www.cnplus.co.uk/technical/2012olympics/olympics-to-prompt-materials-focus/5211844.article#VjoIDM4dn-k>

Hayes G (2008). 'Going for green', Guardian, July 2. <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2008/jul/02/greenbuilding.olympics2012>

Helm T and Asthana A (2010). 'Michael Gove's plan to slash sports funding in schools splits cabinet', Observer, November 20. <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2010/nov/20/michael-gove-schools-sport-funding>

Hill D (2009). '2012 Olympics: dietary issues', Olympic Games 2012 blog, Guardian, December 16. <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/davehillblog/2009/dec/16/paul-norman-olympics-blog-food-concerns> [CITING Norman P (2009). 'LOCOG given food for thought by lobbyists', blog on Estates Gazette website, December 15]

Hill D (2012). 'London 2012 legacy: the battle begins on a Newham estate', Guardian, June 13. <http://www.theguardian.com/sport/2012/jun/13/london-2012-legacy-battle-newham>

Hodson M and Marvin S (2010). *World Cities and Climate Change: Producing Urban Ecological Security*, Maidenhead: Open University Press

House of Commons Transport Select Committee (2003). *Going for Gold: Transport for London's 2012 Olympic Games*, December 13 <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmselect/cmtran/588/588i.pdf>

Hui S (2009). 'Homelessness doubled ahead of Vancouver Olympics, report shows', Straight.com, December 4. <http://www.straight.com/article-273777/vancouver/homelessness-doubles-ahead-vancouver-olympics-report-shows>

Inglis S (2014). *Played in London: Charting the Heritage of a City at Play*, London: English Heritage [excerpts]. http://www.dougcheeseman-design.co.uk/graphics/played_in_london.pdf

InsidetheGames.biz (2009). 'London 2012 planning application for Greenwich is illegal claim opponents', December 8. <http://www.insidethegames.biz/index.php/articles/8361/london-2012-planning-application-for-greenwich-is-illegal-claim-opponents>

Jones J (2008/1). *More Hurdles to Jump*, London: GLA Green Group [no longer online]

Jones J (2008/2) 'On the right track? Is London on course to deliver a truly spectacular and genuinely sustainable Olympics or will 2012 fail to break the mould?', August. http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/members/jonesj/docs/more_hurdles_to_jump.pdf [revised version of More Hurdles to Jump, above]

Kenyon J and Palmer C (2009). 'Funding and sponsorship; the commercial impact of the 2012 London Olympic Games – some considerations', *Journal of Qualitative Research* 2(1): 29–44

Klettner A (2010). 'Biomass switch for Olympic renewables', *Planning Resource*, June 11. <http://www.planningresource.co.uk/article/1008787/biomass-switch-games-renewables>

Knowles M (2009). 'Olympic plan omits top UK market,' *Fruitnet.com*, December 11. <http://www.fruitnet.com/eurofruit/article/5129/olympic-plan-omits-top-uk-market>

Kommersant (2008). 'Locals in Sochi fight off Olympics', July 23. http://www.kommersant.com/p915121/Socchi_Olympics_fight

Leabank Square (2008). 'Olympic noise and dust', *Leabank Square blog*, October 15. <http://leabanksquare.blogspot.co.uk/2008/10/olympic-noise-dust.html>

London 2012 (2007). *London 2012 Sustainability Plan: Towards a One Planet 2012, Consultation Feedback*, London: London 2012

London 2012 (2009). *Towards a One Planet 2012*, second edition, London: London 2012. <http://learninglegacy.independent.gov.uk/documents/pdfs/sustainability/1-cp-london-2012-sustainability-plan-2nd-edition.pdf>

London Assembly (2008). *The Provision of Public Swimming Pools and Diving Facilities in London*, London: GLA. <http://legacy.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports/culture/swimming-pools.pdf>

London Borough of Newham [LBN] (2014). 'New Atherton Leisure Centre on the way', webpage, <https://www.newham.gov.uk/Pages/News/A-new-Atherton-in-site.aspx>

London Development Agency [LDA] (2004) *Socio Economic Assessment and Lower Lea Valley Olympic and Legacy Planning Applications. Appendix 5 to the Environmental Statement*, London: LDA. http://s3.amazonaws.com/zanran_storage/www.hackney.gov.uk/ContentPages/18677074.pdf

London Development Agency [LDA] (2007). 'Hackney Travellers relocation frequently asked questions' [published by P Mudge on Games Monitor, January 28]. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/339>

London Development Agency [LDA] Public Liaison Unit (2008). 'Request for information/Freedom of Information Act', email to Julian Cheyne, June 30. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/files/business%20relocation%20FOI%20response.pdf>

London Gypsy and Traveller Unit [LGTU] (2006). 'Travellers living on local authority sites in the Olympic zone: Statement from the Waterden Crescent Residents Group and the Clays Lane Travellers Residents Association', January 10

London Legacy Development Corporation [LLDC] (2015). *Site Allocation SA13.4 – Greater Carpenters District*, London: LLDC. http://queenelizabetholympicpark.co.uk/~/_media/lldc/local%20plan/31%20march/site%20allocation%20sa34%20response%20to%20inspector%2031st%20march%202015.pdf [with attached note from London Borough of Newham]

Lydall R (2006). 'Olympic hopes sunk? Pool closures in capital make it tougher for swimmers to win in 2012', January 4. <https://www.questia.com/newspaper/1G1-140498317/olympic-hopes-sunk-pool-closures-in-capital-make>

Lydall R (2012). 'Grassroots sports are losers in £440m Olympic cash grab', *Evening Standard*, April 12. <http://www.standard.co.uk/news/grass-roots-sports-are-losers-in-440m-olympic-cash-grab-6648130.html> [WAS Lydall R (2008). 'Grassroots sports are losers in £440m Olympic cash grab', *Evening Standard*, February 25]

Macartney J (2005). 'Thousands of homes destroyed to make way for Olympic tourists', *The Times*, May 26

Mahon C (2007). *Hosting the 2012 Olympic Games: London's Olympic Preparations and Housing Rights Concerns: Background Paper*, Geneva: COHRE. http://www.ruig-gian.org/ressources/London_background_paper.pdf

Muir H (2004). 'Local concerns grow over 2012 Olympics bid', Guardian, September 20. <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2004/sep/20/communities.olympics2012>

Muir H. and Kelso P (2005). 'Olympics row lawyers who briefed against bid claim £1m from public funds', Guardian, August 10. <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2005/aug/10/communities.olympics2012>

Murray A (2015). 'London Olympics homelessness', email to Carolyn Smith, December 8

NOGOE (2010/1). 'Greenwich Park – why take risks with Britain's heritage?' January 7 [published on Games Monitor by C Batsworth, January 8]. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/895>

NOGOE (2010/2). 'Hoodwinked. How LOCOG misled the establishment over Greenwich Park Olympics', press release [published on Games Monitor by C Batsworth, February 4. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/908>

Olympic Delivery Authority [ODA] (2007). *Olympic Park Dust Monitoring Scheme REP-ATK-TE-ZZZ-XXX-ZZZ-E-0002*, December. <http://gamesmonitor.org.uk/files/Fol%20Dust%20particles%20Annex%20A%2020090317%20EN00265%20%20Annex%20A%20-%20Olympic%20Park%20Dust%20monitoring%20scheme.pdf>

Olympic Delivery Authority [ODA] (2009/1). 'Request for information', email sent to Julian Cheyne, March 13. <http://gamesmonitor.org.uk/files/Fol%20response%20re%20Early%20Day%20Motion.pdf>

Olympic Delivery Authority [ODA] (2009/2). Letter to Julian Cheyne, March 18. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/files/dangerous%20particles%2020090318%20EN00265%20ODA%20Response.pdf>

Patrick A (2005). 'Olympics offers little benefit for economy', Daily Telegraph, May 21

Pearl L (2011). 'Outrage over swimming pool closure', Newham Recorder, September 11. http://www.newhamrecorder.co.uk/news/heritage/outrage_over_swimming_pool_closure_1_1017572

Prior G (2009). 'Barge delivery delays cause problems for Olympics', Contract Journal, June 3. <http://www.contractjournal.com/Articles/2009/06/03/68238/barge-delivery-delays-cause-problems-for-olympics.html>

PR Office (2006). Letter from David Russell (acting for the Marshgate Lane Business Group) to Julian Cheyne, February 2

Rayner G (2012). 'Greenwich Park 'ruined' by London 2012 equestrian events, campaigners claim', Daily Telegraph, December 26. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/london-2012/9760773/Greenwich-Park-ruined-by-London-2012-equestrian-events-campaigners-claim.html>

Regents Network (2005). *Are the Waterways of the Lower Lea Valley in Good Hands? Proposals by British Waterways for a New Lock, Atkins Report 2005*, November. <http://gamesmonitor.org.uk/files/The%20Lea%20in%20Good%20Hands.pdf>

Rice D and Ludgate R (2005). 'Pitch invasion', Mail on Sunday, September 25

RioOnWatch (2010). 'Demonstrators protest threats of removals', February 10. <http://www.rioonwatch.org/?p=66>

Rioonwatch (2015/1). 'Tense week introduces new policy of "lightning evictions" across Rio favelas', June 8. <http://www.rioonwatch.org/?p=22402>

Rioonwatch (2015/2). 'Lightning evictions return to Vila Autodromo next door to #Rio2016', October 23. <http://www.rioonwatch.org/?p=24921>

Rohrer F (2008). 'The filthy air conundrum', BBC News, July 30. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/7532603.stm>

Romanowicz G (2006). 'Land clean-up to lay foundations for Olympic regeneration', Edie.net, April 6. <http://www.edie.net/news/2/Land-clean-up-to-lay-foundations-for-Olympic-regeneration/11284>

Rose D (2006). *Report to the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry: The Regional Development Agencies Act 1998, Acquisition of Land Act 1981, Application by the London Development Agency for Conformation of the London Development Agency (Lower Lea Valley, Olympic and Legacy) Compulsory Purchase Order 2005*. [<http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/files/Inspectors%20recommendation%20to%20Secretary%20of%20State-3875798-1.pdf>] [Note: On pages 19–20 plots are itemised but there is no mention of any savings]

Samuel M (2005). 'What Paula Radcliffe paused to do in the streets of London, bid organisers are doing to the locals', The Times, May 4. <http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/sport/columnists/article2634105.ece>

Samuel M (2007). 'Your brilliant Olympic legacy: the local pool's closed', The Times, June 12. <http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/opinion/columnists/article2612792.ece>

Sinclair J (2011). 'Olympic legacy pledge "cannot be met"', Independent, May 21. <http://www.independent.co.uk/sport/olympics/olympic-legacy-pledge-cannot-be-met-2287328.html>

Slavin M (2007/1). 'COHRE names the 2007 winners of its Violator, Protector and Defender Housing Rights Awards', Games Monitor, December 5. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/511>

Slavin M (2007/2). 'Intercontinental anti-2010 Olympics movement launched in Mexico', Games Monitor, October 26. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/484>

Slavin M (2007/3). 'Eastway cyclists sold short by ODA', Games Monitor, [letter from M Humphreys to the East London Advertiser], October 17. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/483>

Slavin M (2008/1). '2014 Winter Olympics bring on the ruthless redevelopment of tourism around Sochi', October 5. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/702>

Slavin M (2008/2). 'Eastway cyclists visit Hog Hill circuit', February 28. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/583>

Slot O (2008). 'London Olympic park: businesses fight for compensation', The Times, June 3. <http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/sport/olympics/article2377349.ece> (See also here: <https://queenelizabetholympicpark.co.uk/~media/lldc/local%20plan/local%20plan%20examination%20documents/third%20party%20statements/replp03701%209%20olympic%20businesses%20fight%20for%20compensation.pdf>)

Soil Association (2007) *Feeding the Olympics: How and Why the Food for London 2012 Should be Local, Organic and Ethical*, London: Soil Association/NEF/Sustain. <http://www.soilassociation.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=ys9NTDlvulA%3D&tabid=387>

Sowman C (2009). 'Olympics and Crossrail criticised over pollution', Contract Journal, July 15 [no longer online]

Sparre K (2008). 'Taxpayers and residents will pay dearly for Sochi Winter Games', Play the Game, May 26. <http://www.playthegame.org/news/news-articles/2008/taxpayers-and-residents-will-pay-dearly-for-sochi-winter-games>

Sumner J (2007) *Report on Manor Garden Society Allotments for the Olympic Panel of Waltham Forest Council*, October 9

Swain J (2012). 'London 2012: the changing face of rough sleeping', Ending Homelessness in London, April 4. <http://jeremyswain.blogspot.co.uk/2012/04/london-2012-changing-face-of-rough.html>

Tent Village Voice (2010). Newsletter of the Olympic Tent Village, issue 2, February 22. <https://olympictentvillage.files.wordpress.com/2010/02/village-voice-issue2-final1.pdf>

Twinch E (2010). 'Bar lowered on 2012 rough sleeper figures', Inside Housing, February 19. <http://m.insidehousing.co.uk/bar-lowered-on-2012-rough-sleeper-figures/6508622.article>

UBS Investment Research (2006). 'Winning by taking part: East London's economy and the Olympics', February 23. <http://www.ibb.ubs.com/Institutions/R50559C.pdf>

UK Government (undated). 'Olympic park venues'. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/137964/ODA_Venue_Factfile_Olympic_Park_venues.pdf

UK Government (2005). *London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Bill*. <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200506/lbills/082/2006082.htm>

Vidal J and Gibson O (2011). 'London Olympics pollution on course to land Britain hefty fine from IOC', Guardian, April 24. <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2011/apr/24/london-olympics-pollution-fine-ioc>

Waltham Forest Guardian (2006). 'Waltham Forest has a total of five public pools...', August 11

Weaver M (2006). 'Sewage overflows threaten London Olympics', Guardian, January 19. <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2006/jan/19/olympics2012.homeaffairs>

Wells M J (2007). 'Contamination and controversy in the Olympic park', Games Monitor, May 10. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/406>

Wells M (2009/1). 'Should we beware the east wind?', Open Dalston, October 2. <http://openunited.blogspot.com/2009/10/should-we-beware-the-east-wind.html>

Wells M (2009/2). 'Olympic park radioactive waste scare as regulations breached', Games Monitor, July 27. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/845>

Wells M (2009/3). 'Olympic stink on river Lea', Games Monitor, April 1. <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/796>

Whitelegg D (2000). 'Going for gold: Atlanta's bid for fame', International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 24(4), December: 801–817

Williams R (2007). 'Gypsies lose high court battle over Olympic sites', Guardian, May 4. <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2007/may/04/communities.olympics2012>

Williamson T (2010). 'The 2016 Olympics: a win for Rio?' RioOnWatch.org, serialised over several pages July 26–30. Start 1. <http://www.rioonwatch.org/?p=83>; 2. <http://www.rioonwatch.org/?p=123>; 3. <http://www.rioonwatch.org/?p=132>; 4. <http://www.rioonwatch.org/?p=145>; 5. <http://www.rioonwatch.org/?p=150>

Withers I (2011). 'LDA facing £327m in Olympic park claims', Building, April 1. <http://www.building.co.uk/lda-facing-%C2%A3327m-in-olympic-park-claims/5015904.article>

Woo A (2010). 'Homeless on the move from Olympic venues, outreach group says', Canwest News Service, January 9. <http://canada.com/sports/Homeless+move+from+Olympic+venues+outreach+group+sayss/2422258/story.html>

Woollett A (2005). 'The London Olympic bid should be scrapped ...', statement for No London 2012 press conference, February 14

Zigfeld K (2008). 'Russia's 2014 Olympics a disaster in the making', Pajamas media blog, May 4. <http://pjmedia.com/blog/russias-2014-olympics-a-disaster-in-the-making>

