BP2 / FINANCE, PROFIT + INFRASTRUCTURE

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 1 / LLV impacts + beyond
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

Dedicated to the memory of Katy Andrews 1958–2015
The motion of the shadowing clouds / is felt right down in the earth. / When late-summer days cloud over / the ground cools to the chill of a cellar. / The grass around us darkens before it yellows. / The wellspring sharpens its iron taste.
(From *Chickweed Wintergreen* by Harry Martinson [Tarset: 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
NOGOE	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
SOCOG	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. FUNDING, TAXES AND FALSE HOPES

Just like Pepsi setting up a bottling factory in India, people needing new jobs and urban improvement want to believe the promises that the Olympics seems to offer. Just like other multinationals, governments are willing to tempt the Olympic business to their countries by offering public funds to pay its enormous infrastructure costs.
Kevin Blowe (2005). 'Bidding for disaster', Radical Activist Network newsletter, spring edition

1.1 Proliferating expenditure and deceptive accounting

– Juggling figures in Whitehall

Government calculations for the total 2012 budget, finalised at £9.325 billion in March 2007, were challenged by Andrew Gilligan in the Daily Telegraph on November 7, 2009. Gilligan charged that the total budget figure 'substantially understate[d] the true position'. The paper's journalists had discovered a further £2.7 billion of direct funding for the Games and Games-specific projects. These extra costs included (verbatim): £1.15 billion spent by the London Development Agency (LDA) to buy and decontaminate the Olympic park area; a further £359 million not publicly announced by LDA, including £269 million in interest payments and £90 million in Olympic grants; £389 million for Games-specific transport improvements by Transport for London (TFL) and Network Rail; about £60 million costs for Whitehall departments working on Games preparations and legacy planning; £240 million spent, or bid for, by local councils; a contribution of £110 million by the Homes and Communities Agency towards the costs of the athletes' village; £280 million on Olympic-related grassroots and elite sports projects; and almost £100 million in direct Games-related spending by a range of other public bodies, from the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA) to the Arts Council and National Health Service. This took the estimated total cost of London 2012 to £12 billion, a figure six times higher than the original forecast of £2.05 billion given in the original bid document. In his article, Gilligan quoted Hugh Robertson, then shadow sports minister, who described the notion of an Olympic budget as 'an extraordinarily misleading term'. Robertson believed that even the £12 billion figure would prove a substantial underestimate. It is not clear from media reports whether this figure included the projected cost of Olympic security (£1.5 billion) (see BP3 §1.1).

Even before the March 2007 announcement, The Times (Sherman and Goodbody 2006) calculated a far higher figure than initial bid estimates: around £10 billion. Hidden costs included £1 billion for regeneration of the Lower Lea Valley (LLV), a 60 per cent contingency reserve proposed by the Treasury (these two items taking the total to £7 billion), security costs, VAT and monies for decontamination (another £1 billion) plus running costs of the event itself, expected to be raised from private finance and sponsorship (generating an extra £2 billion and expected to rise). The Times' scrutiny followed Labour culture secretary Tessa Jowell's concession to MPs on November 21 that year, that the main budget had been upgraded – but she stated a figure of only £3.3 billion for the total budget (up at this point from £2.375 billion). Jowell suggested that the National Lottery should bear the brunt of an extra £900 million 'core' cost (hitting small sporting and other voluntary and cultural organisations all over the country). Chancellor Gordon Brown stated initially (November 7, 2006) that the public would not have to pay VAT (Culf 2006). Extra costs in the 'core' budget were put down to a rise in the price of steel, construction inflation and revised transport expenditure. The London bid itself was priced at around £15 million (Blowe 2004).

- Parliamentary scrutiny was abrasive. The House of Commons Public Accounts Committee (2007) risk assessment on Games preparations noted that while there had been serious underestimation of costs at the time of the bid, possibilities for private sector finance had been 'seriously overestimated'. '[Government] expected to raise £738 million of private sector funding, which would have covered a quarter of Olympic costs, but now there is little prospect of significant private sector funding being achieved,' the committee declared, adding: 'We intend to return to the budget of the Games on the basis of a further report by the [c]omptroller and [a]uditor [g]eneral. As ... ultimate guarantor of funding for the Games, the [g]overnment is financially exposed' (Slavin 2007/1).

- One week later, on July 2, 2007, the House of Commons Culture, Media and Sport Committee expressed 'deep concern' about Olympic raiding of funds from the culture sector. 'When we took evidence for this inquiry, the

Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) was anticipating losses of income, based on Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) estimates, of £75 million less in lottery ticket sales and up to £68 million less as a result of changes in the allocation of lottery proceeds, mostly in the three years up to 2012.' An additional allocation of £675 million of lottery money for Games funding was announced also in March 2007. HLF told the committee that there the total cash loss from heritage to the Olympics would be £161.2 million plus the diversion of resources through a special Olympics lottery. 'HLF suggested that this would prohibit funding major projects such as the British Museum. Total contribution from the National Lottery was stated as £2.2 billion (Evening Standard 2007). Raising cash from the private sector combined with cuts in state funding would also damage cultural sponsorship, the committee said. John Tusa (2007), managing director of the Barbican Arts Centre, criticised the raiding of lottery funds, in the context of possible reductions in general arts funding. Dame Judi Dench called for arts funding to be ringfenced and accused the government of diverting money from theatre and film to pay for the Games (Evening Standard 2012/1).

- The same select committee published a further report on April 23, 2008 (Slavin 2008/1), complaining again that 'such a radical revision of cost estimates has been damaging to confidence in the management of the overall programme. It ... also exposed the [g]overnment and the Games organisers to the charge that the initial bid [estimation of costs] was kept artificially low in order to win public support'. In 2008, the contingency fund stood at £3.72 billion, including contingency provision built in to individual projects plus a £238 million security contingency, while £3.482 billion was made available to the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA), forming 62 per cent of its base costs. The committee recommended that a 'substantial proportion [of contingency reserves] should be regarded as untouchable before 2011', adding that any unspent contingency to be funded from lottery revenue should be returned 'to the benefit of non-Olympic lottery distributors'. The committee raised concerns over expectations of revenue from post-2012 land sales (anticipating downturn in the property market), and noted that 'under current plans assets may take until 2030 to be realised'. Particular scorn was poured on financial management of the aquatics centre, which at a 2008 figure of £303 million would have cost more than four times the figure provided in the 2004 Candidature File. 'The history of the aquatics centre shows a risible approach to cost control and ... the Games organisers seem to be willing to spend money like water,' the committee said. The report also commented on the amount of money expected to be raised from the private sector (£100 million) to fund elite sport in preparation for the event: '[I]t may prove very difficult to raise, as no private sector sponsor will be able to cite any association with the London 2012 Games, in order to protect [London Organising Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG)] sponsors. The effect is to introduce an element of uncertainty into a long-term funding programme, hobbling financial planning. We believe that it will turn out to be a misjudgment and an unwelcome diversion of effort.'

– LDA mismanagement

A KPMG report in 2009 for LDA on the Olympic Legacy Directorate (OLD) budget revealed a massive shortfall for land purchasing (Mulholland 2009). Originally estimated by officers in spring that year to be between £86 million and £100 million by September, the shortfall now stood at £159.8 million. The deficit should have been picked up more than a year earlier, the report stated, and before London mayor Boris Johnson took over. The OLD budget covered the complex task of land remediation and purchase, which involved 3,000 separate land interests. 'While there is no evidence of fraud relating to the budget shortfall, KPMG identified a number of long-standing weaknesses in the OLD: poor documentation, poor performance control and monitoring, poor financial controls and the lack of long-term budgetary control. Two members of staff were suspended although there was no evidence of wrongdoing by either,' the article stated.

The OLD budget was not part of the £9.325 billion 'total' budget asserted by Tessa Jowell. Smaller local regeneration projects formerly funded by LDA were likely to be hit to compensate for the shortfall. The Observer (Mathiason 2009) suggested that the error would force a £21 million cut in funding to Olympic legacy projects: 'Inadequate controls meant that neither the person overseeing the £1.3 billion Olympic budget [for land acquisition] nor his finance manager were qualified accountants. Despite this, they were allowed to sign off invoices of up to £7 million without approval.' As mentioned in BP1 §2.3, the Observer reported as early as September 2005 that 'London 2012 sources admit privately that some of the costs [of financing relocation of firms] were deliberately underestimated or disguised during the bidding process' (Campbell 2005).

Another disaster in LDA finances was uncovered hot on the heels of the KPMG report: £800 million of debt racked up buying land for the Games. The Observer (Mathiason ibid) suggested that this huge sum threatened to delay or even derail work to sell land later and find tenants for facilities after the event. LDA was due to hand over control of the area to the new Olympic Park Legacy Company (OPLC), and wanted to transfer the debt at the same time. However, OPLC chair, Baroness Margaret Ford, had been adamant that the new organisation should not be saddled with this debt, believing that it would deter potential investors. Ford persuaded senior government officials to transfer the £800 million to the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), yet this would breach stringent departmental expenditure limits laid down by the Treasury. 'Insiders' told the Observer that they were not prepared to keep the debt on LDA books as this would mean a rise in London council taxes. The situation could have forced the government to issue fresh legislation to force LDA to keep the debt. In the event, the deal was signed off a year later on September 29, 2010.

Paul Norman (2010/1) of Estates Gazette suggested that the subsumption of LDA into the Greater London Authority (GLA) (effectively its abolition) in March 2012 would leave a further £387 million of Olympic debt outstanding (owed to the government), implicating the future funding of Mayoral economic development initiatives. This sum dated from the transfer negotiated by Ford (above). Under the Ford agreement, the LDA, which had already spent £1.345 billion developing the Olympic park, received £138 million in cash and was relieved of £300 million in promised contributions to ODA. It was also required to repay £369 million of its government debt between the financial years 2011/12 and 2013/14 with remaining liabilities paid over a 10-year period. Additionally, LDA had £25 million of OPLC commitments and land purchase compensation claims outstanding estimated at £41 million. The London Assembly prevaricated (ibid): 'It is not yet clear how these liabilities will be met.' Earlier scrutiny of the GLA's draft budget 2010/11 by Paul Norman (2009) revealed that LDA would in fact have spent £1.795 billion on the Olympics in total by the end of 2013. By the end of 2008, it had spent £936 million on land assembly and remediation of the Olympic park. GLA had forecast that a further £140 million would be spent in 2009/10 with the all-in total rising to £1.154 billion by the end of April 5, 2013. Between December 2009 and 2012/13 a further £500 million would be provided for the Olympic park and related expenditure via a public sector funding package. Remaining monies would be spent on management, business improvement district support and legacy development.

– *Impacts of 2008 crash*

On May 13, 2009, BBC broke the news that construction of the athletes' village would (for the time being) be fully publicly funded (BBC News 2009/1). Matthew Beard (2008) in the Evening Standard had reported earlier in October 2008: 'Games chiefs today admitted they may be forced to nationalise the £1 billion Olympic village amid the current economic turmoil' (this assertion later turned out to be from ODA chair, John Armitt). By May 2009, Olympics minister Tessa Jowell had rejected private funding on the grounds that the Lend Lease proposal was 'not a good deal for the tax payer'. Lend Lease had been prepared to invest up to £150 million in equity and £225 million in bank debts to finance construction of the athletes' village. ODA budgeted £250 million for the complex. Rescue would need another £750 million from public funds. Paul Kelso (2008) writing in the Daily Telegraph, reported that ODA had already been forwarded £95 million out of contingency funding to enable work on the athletes' village to proceed, and that government expected to provide another £155 million after Lend Lease failed to raise finance from the market. 'If the tax payer is funding this now, then the [g]overnment needs to ensure that tax payers have a greater share of the equity when the village is sold off as housing after the Games', shadow sports minister Hugh Robertson told Kelso. As late as January 2009, the government was holding out for a private sector solution, according the use of a further £326 million from the contingency fund to keep work going while talks continued (Gibson 2009/1). Return to the commercial market was announced on October 1, 2010 (Gibson 2010) when the athletes' village was sold at a loss to Delancey and Qatari Diar for £557 million (Kollewe 2011). The media centre in Hackney, equivalent in size to Canary Wharf's Canada Tower, was also funded completely by the public purse, despite scepticism from opposition MPs (Gibson 2009/1). ODA was forced to write off more than £10 million bailing out both facilities (Mark 2009) – annual accounts show that £7.5 million spent on the designs for the media centre in Hackney Wick were 'deemed unrecoverable' after the deal with development partner Carillion Igloo was terminated in November 2008 after the failure to attract private finance. ODA also became liable for £3.5 million of bank expenses and legal fees when the deal with Lend Lease over the athletes' village was dropped (Mark ibid).

– *Regional effects*

Scale of investment in the London Olympic project raised ire in other parts of the country. The Observer (Mathiason 2005) claimed that any budget overspend footed by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister would affect aggregate housing target delivery in the south east and regeneration projects in northern industrial towns. Effects were also felt more locally in London and the south east. In 2007, Peter Andrews, chief executive of London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC) complained that regeneration needs of east London outside the Olympic park were in danger of being ignored by central government. The LTGDC area, 20 times the size of the Games precinct, had received only £100 million against a (quoted) figure of £5.8 billion to build Olympic facilities (this included £1.7 billion for funding regeneration and infrastructure in the area surrounding the Olympic park). 'We're left scratching around for cash', he told Joey Gardiner of Regeneration and Renewal (Slavin 2007/2). 'I'm worried we won't get sufficient funds to deliver our vision. With the Olympic effect, there's a danger it will get ignored.'

Under the Barnett Formula, 'Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland could have laid claim to hundreds of millions of pounds as their rightful equivalent to London's Olympic regeneration money' (Walker 2008). This issue was raised during a joint ministerial committee meeting between former justice secretary Jack Straw, and the first ministers of the devolved polities (Alex Salmond, Rhodri Morgan and Peter Robinson). In a separate report, SNP culture, media and sport spokesperson Pete Wishart MP hit out at LOCOG after it was revealed that just seven of the approved 1,174 Cultural Olympiad projects were in Scotland. Research by Plaid Cymru revealed a 50 per cent dip in lottery funding for organisations in Wales, down from £65 million between 2000–2005 to £31 million between 2005–2010. Plaid Cymru charged that investment for London 2012 was not benefiting areas of the UK outside the capital (Cheyne 2010/1).

– *Diversion of local authority finance*

Local authority resources were diverted to Olympic projects in ways that were not easily identifiable or accounted for. Some of the host boroughs approached by Charles Batsworth (2009/1) under freedom of information (FOI) legislation appeared to hide or to be unaware of how much money they were funnelling through to the Olympic project. On Games Monitor, Batworth argued: 'The lack of transparency and thorough accounting procedures make it almost impossible to calculate how much council tax payers are contributing to the 2012 Olympics as a whole, over and above the highly publicised £9.3 billion budget ... The failure to identify and track the true expenditure by local authorities will make any future evaluation of the overall impact of the Olympics impossible;

but this is one of the recurring characteristics of the Olympic Games – the failure to accurately record and analyse the real costs and benefits.' London Borough of Newham failed to provide any information on the grounds that it would exceed the search limit of 2.5 days, leading Batsworth to suggest that this indicated that they had no practical means of tracking their Olympic spending. London Borough of Hackney [LBH] also declined to provide any financial information, but did indicate the wealth of time that staff were dedicating to Olympic promotion and proliferation of policies and projects around the 2012 event and its legacy. LBH statement of accounts for 2007/08 showed a reserve of £9.3 million for maximising benefits and offsetting costs of the event. London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH) supplied some figures, totalling over £1.3 million over three years. This revealed payments to the Five Boroughs Unit (executive director on an advertised salary of £125,000). 'Based on current contributions, £5 million of council tax revenue will be paid to the unit overall by the five boroughs, Batsworth hazarded, 'for "maximising opportunities", "engaging with neighbourhoods", and "giving strategic and operational coherence"'. The LBTH 2012 Unit itself was funded by the Local Public Services Agreement Reward Grant (not local tax payers), diminishing the funding of services that would otherwise be provided by this grant. London Borough of Waltham Forest (LBWF) expenditure totalled £541,525.04 over three years. However, the borough noted that this did 'not give an accurate reflection of the overall expenditure towards the 2012 Olympics' and that cost implications across the council as a whole would be 'practically impossible to measure'. LBWF also explained that the 2012 team costs for the first two years (£550,000) were met by the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF). Batsworth commented: 'This does not appear to be the type of use for which the fund was intended. LBWF are still embroiled in a scandal concerning the misuse and maladministration of NRF funds.' He was still waiting for a response from Greenwich council when he posted the article.

- In December 2010, Newham mayor, Sir Robin Wales, suggested that any benefits of hosting the event could be damaged by the government's decision to cut council budgets (Cheyne 2010/2). Wales told the BBC that budget cuts being forced on local authorities were 'savage, reckless and callous'. Three of the Olympic boroughs – Newham, Tower Hamlets and Hackney – were all subject to an 8.9 per cent reduction in spending from April 2011. Sir Robin said the cuts would mean that Newham council would be forced to save £43 million in 2011/12.

– *London council taxes*

Olympic-related increments on London council tax were inevitably contentious. Tessa Jowell refused in 2005 to bow to Tory demands for a cap on council tax levy in London if costs escalated (Mulholland 2005). Tory councillors in outer London boroughs Barnet and Richmond-on-Thames protested the levy as disproportionate on their often elderly constituents. In a letter to the Edgware and Mill Hill Times, dated April 6 2006, Reuben Thompstone, candidate in Woodhouse ward in Barnet, demanded that Olympic boroughs contribute more (as things stood, he claimed, Barnet council tax payers were paying £4 million more than those in Newham). Brian Coleman, London Assembly member for Barnet and Camden described residents as 'paying through the nose and getting nothing' (Marzouk 2006). Council tax is partially graded by value of property, and in Barnet monthly increments of the levy varied that year between £180 (Band D) and £360 (Band H). This is Local London reported (Marzouk ibid) that around 75 per cent of Barnet council tax payers were in Band D or above, and predicted that this would rise with re-evaluations that year (ibid). Thomas and Rita Glenister, of Darlands Drive, Barnet, went to court in September 2006 stating they would rather go to jail thn pay the levy. 'We have paid our rates for 51 years and have never broken the law', Mrs Glenister, 72, told the Edgware and Mill Hill Times. 'It is completely unjust. This is the last straw. We've worked hard all our lives. I'm determined not to pay this. I'll go to prison. Someone has to make a stand against this.' Her husband added: 'We don't even know whether we are going to be alive by the time the Olympics comes round in six years time. I'll be ... willing to pay the rate when every tax payer in the country is paying it and not just Londoners.' David Clark of Bexley cut his payment to Bexley council (£160 in 10 installments) by £2.40 per transaction in protest. Bexley Pensioners' Forum campaigned actively for a boycott (Johnson and Piper 2006). Pensioners presented a petition of 8,000 signatures to parliament calling for the Games to be funded nationally in December 2007 (BBC News 2007), echoing an earlier call by leader of Richmond council and GLA member Tony Arbour (Farquarson 2006).

By 2008, the Tories were raising the prospect of further council tax rises to fund both London 2012 infrastructure and associated regeneration (Cracknell 2008), and they suggested that LVRPA might be used as trojan horse to raise further finance. They claimed that not only would households in London be affected but also parts of the home counties. London mayor Ken Livingstone promised that the burden falling on London taxpayers would be limited to £20 a year per household, but answers to parliamentary questions revealed that ministers had already instructed officials to talk to LVRPA about financial liabilities arising from the Games. The Sunday Times (Cracknell ibid) noted that London boroughs had already raised fears about cost overruns on maintenance after the Games.

– *Utilities bills*

There were fears that utilities bills could be forced upwards to cope with extra demand that the Games and its legacy developments might make on supply. Thames Water chief executive Bill Alexander considered appealing to the water regulator for 'interim determination' to help raise monies for infrastructure investment to meet Olympic demand (Jameson 2005). Thames Water proposed two major extensions to its London ring main to improve water supply flexibility to the east of the city. In January 2006, Thames Tideway Strategy Group recommended that government build a £1.7 billion 'super sewer' under the Thames, stretching from Hammersmith to Barking, to prevent sewage overflow marring the Games (see also BP1 §3.4). Originally predicted as an extra £45 per year on

Londoners' annual water rates, by 2015 this had mutated to around £12, rising to an extra £80 per year (Smithers 2015). Bill for the burial of overhead power lines was passed on to the ODA. However, extension to the national grid itself, necessary for legacy developments, was paid for by the customer (National Grid 2003). Construction Products Association argued that rising energy costs could add as much as £90 million to Olympic delivery costs (Construct2012.co.uk 2006).

– *Costs of previous Olympic events*

Olympic events are notorious for budget inflation. The cost of hosting the 1976 Games in Montreal rose from an estimation of C$250 million to C$2.4 billion. Montreal 1976 was the last Games funded solely by the public sector (Whiteless 2000) and the city remained in debt for many years. Sydney 2000 cost over twice the pre-bid figures. Barcelona 1992 left a US$20 million debt (Murphy 2004). In Athens, total costs were forecast to be at least four times as high as the bid committee's initial budget (Blowe 2004; Mathiason 2005). The Observer reported (Mathiason ibid) that 'Greece had its credit rating downgraded by Standard and Poor at the end of [2004], in large part because of the cost of staging the Games.' In 2009, the Brazilian Olympic Committee estimated its budget at US$14 billion in preparation for Rio 2016; the Rio bid itself cost US$48 million (Chinese Olympic Committee 2009). Cost of Singapore's Youth Olympics of 2010 ballooned from S$107 million to S$387 million (Cheyne 2010/3).

In February 2009, Russia cut its budget for the hosting of the Sochi 2014 Winter Olympics by 15 per cent. Deputy prime minister Dmitry Kozak hoped to make savings of around £5.8 billion, but this optimism was short lived. On June 7, 2010, BBC News reported that Sochi 2014 would cost £20 billion to stage, nearly three times more than the original estimate. BBC reporter in Moscow, Richard Galpin, suggested that given the scale of corruption in Russia, many would suspect that costs were being inflated by bribes paid to officials to secure contracts for Olympic projects. One businessman had already alleged that he was forced to pay US$4 million to a Kremlin official to ensure he kept a building contract, amounting to 12 per cent of the total value (BBC News 2010/1). Earlier, preparations for Sochi 2014 had been affected by lack of interest from firms in bidding for projects, forcing an extension of tender deadlines. Land acquisition also proved problematic as owners refused to sell at prices offered by the Russian government (BBC News 2009/2).

– *Budget overruns on Stratford venues*

In 2011, Daily Telegraph (Kelso 2011) raised the matter of the aquatics centre, designed by Zaha Hadid, breaking the boundaries of its budget and overrunning its construction schedule, something asserted in a report by the National Audit Office. There was also 'dismay at how the Zaha Hadid design [had] been compromised by two 'wings' of temporary seating', the paper reported. However, from what the Telegraph said, it looked as if costs were deliberately underestimated by bid writers for public consumption. The paper continued: 'In the bid book, the aquatics centre was costed at £72 million, but architectural consultants are understood to have advised the government that £150 million was more appropriate. A source with knowledge of the discussions told the Telegraph they were 'surprised to find their advice had been ignored and a figure of less than half used for public consumption. On Tuesday, David Higgins, the former chief executive of the [ODA], acknowledged that the bid book estimate was "a joke".' The last estimate accessed by Games Monitor for the aquatics centre was £262 million. Newham Council was keen initially that ODA build in the possibility to add wave machines and slides later to encourage use by local residents, but in the end, increased costs and building constraints prohibited this (Gibson 2011/1). Spectator capacity in the aquatics centre was reduced after the event to 2,500 from 17,500, and the centre has now reopened. Figures from 2011 estimated that it would cost £1 million a year to keep the complex open (Gibson ibid).

A review of preparations for the Games in 2008, by business tycoon David Ross, found that cost of the main stadium had risen by £29 million since November 2007, to a (then) projected cost of £525 million. Ross suggested that this increase needed to be offset by savings elsewhere (24dash.com 2008). By 2009, the figure had risen to £527 million (Conn 2009).

1.2 Impact on London's visitor economy

Not an outcome I expected. The Olympics are beginning to make me feel quite sorry for business! Small, independent hotels and restaurants will find themselves unable to profit from advance bookings. PwC is assisting European Olympic Committees, who are worried about businesses going bankrupt, by setting up accounts in which money for bookings can be kept but not paid on to the companies until the event. They will be able to see their money but not actually get their hands on it! This ... scheme is called Escrow.
Julian Cheyne (2010/4). 'Businesses can see their money but not touch it', Games Monitor, September 20

Official promotion organisation London 2012 suggested that London's visitor economy would benefit from the Games by £2 billion (Gamesbids.com 2005). However, by 2011, consultancy Oxford Economics predicted that London would lose £375 million from tourism revenues as visitors delayed plans to come to the city until after the event (Magnay 2011/1). Immediate benefit during the Games was predicted by the firm to be around £300 million. Over the 10-year period 2007–2017, Oxford Economics estimated that tourism gains for London would amount to £1.47 billion. Earlier estimates were not promising. Consultants Arup, working for LDA in 2002, placed possible benefit at a net gain to the UK economy of £82 million (a fraction of the total costs of development), with a downside risk of £145 million (Crookson 2004). Paul Dales of consultancy Capital Economics calculated in May 2005 that total benefit of a London Olympics to the British economy would be 0.34 per cent of GDP over seven years, or just 0.05 per cent per annum, in a word 'negligible' (Patrick 2005).

Remarkably, LDA (2004/1) considered downsides to hosting the Games within the Olympic environmental statement in an attempt to calculate the amount and type of retail floor space that the Games could support. Atlanta 1996 was regarded as a retail disaster. The report relates: 'Retail sales in Atlanta grew 1.1 per cent at the time of the Olympics in August 1996, which when compared with other cities was one of the lowest rates of growth for the month in the US. Many restaurants were empty during the Games, even Olympic merchandise stores failed to achieve solid sales, and sales in some suburban shopping centres fell by 50 per cent.' LDA (ibid) concluded that low spending 'was due in part to the low-cost nature of the ... Games, which saw a limited number of new facilities constructed in the city centre to capture the potential direct and indirect spending'.

Even with a buoyant context, consumer spending at Olympic events seems confined to officially sponsored goods and hotel chains, hardly an economic miracle. Major beneficiaries of Sydney 2000 in New South Wales were the clothing and soft goods sector (souvenirs), plus the hospitality and services sector (take-away food). The Australian Bureau of Statistics estimated a net increase of A$164 million in retail turnover in New South Wales in September that year. Sydney also saw 'an increase in services spending and souvenir shopping, but [this resulted] in a generally flat retail environment for other sectors during the two-week period'. Visitors broke their time between the Olympic park and central city (one destination, Darling Harbour experienced an increase in visitors of 292 per cent). Developers made significant investment in the city's retail core. However, LDA (ibid) comments: '[A]s has been the case for most host cities the Olympics were a mixed blessing.'

Optimism in the (international) hotel industry about the awarding of the 2012 Olympics to London seemed misplaced. UK tour operators suffered a 50 per cent decline in business for 2012 (ETOA in TravelMole.com 2011), according to a survey of attendees at the British and Ireland Marketplace. ETOA (2011) suggested that the UK's position within the European Union (that is, outside of the Schengen agreement on European border controls) had made the country's tourism industry 'a marginal proposition'. With London as the UK's key gateway city, if visitors stayed away, other UK tourism locations would suffer. 'Athens has nothing like the central importance that London occupies [in the UK tourism economy] yet when its visitor arrivals dropped by six per cent in the Olympic year, [those to] regional Greece fell by 11 per cent' (Cheyne 2010/5).

Executive director of ETOA, Tom Jenkins, suggested that: '"Much ... long-haul business [was being] lost, amounting to over one million clients. That this loss ... occurred because of a misperception is obviously regrettable ... How many tickets are actually being sold to foreign visitors? If we have this figure then demand can be assessed. At present an industry stands in jeopardy through over-hyped fantasies of bonanza"' (ETOA 2011). A year before, Jenkins had warned that '"false expectation of bookings is in danger of destroying an export industry ... For August 2012, ETOA members – who ... regularly deliver over 15,000 hotel rooms per day – cannot reserve space. Without any reservations to sell, nothing can be sold".'

London hoteliers were skyrocketing rates in advance of the Olympic summer, pricing out many long-haul visitors to the country. Cheyne (ibid) notes Price Waterhouse also wary of false expectations of bonanza and caution expressed by government tourism agency VisitBritain. Christopher Rodrigues, chair of VisitBritain, conceded in an interview for India's Economic Times that London 2012 would drive tourism away from the capital (Batsworth 2009/2). Rodrigues conceded that 'London is reasonably well known' and 'already on the map'. 'The major impact of the Olympics on tourism in the UK is going to be on other places, because many people tend to avoid the city because of all the Games hype,' he said.

ETOA had predicted a fall in visitor numbers around the event since 2006. One report from that year stated that there was unlikely to be any long-term boost to tourism from hosting the Games, despite promotional assertions. One month before the start of Athens 2004, visitor arrivals were down by 12 per cent. Australia saw growth of over 10 per cent decline in visitors two years before Sydney 2000 and this still persisted two years later. The report cited a similar Olympic effect in Atlanta, Barcelona and Seoul. Beijing saw international visitor arrivals plummet by 30 per cent in the month before the Games in 2008, compared with the previous year. In the months after the event, the tourism slump in Beijing continued with international arrivals down by more than 20 per cent. Beijing fared considerably worse than the rest of China in 2008, which was not a strong year in general for tourism in the Asia-Pacific region (Cheyne 2009). ETOA's 2010 figures for visitor numbers are shocking: Sydney received 97,000 foreign visitors rather than the anticipated 132,000, Athens saw fewer than 14,000 (105,000 were expected), and Beijing only received 234,000 instead of 400,000 (Cheyne 2010/5). Simon Jenkins (2010) in the Evening Standard suggested even Disneyland lost visitors during the Los Angeles 1984 Olympic Games and that visitor numbers to the Costa Brava turned down during Barcelona 1992. Vancouver Sun reported that tourism revenue declined in British Columbia and was below the levels recorded five years previously just before the Winter Olympics in 2010 (Bramham 2009). Delhi's Commonwealth Games also saw cancellations of almost 50 per cent (Cheyne 2010/6).

- Hotel managers, outraged by price gouging practised by LOCOG's partners Thomas Cook and CoSport, withdrew rooms from LOCOG's preferential rate scheme. Julian Cheyne (2011/1) commented on the Games Monitor blog: 'At the heart of the matter is the undisclosed payment made by Thomas Cook and CoSport to LOCOG to become official resellers of these rooms. This kind of corruption lies at the heart of the Olympic system whereby a range of commercial organisations pay organising committees to gain monopolistic access to the Games. Price gouging was supposed to be outlawed at [London] 2012. In reality, it is central to the whole event.' JAC Travel, the UK's largest inbound tour operator, encouraged hoteliers to break with LOCOG. JAC's chief executive Mario Bodini said: 'We applaud the British Hospitality Association for putting pressing questions to LOCOG. We would like its members to know that if they decide to withdraw rooms from LOCOG, JAC Travel stands ready to contract with them on the usual terms and to sell their rooms at reasonable rates to genuine visitors from overseas' (ibid). Evening Standard reported (2012/2) that leading hotel groups were considering legal action against LOCOG. One package with a face value of £1,740 for three nights at the Hyatt Regency Churchill had been priced at £6,499.

- Campaigning coalition London Citizens and the Unite union lambasted labour conditions suffered by hotel workers in a report *Rooms for Change, Putting London Hotels on Track for the Olympics,* published in March 2009. 'London's hotels are not, at present, fit for an Olympic city' the report asserted. 'The heart of the problem is the treatment of workers and ... management's reliance on a transitory, migrant labour force that is hired and fired at will. "Dickensian" is not too strong a word to describe conditions that prevail in some of London's leading hotels.' (Independent Catholic News 2009).

- Small independent hotels and restaurants were unable to profit from advance bookings at Escrow.com, where special accounts were set up by PwC at the behest of several European Olympic committees. These withheld customer payments from businesses prior to the event (Cheyne 2010/4).

– Local trading

A 2006 study by the Young Foundation (*Bridging the Gap: The London Olympics 2012 and South Asian-Owned Businesses in Brick Lane and Green Street*) found that fewer than one in five respondents in these east London restaurant locations were confident that London 2012 would confer either medium or long-term benefits on their existing businesses. Remaining respondents were convinced that either benefits would be short term or stated that they were uncertain about the implications of the event. Most doubted that agency support to take up opportunities around the Olympics would be forthcoming. Nine out of 10 had received no information from any agency linked directly with the Games. Half of all respondents stated that they did not think that London 2012 organisers were sensitive to their needs. Some respondents in Brick Lane highlighted development pressures in the Spitalfields area and feared displacement by large retail and leisure chains.

Their fears were well placed. Two weeks in to the event, Docklands and East London Advertiser charged that the 'Olympics has left us a ghost town' (Huntley 2012; Kvist 2012/1). The paper suggested that local residents had fled London or stayed indoors to watch festivities, and that tourists had concentrated attention on the Olympic park, ignoring attractions of Brick Lane. Restauranteur Azmal Hussain, vice chair of Brick Lane Restauranteurs Association described Brick Lane as a 'dead city', which he put down to lack of marketing (Brooke 2012). 'We were told 90,000 people would be drawn to the area by the Olympics but instead it's the worst I've ever seen', he said, adding that restauranteurs had 'not seen a penny' of the £120,000 London 2012 promotional budget for Brick Lane. The paper reported (ibid) that '[t]raders blame[d] some of the lack of custom on police and council together targeting the area looking for licensing infringements, street peddlers, [prostitution] and anyone with drugs ... There's too much heavy police presence,' Hussain told the paper. Daraz Miah of Brick Lane Curry Association had been told by LBTH mayor Lutfur Rahman to expect 20,000 visitors on the first day of the Olympics. 'Many of us took on extra workers – I took two on myself. But on the day of the opening ceremony we were dead. Even the next day everywhere was empty. We have 100 seats and normally it's packed on a Saturday' (ibid).

Elsewhere, at the historic House Mill on Three Mills Island, trustee Beverley Charters told the paper (Kvist ibid); 'Business is 100 per cent down and if it continues to run at a loss for the six weeks of the Games, losing thousands of pounds, we'll have to close it. We've got three exhibitions, artists displaying and selling their wares, and special events in the evenings and weekends, and we still have to pay for food ordered for events.' She blamed transport planning (spectators were directed to Stratford and West Ham stations). Hotels and pubs also suffered. The landlord of the Bow Bells on Bow Road, on the main route to the Olympic park, said takings were only up by £200, despite the pub being packed with drinkers for the opening ceremony. Trade was also down between 10 to 15 per cent at the Wentworth Arms on Eric Street in Mile End (sidebar page 10). One businessman, Lance Forman, who had opened a riverside cocktail bar alongside an upmarket restaurant in his new premises on Fish Island blamed 'heavy-handed Olympic officials who took down side-street notices. He said they had claimed that the posters contravened advertising and trading regulations (Kvist 2012/2). 'Some ... companies were reluctant to book because their legal teams were telling them that they could not even mention the Olympics on party invitations to clients and staff,' he told the Advertiser. He also complained that Olympic volunteers and police were directing spectators in the opposite direction, out through Westfield Stratford City shopping centre. Visitors to the Tower of London were down by 56 per cent, and also at the Museum of London and Museum of London Docklands. Bethnal Green's Museum of Childhood (part of the V&A) saw a fall of 30 per cent in visitor numbers. Whitechapel Bell Foundry scaled back production in favour of public tours. Director Kathryn Hughes lamented: 'We've had no queues outside in the street as expected' (Kvist 2012/3)

2. PROFITEERING AND SPECULATION

2.1 Property speculation

– Compensation payouts on land

In March 2006, concerns were raised in the House of Commons over compensation payments to London and Continental Railways (LCR) for land required by the Olympic precinct development passed on to them earlier by the government at no cost. That year, the House of Commons Transport Committee stated in its report *Going for Gold: Transport for London's 2012 Olympic Games:* 'It [could] be [that] some compensation was justified. We are not in a position to take a firm view. We are however disturbed by the appearance of this transaction which gives the distasteful appearance of the tax payer subsidising the private sector twice over ... London's intention to bid for the Games is also of long standing. If the [g]overnment had inserted the appropriate reversion clauses into the agreements on this land, then there would have been no question of paying the developers to acquire the land [formerly] in public ownership [...] We are very disappointed that the [g]overnment has demonstrated so little acumen and foresight.'

Labour MP Clive Betts had highlighted the need for transparency in public-private sector deals for delivery of Olympic developments back in 2005, and called for parliamentary scrutiny of such arrangements. Deals were being discussed with Stratford City Developments ahead of consent for the Olympic bill to ensure conversion of flats into housing for 4,500 athletes (Booth 2005). Consortium Stratford City Developments and LDA agreed not to frustrate the other's planning applications in 2003.

- The scale of payouts by LDA on land required for Olympic developments was uncovered by Games Monitor activist Julian Cheyne (2010/7) via FOI queries. Just over £15 million was paid for the freehold of the Park Village estate, and a similar sum was paid for leasehold of the Clays Lane estate, plus just over £630,000 in disturbance costs. This latter comprised £64,982.11 (incl VAT) for legal fees, £63,608.32 (incl VAT) for property consultancy, and £501,809.43 to Peabody in respect of rental voids. While freehold interest had been acquired on the Gypsy and Traveller sites at Clays Lane and Waterden Road, prices had not been agreed, and lease agreements had yet to be agreed with LVRPA over the Eastway sports centre site and East Marsh.

- Property Week (2008) reported that LDA could have been forced to pay up to £3 million in costs to property developer Neptune, after failing to justify an attempted Olympic compulsory purchase order. Neptune, awarded costs at the end of February 2008, was seeking £2 million for legal and professional fees and an additional £1 million for tenants on the land. A decision was to be made at the High Court at an unspecified date. LDA had wanted to use the site to relocate the bus depot formerly at Hackney Wick, but this was contested by Neptune as 'inappropriate'.

– Speculative investment

[T]he indirect impacts of processes of gentrification and price inflation can be severe. In Barcelona, for instance, the 1992 Games was partly responsible for massive increases in costs of living in the city. Between 1986 and 1992 the market price of housing grew by an average of 260 per cent, and this expansion continued through the 1990s with significant increases in social inequality. Likewise, in Sydney, rates of evictions and homelessness increased markedly in the neighbourhoods alongside Olympic development. The consequence is that although development takes place in such cities it does not always lead to the [regeneration] of its poorer urban neighbourhoods and communities. In fact, it can make things worse by creating blight, congestion and ... displacement.

Mike Raco (2004). 'Whose gold rush? The social legacy of a London Olympics', in Vigor et al, *After the Gold Rush: A Sustainable Olympics for London,* London: IPPR, Demos, page 37

The Olympic bid was highly disruptive of the property economy. Legal Week (2006) reported delays in land deals stretching back over three years before the bid decision was announced, impacting on local and regional property markets. Richard Guyatt, property partner of Bond Pearce, told the website: 'Most property deals in the south have been affected by the Olympics, which has taken a broad brush approach to all of east London

... For expanding companies it has been a real problem. It is also hard to find comparison prices [for land in the affected area].' Demand improved, however, once the bid decision was announced. Estate agent Dan McLeod of Atkinson McLeod told BBC News (2005/1) that it was 'the best news for the property market in this area for years'. McLeod enthused: 'Almost overnight any land that can be developed will go ... since the announcement, we have already had calls from [interested] investors.'

The property market was reported as buoyant with inquiries. In April 2010, John Kennedy of estate agents Knight Frank told the Evening Standard (2012/3) that over half of the inquiries his company was getting were from Chinese investors who had experienced the Beijing effect first hand. Just under half (42 per cent) of all dwellings under construction in the Greater London area (or 32,000 of 76,000 homes) were in east London, as were more than half of the 130,000 homes with planning permission but not yet under construction. Comparisons were made by estate agents to the massive surge in development around Canary Wharf. Earlier, Self-Catering Breaks News reported that Travelodge had raised £100 million for new hotels in the Olympic area (Bray 2009). The other large development locally is the Stratford City site, and plans were well underway before the Olympic bid announcement. Stratford City comprises 140,000m^2 of retail space (Westfield Stratford City shopping centre), plus an additional 10,500m^2 of additional retail, primarily local shops and eateries; 465,000m^2 of office and other commercial business space; 120,000m^2 of hotel and conference space; housing for 11,000 people (4,500 homes), health and educational facilities plus 32 acres of public open space (Future Stratford website in Dowding 2011/1).

Barcelona, Sydney, Athens and Atlanta all saw house prices rise by an average of 66 per cent in the five years before the Games (in Barcelona, prices rose by 131 per cent during the five years prior to 1992) (Hill 2007). Figures for London are as remarkable. Nationwide Building Society, reported by the Evening Standard (2012/4), suggested that house prices in Hackney rose by 129 per cent between 2000–2010, Waltham Forest by 131 per cent, Tower Hamlets by 137 per cent and Newham by a giant 151 per cent, all faster than anywhere else in London over the previous decade. Closer inspection by Reuters (Hill ibid, citing a study of areas close to the Olympic site between 2005 and 2007 by Halifax Estate Agents) reveals differentials within the famed Olympic bubble. Leytonstone (E11 postcode) saw the highest rise, up 23 per cent, compared to London as a whole up only 15 per cent; this was followed by Hackney (E8) at 21 per cent, Clapton (E5) up 18 per cent. Real estate analysts disagreed on exactly how the Olympic effect was disrupted by the financial crash in 2008. Bloomberg (Batsworth 2011) suggested that far from booming, the areas nearest the Olympic park were blighted, with prices falling. The area saw an overall rise of a 'mere' 19 per cent, compared to a London figure of +27 per cent (Batsworth does not give a timeframe). Two years after the event (BBC News 2014/1), research by Lloyds Bank stated an overall increase for the nine years 2005–2014 of £125,000 in the 14 postal districts closest to the Olympic park (+23 per cent across all areas), compared to +17 per cent across London and +8 per cent in England and Wales.

The rental market was not so secure, although media reports around February 2012 suggested that rents had gone through the roof. Initially, however, there was a trough: London property consultant David Salvi of Hurford Salvi Carr, told The Times (O'Connor 2008) that supply in east London had risen by about 40 per cent in six months and rents had dropped by five per cent. In June 2008, prices in Stratford were a third lower than in Greater London, and rents on one-bedroom apartments were down 20 per cent from their peak. Evening Standard (2012/3) reported a mixed start to 2010. Rents in London as a whole were up 15.7 per cent, but in Hackney up only 2 per cent, and Newham just 6 per cent (as comparison, in the same report, house prices in Tower Hamlets rose 16 per cent and in Waltham Forest by 18 per cent). The Independent reported (Rawlinson et al 2011) that beyond the Olympic area in Stratford, agents in London were citing rent increases of around eight to 10 per cent over the financial year 2010/11. By 2012, NBC in the US alleged that London landlords were evicting tenants to cash in on London 2012 and rents that could be levied from tourists (Smith 2012). 'Homes in the east London boroughs … are fetching between five and 15 times their typical rates as properties are rebranded as short-term "Olympic lets". Some landlords are also enforcing expensive penalty clauses for tenants who want to remain during the gathering of the world's top athletes,' NBC reported, something backed up in an article by housing charity Shelter's head of campaigns Antonia Bance. In Dalston, one-bedroom apartments that normally fetched around £300 per week were being advertised in 2012 at £1,625, while in Newham, a three-bedroom house on a council estate was on the rental market for £15,000 for three weeks (Smith ibid). Rental prices for the Games fortnight in Greenwich shot up to 35 times the usual price (Web Snippets 2011).

- As early as 2006, it was predicted that top-floor apartments in the athletes' village would be sold for up to £1 million after the Games were over (Pocock 2006). On August 12, 2011, it was announced that the athletes' village had been snapped up by developers Delancey and Qatari Diar for £557 million. UK taxpayers were left £275 million out of pocket (Kollewe 2011). The number of flats to be built was scaled back from 4,200 to 2,818 in October 2008.

- Shares of property developer Telford Homes rose by 14 per cent in the year 2009/10 (to March 31). The company put this down to Olympic-related regeneration stimulating demand in east London (Hemming 2010).

- Inside Housing reported (Duxbury 2010/1) that two housing associations had agreed a landmark deal in July with an IKEA-owned development company that would see 1,500 homes built on the edge of the Olympic park. Housing associations Southern Housing Group and East Thames Group teamed up with development company Landprop to build the scheme on the 13-acre site in Sugar House Lane, right by the river Lea. Described by the magazine as 'one of the most significant private investments in the Olympic zone in two years', the developer, which is owned by Inter Ikea, investment arm of the Swedish furniture company, bought the land for an undisclosed sum from receivers CB Richard Ellis. The site had been owned previously by developer Cleveland. The deal represents the largest investment on the Olympic fringe since Westfield bought the Stratford City site in 2008. Branded as Strand East, the development (now at 1,200 dwellings) was eulogized as a 'mini-Venice' with moorings, water taxi service and floating cocktail bar (Evening Standard 2012/5). Underway in 2015, it features a 130-ft-tall illuminated wooden tower. Southern Housing and East Thames are also partners with developer First Base in the 'special purpose vehicle' Triathlon Homes building the 2,818 unit athletes' village.

- A 'boiler room' scam linked to nonexistent housing plots near the Olympic site conned more than 100 people out of hundreds of thousands of pounds. Fraudsters offered shares in companies supposedly owning land in Stratford that they said would 'rocket' in value before the Games, police told BBC's Inside Out programme. Their victims could not contact them once their cheques had cleared. Lorna Rapley said that her late father, Alf, lost £37,000 in the fraud, while John Middlemass, who lost £80,000 in the scam, said that he was persuaded to join 'what sounded like a good investment' by criminals who 'ruined' his life (BBC News 2010/2).

- University College London (UCL) and Newham Council announced plans in November 2011 to explore the establishment of a new campus for UCL in Newham on the site of the Carpenters Estate in Stratford, to complement the university's Bloomsbury location (Slavin 2011). Under the terms of the agreement, both parties would have had six months from that date to progress proposals for the development, which comprised teaching and research space as well as additional 'community', residential and commercial property. The agreement fell through in May 2013 after a strenuous campaign by the last remaining residents who complained of being kept in the dark on proposals (see BP1 §2.1). UCL states (2015) that it now plans to move to an 'education and cultural quarter' south of the ArcelorMittal Orbit in the Olympic park, operational by 2019/20.

As an international comparison, in Rio de Janeiro property prices rose 250 per cent in the six years to May 2014, according to Brazil's FIPE-ZAP index, and 200 per cent in Sao Paulo (Watson 2014), an inflation attributed to the country winning bids for the 2014 World Cup and summer Olympic Games in 2016.

2.2 Construction economy

Corporations [have] extend[ed] their influence into the heart of decision-making … LOCOG is obliged to raise US$376 million from corporate sponsorship 'of which approximately two-thirds is in the form of goods and services values in kind'. This has opened the door for big corporations to flood key management and executive positions in LOCOG with their own personnel. It has happened to such an extent that the boundaries between what is public and what is private have become increasingly difficult to disentangle. According to the International Accounting Bulletin, the global business services firm Deloitte has seconded over 130 staff to LOCOG since 2005 … Thirty or more [legal firm Freshfields] employees have worked for LOCOG's legal team … Recently released government figures show that … ODA subcontracted out £5.6 billion worth of business for the Games. These contracts were then subcontracted [again] … with over 43,000 separate awards being made … Contracting out becomes a 'commercial matter' to be systematically insulated from democratic politics and wider social demands in order to enhance commercial viability … Attempts to access detailed information about [financial and contracting arrangements] then become subject to the constraints of commercial confidentiality …
Mike Raco (2012). 'Taking the politics out of the Olympics: privatisation and the London Olympics', Occupied Times of London, issue 15, July

French multinational GDF Suez, contracted to construct and run energy centres in the Olympic park and adjacent Stratford City, plus associated service infrastructure, has been condemned internationally for ecological damage and social injustice in the building of massive dams in the Amazon rainforest (Batsworth 2010/1). '[The transnational's] major involvement in Madeira River Jirau Dam hydroelectric scheme in Brazil earned it a nomination for the 2010 Public Eye Awards, organised by Greenpeace and others to publicise the most environmentally destructive corporate practices. The Jirau Dam project is accused of displacing thousands of indigenous residents, unauthorised deforestation, causing pollution, violation of labour laws and fomenting conflict through political manipulation. GDF Suez and its partner companies in the ESBR construction consortium have been fined for illegal deforestation, and are already codefendants in civil action lawsuits in Brazil filed by the [s]tate and Federal Public Prosecutors' Office and nongovernmental organisations,' Batsworth reported. 'GDF Suez is also bidding for the Belo Monte dam on the Xingu River, an even larger hydroelectric project threatening ecological disaster in pursuit of economic growth. It is attracting fierce international and indigenous opposition. The cause [has been] championed by film director James Cameron. An estimated 20,000 people will be displaced and 500km^2 of forest submerged.' Combined cooling heating and power (CCHP) units in the Olympic park area have all capital and running costs met by GDF Suez – in exchange for a 40-year sole concession to supply these services. Essentially this creates a privatised utility monopoly within the Olympic park and Stratford City with a guaranteed stream of profits going to the operators. Batsworth argued that, in effect, the Olympic park has been mortgaged to GDF Suez and its shareholders, with no control over the use of massive future revenues from utility bills. While it may be true that CCHP units are more efficient, this will translate simply into increased profits for the operator (Batsworth ibid).

Several US giants were involved in partnerships bidding for Olympic construction work. KBR, formerly Kellogg Brown and Root, engineering and construction arm of Halliburton Co, bid with Bovis Lend Lease (part of the Australian Lend Lease Corporation) and UK design and engineering consultants, Capita Symonds, for a no-risk engagement (as managerial partner) with a chance to bid for 'cherries' in the legacy phase. Between 1995 and 2000, Halliburton Co was headed by the then US vice president, Republican Dick Cheney. The firm was under investigation for overcharging of contracts to the Iraqi government-under-occupation. In 2006, chancellor Gordon Brown was forced to clarify to MPs (Mathiason 2006/1) whether he had any dealings with Bechtel, another controversial US construction company bidding for the contract to oversee building of the main Olympic facilities. Bechtel has been dubbed (Observer 2005/1) 'the working arm of the CIA'. The firm was the first company to be awarded contracts by the Bush administration in the aftermath of the Iraq invasion, and had also advised the UK government on nuclear energy. Demonstrations in Bolivia (Olivera 2006) against the privatisation of water to the company in 2000 forced the firm to leave the country. Bechtel prosecuted the Bolivian government in international courts, pressing for £13.6 million in damages and costs. However, after international pressure, it dropped all claims to Bolivian water in January 2006.

In the event, Laing O'Rourke in partnership with Mace Ltd (project management) and environmental evaluation company CH2M Hill (together called the CLM consortium) won the contract to manage construction of the main stadium and athletes' village (Kernon 2006). Contracts for building work itself were awarded separately by ODA later on, and Lend Lease was one of the successful firms, gaining the initial athletes' village contract. Laing O'Rourke built Terminal 5 at Heathrow airport where 900 workers walked out over bonus payments in the winter of December 2005 (BBC News 2005/2), and has also held construction contracts on the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL), Canary Wharf and Gatwick Airport. In October 2004, the company faced widespread walkouts and wildcat strikes from members of both the Union of Construction Allied Trades and Technicians (UCATT) and General and Municipal Boilermakers and Allied Trade Union (GMB) over imposition of a new contract. Staff had been told to sign the contract or face the sack (Workers' Liberty 2004). Workers at the Kings Cross CTRL site claimed that Laing O'Rourke management had intimidated migrant workers around the signing of the contract. The CLM consortium had worked on five previous Olympic Games: Torino 2006, Athens 2004, Salt Lake City 2002, Sydney 2000 and Atlanta 1996 (Contract Journal 2006). Responsibility for redeveloping the venues and athletes' village after the event also fell to the consortium. The awarding of the management contract to CLM caused some controversy within the industry and parliament as building tycoon Ray O'Rourke had given a substantial donation to the 2012 bid team and significant help in kind (Evening Standard 2012/7) in the run-up to the International Olympic Committee (IOC) decision.

- ODA forced all firms winning London 2012 contracts to sign clauses preventing them from talking publicly about details of their work for six years (BBC News 2009/3). Under the terms of the contract, in the event of suspicion of leak or other disclosure, the contract allowed ODA to search the firm's premises and emails. While ODA maintained that the contracts were standard confidentiality agreements, BBC London's Olympics correspondent Adrian Warner reported: 'The companies I have talked to are shocked they have to sign a document which effectively allows 2012 to walk into their premises and start searching them. Legal experts have told me these contracts are draconian.' Warner asked organisers of the Vancouver 2010 Winter Olympics whether they had imposed similar widespread restrictions on firms in Canada, and were told emphatically that they had not. Firms signed away the right to talk to any third party without ODA permission, about technical plans, cost of venues, project progress, environmental issues, health and safety measures and any discussions with ministers.

2.3 TV rights, brand protection and sponsorship

Increasingly, free time itself has to be directly or indirectly purchased before it can be 'consumed' ... there is a logic in this, since 'free time' is in fact time 'earned'; it is capital on which a return can be had, potential productive power, which has therefore to be bought if one is to have control over it ... The idea, which is not at all absurd, that one might be able to put a shilling in a juke box and 'buy back' two minutes silence illustrates the same truth.

Jean Baudrillard (1998). *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures,* London: Sage, page 153

– Broadcasting rights

Broadcasting rights revenues have shored up IOC finances since the 1980s, when then IOC president, Juan Antonio Samaranch, overhauled the organisation's finances (in crisis during the 1970s) to entice host city administrations to bid for the Games, despite massive financial burdens. Since 2008, host cities have received a fixed sum for broadcasting rights revenues, rather than the 49 per cent offered previously.

SportCal.com (Murray 2012: 7) reported that 'media rights for 2010 and 2012 … together brought in US$3.91 billion, compared with US$2.57 billion for the previous [four-year] cycle … [and that] media rights [were] now worth over four times the US$957 million brought in by the IOC's ... TOP sponsorship programme for the 2010 and 2012 cycle.' Also, that 'media rights and TOP sponsorship figures together, plus US$989 million from the [Vancouver 2010] commercial programme, and an estimated US$2.14 billion from the London 2012 programme, [meant] that the Games [would] be worth a staggering US$8 billion in [that particular] cycle.' This figure includes US$2 billion from US broadcasting network NBC, and £703 million from the European Broadcasting Union (including an estimated US$100 million from the BBC). Initial reporting of media revenues fell far short of such inflated figures. Earlier, the Observer (2005/2) had suggested that the European Broadcasting Union had paid a mere £394 million for TV rights to Vancouver 2010 and London 2012.

– Brand protection

Restricted use of Olympic branding is considered essential by organisers to 'protect' profits, and the Olympic Symbol Protection Act 1995 regulates its use in the UK. In 2005, Institute for Practitioners in Advertising complained that the London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Act 2006, setting up the ODA and defining marketing prohibitions was ‘so extreme that it could technically lead to pubs being prosecuted for using chalkboards to flag up [TV] coverage of the Games’ (Fraser 2005). The Independent (Sharp 2011) reported that LOCOG had warned travel agents hoping to cash in on the Games that they could not use terms such as London 2012, London 2012.com, Olympic(s) or the Olympic symbol in business names, promotions or advertising material. Protected Olympic trademarks (or ‘permanent properties’ [Chappius 2012]), registered through the WIPO Madrid system, include the use of the terms ‘Olympic’/’Paralympic’, ‘Olympiad’/’Paralympiad’ and ‘Olympian’/’Paralympian’; insignia such as the 2012 Games logo (and mascots), Olympic rings and paralympic logo, Team GB, British Olympic Association (BOA) and British Paralympic Association logos, London’s bid logo; derivatives of the domain name London2012.com; plus Olympic and Paralympic mottos ‘Citius, Altius, Fortius’ (Faster, Higher, Stronger) and ‘Spirit in Motion’. The Nairobi Treaty on the Protection of the Olympic Symbol 1981 obliges all state signatories to police the use of the Olympic five-ring symbol.

Sponsors also receive protection. Brand enclosures (‘a last line of defence’ according to Dalton Odendaal, London 2012’s sponsorship manager), extended to the prohibition of competitor marques on fans’ clothing. Restrictions at the event were policed through conditionality attached to tickets and enforced by LOCOG’s Brand Protection Task Force (itself staffed by police, trading standards and tax officials) (Ellen 2010: 15). LOCOG also issued an instruction to all police forces patrolling Olympic venues to ensure that food and drink products (including even packets of crisps) sold by commercial rivals to Olympic sponsors were placed in ‘unidentifiable packaging’ (Daily Telegraph 2012). Brand Republic (Quilter 2009) suggested that ‘under current IOC rules only official sponsors [were] allowed to have their brands within a specified radius of the event’.

- CBC revealed the contents of an IOC document detailing patrols at Vancouver 2010: ‘Brand protection teams of two or more members conduct[ed] surveillance on foot, within and around each venue or cluster of venues, at neighbouring areas and in the city to ensure that venues [were] clean internally, to carry out surveillance of ambush marketing, and to handle and report such activity in the appropriate manner with the goal of ceasing such activity’ (Branham 2009). Two weeks before, Vancouver Sun (Constantineau 2009) reported one hotel manager who said that the hotel would be careful to display the ‘right’ Olympic corporate brands to reflect 2010 sponsorship. ‘Panasonic is a Games sponsor, so when we renovated our revolving space on the 19th floor, we bought Panasonic televisions rather than some other brand,’ he said. ‘Maybe they’ll see we’re using their products in an awesome space.’

The government introduced a further curtailment of grassroots commercial reference to the Games with the London Olympic Association Right (LOAR), again under pretext of protecting Olympic brands and prohibiting visual and verbal association with the event, with the threat of £20,000 fines or civil penalties (Kemp Little 2015). The Times (Bryce 2006) commented: ‘Opponents of the LOAR provision argue that it goes well beyond existing British intellectual property laws and significantly limits the freedom of commercial expression and competition,’ adding that LOAR also ‘ensure[d that] ... sponsorship fees [were] kept at a premium’. Athletes’ rights to earn income from endorsements may also have been curtailed. The Times noted that BOA planned to ‘carpet register’ a series of London 2012-related images with every trademark class throughout the UK and Europe, to provide a ‘firm foundation’ for brand-infringement actions. Use of any two of the following would be in breach of LOAR: ‘Games’, ‘2012’, ‘Two Thousand and Twelve’, ‘Twenty Twelve’. Use of any of the latter with: ‘gold’, ‘silver’, bronze’, London’, ‘medals’, ‘sponsor’ or ‘sponsors’. Anyone in breach of these regulations would be liable for damages, forfeiture of any profit, and goods infringing trademark protection could be seized or destroyed (Breen 2012). Unofficial ticket sales and merchandise were also unlawful.

- London’s initial five host boroughs (Greenwich, Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest) asserted that they should be singled out in Olympic branding to compensate for the amount of disruption that the Games would cause. Other London councils wanted a more liberal attitude to the use of the 2012 logo to boost sports participation across the capital. Local Government Chronicle website reported (Illman 2009) that the IOC believed there should be only one version of the logo. This appeared to prevent the use of the slogan ‘host borough’ for some and ‘hosting 2012’ for other authorities, and was promoted as compromise. ‘There are lots of tensions in London local government’ said one senior local government source.

The journal Index on Censorship (McColgan 2009) details how §16 of the 2006 Act provides a legal basis for executive regulation of all advertising ‘in the vicinity of London Olympic events’. The Act stipulates that the regulations applied ‘in respect of advertising of any kind’, including non-commercial advertising and ‘announcements or notices of any kind’. What was considered to be ‘advertising’ could include ‘the distribution or provision of documents or articles’, ‘the display or projection of words, images, lights or sounds’, and ‘things done with or in relation to material which has or may have purposes or uses other than as an advertisement’. The Act imposed obligations on owners and occupiers of properties, and contravention of regulations was punishable by an unlimited fine. Furthermore, police were entitled to enter property forcibly to ‘remove, destroy, conceal or erase’ anything deemed inconsistent with the provisions of the Act. Aileen McColgan, professor of law at King’s College London, noted that in the first place, the 2006 regulations on advertising were objectionable because they ceded ‘to the executive’ the power to make draconian rules, rather than risk parliament voting on the content of those rules. However, she went on to suggest that ‘the Olympic Act would provide a legal basis for the criminalisation of those wearing Pepsi-Cola T-shirts or Burger King baseball caps (competitors Coca-Cola and McDonald’s being official sponsors)’, and that ‘extension of [the term] “advertising” to include noncommercial advertising and “announcements or notices of any kind” ... [could cover] the display of a notice protesting against sponsors’ labour practices, or their contributions to global warming or the epidemic (sic) of obesity.’ Also, she noted, ‘advertising restrictions may apply well beyond Olympic arenas to, for example, the front windows of private homes in the vicinity of the Games'. McColgan touted the idea of a legal challenge to uphold the rights of freedom of expression enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights and the UK Human Rights Act 1998, commenting that it was 'a matter of regret, however, that the Olympic Act ... created the scope for regulations which exercise[d] an extraordinary chilling effect on freedom of expression'.

- Northern Echo (2006) suffered an early warning from Olympic lawyers prohibiting use of Olympic insignia to promote a Sport Aid fundraising event to aid prospective Olympic talent and raise cash for grassroots sport.

- In June 2011, LOCOG made an objection to the trademarking of an event called the Great Exhibition 2012, a series of nationwide initiatives culminating in a two-week festival planned for that August. The company was given until June 27 to withdraw their application or face legal proceedings under the 2006 Act. LOCOG objected in particular to the use of '2012' in the festival's name, apparently as they considered that the year was by then widely enough used to refer specifically to their own event. 'It's certainly true that LOCOG have been given very strong rights for this specific event and have made clear that they intend to exercise their powers to their full limits,' Lorna Brazell, a copyright lawyer for firm Bird & Bird, told the Independent. 'This kind of debate is going to get more intense as the Olympics approach,' she added. 'In this case, it is the broadest reach of their powers I have seen so far' (Sharp ibid).

- Author Robert Ronsson received legal threats from LOCOG over his 2007 novel entitled *The Donovan Twins: Olympic Mind Games.* He published the book regardless. LOCOG later withdrew their complaint and did not prosecute (Sharp ibid).

Company names predating 1995 were exempt from legislation (Ormsby 2012). However, Reuters (ibid) reported 'hundreds of infringements' of Olympic trademarking in host boroughs. In Newham, there were sightings of shopfronts sporting the word 'Olympic' on their fascias. At times, the 'O' was dropped (as at the Lympic Cafe in West Ham Lane), or another letter added (Reuters found a D-Olympics hairdressers in operation since 1997). Kamel Khichane, Algerian owner of the Lympic Cafe said he took advice from Newham Council before renaming his premises at a cost of £3,000. The council had told him previously that as long as he did not represent the Olympic rings, he would be within the law (TheOlympicBorough.com 2011; Rawlinson 2011).

Earlier, Olympic Removals, a family business based in Waltham Abbey, were told to pick another logo or face the consequences. They feared that any court battle could ruin them (Jensen 2009). More high profile, Brand Republic (Quilter ibid) reported that mobile telephony firm O2 were prohibited from using their own trademarks on the Millenium Dome during the Games, as it was an official venue, and Wembley stadium was forced to cover signage displaying non-Olympic sponsors. The magazine noted: 'The issue has left a problem for ... LOCOG because it is unable to give the arena, hosting badminton and basketball, a recognisable name. At the moment it is ... referred to as NGA1 (North Greenwich Arena 1) in LOCOG documentation.' Sponsor AEG refused to allow LOCOG to use the arena's former name, Millenium Dome, 'as it fear[ed] that [this] carried a white elephant status.'

The spectre of ambush marketing loomed large in the media imagination and London 2012 launched a public education campaign to inhibit it (Wilson 2008). BBC News reported (Fraser ibid) that 'London' had secured first rights to 'almost all the billboard space around the city for the key time around the Games'. ('Almost all' turned out to be 99 per cent.) Official sponsors had right of first refusal (Ellen ibid: 14) of advertising space.

Athletes' profit from their own imagery as commercial endorsement was also restricted by the BOA, and they were obliged to help 'maximise' revenues for BOA, LOCOG and Olympic TOP sponsors (Ellen ibid: 14–15). On Twitter, during the event, athletes protested restrictions in the Team Member Agreement (TMA, conditional to selection and participation) with the hashtags #wedemandchange and #rule40 (Mackay 2012). The TMA stated: 'Athletes may not wear, have tattooed, branded, painted, shaved, cut, pierced, applied or affixed to, into or on to their body (including ... spectacles or contact lenses [as with the Linford Christie example]) any name, logo or design of any commercial or political entity' (Ellen ibid: 13).

– Commercial sponsorship

IOC was set to make over US$1 billion in corporate sponsorship during the lead-in to London 2012 (this figure included sponsorship revenues relating to Vancouver 2010) (Beard 2012/1). Marketing magazine (Barrand 2006) reported that a 'clutter' of agencies other than LOCOG was offering London 2012 sponsorship deals, causing confusion among firms: 'As well as each of the national associations for individual sports, a variety of government-funded sports bodies, charities and the DCMS are actively selling off the back of 2012. Their over-zealous approach has led some marketeers to claim they are turning their backs on 2012 due to proposals' lack of clarity. Industry experts have been quick to lay the blame at chancellor Gordon Brown's door after he used his [2006] March budget speech to ask sponsors to fill an extra £100 million hole in athletes' funding.' Sponsoring companies were mandated to participate in 'community' and schools events in return for use of the London 2012 logo (Evening Standard 2012/7).

- Advertising agencies competing for London 2012 contracts discovered in 2009 that, to win the contract, they would be forced to become Tier 3 sponsors at the cost of nearly £10 million, and thus, would be obliged to 'donate' millions of pounds-worth of work, reported the Daily Telegraph (Andrews 2009). Two agencies refused to pitch for contracts as a result. Industry sources explained that marketing benefits of being associated with Olympic work were 'limited and not sufficient to justify the financial commitment'. 'Value-in-kind' sponsors for London 2012 included chewing gum maker Trident, technology group Airwave, Boston Consulting Group and solicitors Freshfields (ibid).

AdiZones

Branded multisport outdoor gyms, or adiZones, appeared in host borough parks in 2012, with 50 constructed across the UK (Spitzenprodukte 2012). Sportswear company and IOC partner Adidas financed 50 per cent of the budget to the tune of £1 million, with Sport England matching funding (ibid). Each adiZone cost £150,000 (Duman 2012; ibid), with 'exercise apparatus and [references to] team sports (for example, a short basketball court … single football goal or …climbing wall)' (Spitzenprodukte ibid). All adiZones offer free wifi. Duman (ibid) describes the adiZones as a 'montage of sampled suggestions for physical activity', 'dense, hypnotic and highly branded insertions [in] public parklands … where cluttered symbolic opportunities to participate in sport, play, movement and fitness outdoors 24/7, 365 days a year, are rolled together with unique branding opportunities[.] [O]ver 15 Adidas logos are contained within the oversized 2012 [footprint] of any adiZone', itself decorated with Adidas-endorsed athletes and singers on a 'wall of fame'.

Spitzenprodukte suggests the 2012 adiZone footprint is an example of 'Google Earth Urbanism' (ibid), (political) insertion of brand identity into local promotion of the Olympic event. He notes advantages of securing brand recognition cheaply with young people that might frequent the spaces.

> Athletes are ... roped in for launch events[. P]romotional literature released by TGO, the providers of the equipment, boasts '[A]didas provide[s] a Getty Image photographer at each launch and full PR support so that communities can promote their adiZone to its full potential.' The literature makes clear that adiZones provide a great opportunity to make maximum political impact for lowest possible outlay on the part of local councils. [A]didas also retain[s] an important stake in the adiZone[. B]y promising three-years [of] maintenance as part of the price, TGO and [A]didas secure access to advertising space for a guaranteed period of time. This is truly a public-private partnership in all senses of the word.

AdiZones seem incongruous within the moral discourse of 2012 legacy ambitions (Duman decries a 'redemptive, quasi-humanitarian drive for a sweeping and radical change that legitimises the explicit and outlandish branding operation'). Spitzenprodukte characterizes the gyms as third places (Oldenburg), 'where the users have no obligation to be', rearticulated within a more visceral youth subculture of 'hanging-out'. Such spaces contest the inference of branded environments. '[D]isplaying a degree of brand loyalty, young consumers can "inhabit" the semiotic meaning of the brand and manipulate it,' Spitzenprodukte writes. Furthermore, he suggests somewhat provocatively, adiZones might enable a re-'negotiation of the relationship between consumer and corporation' (ibid).

2.4 Sponsorship controversies

– Dow Chemical

The biggest controversy at London 2012 around sponsorship revolved around Dow Chemical, one of 11 Worldwide Olympic Partners since 2010. The transnational was removed as sponsor of the 'wrap' for the main stadium on November 19, 2011 (BBC News 2012/1). Dow Chemical is 100 per cent 'owner' of Union Carbide, the company responsible for the Bhopal gas disaster in 1984 where 25,000 people were killed and over half a million others suffered injuries. Dow Chemical is liable for continuing contamination under the 'successor liability' principle (established in both US and Indian law). Greenpeace published a report in 1999 on contaminated groundwater around the abandoned Union Carbide factory, and declared Bhopal as 'global toxic hotspot'. Chemicals in the groundwater are carcinogenic, causing birth defects, and it is sole source of drinking water for tens of thousands of people. Contamination has been caused by water leeching through toxic waste buried on the factory site and by leakage from solar evaporation ponds. Union Carbide had conducted tests and was aware of environmental and groundwater contamination, but chose to keep its findings secret.

Lord Coe described the revocation of sponsorship, rather disingenuously, as a 'sensible cost-cutting idea' (BBC News ibid). On the same day, the anniversary of the Bhopal gas disaster, survivors burned an effigy of Coe and Vijay Kumar Malhotra, acting president of the Indian Olympic Association (BBC News 2011/1), and marched with banners proclaiming 'Down with London Olympics' and 'We want justice'. Dow Chemical will remain as Worldwide Olympic Partner until 2020 (Kaskey 2010). A detailed timeline of the controversy can be found here: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-16089139.

- On January 25 2012, Meredith Alexander, member of the Commission for a Sustainable London 2012, resigned live on BBC's Newsnight in protest at Dow's sponsorship. Alexander, who works for the development charity Action Aid told the programme that she wanted to bring attention to the 'toxic legacy' of Bhopal. 'This is an iconic case,' she said. 'It's one of the worst abuses of human rights in my generation and I could not stand idly by.' Alexander had been a commissioner since 2010 (BBC News 2012/2).

- Barry Gardiner MP charged that the procurement process that led to appointment of Dow Chemical as sponsor of the main stadium wrap was 'rigged'. He told an adjournment debate in the House of Commons: 'The entire procurement process appears to be a sham. The application window was only 10 days long. That is only 10 days to apply for a purported £7 million contract, something unheard of in government or business worlds ... We have now heard opposition from the Indian Olympic Association, Olympians, the Indian government and even LOCOG's own sustainability commissioner. The government must now intervene in this mess and act to kick Dow out of the Olympics' (Press Trust of India 2012).

– ArcelorMittal

On July 2 2012, Goldsmith College-based research unit, Forensic Architecture, with survivors of the Omarska KZ concentration camp near Prijedor in Bosnia (and Four Faces of Omarska and Grupa Spomenik), declared the ArcelorMittal Orbit as 'Omarska Memorial in Exile' (Forensic Architecture 2015/1). The site of the camp is now an iron ore mine operated by ArcelorMittal.

Forensic Architecture indicted the ODA for 'manufacturing' the red tower with iron ore and profits from the mine. Between 700 and 800 people were killed at the camp, operational in 1992, by Bosnian Serb forces, when around 3,334 Bosniaks and Croats were imprisoned there. Over 3,000 people are still missing in the Prijedor region. ArcelorMittal assumed 51 per cent ownership of the mine in 2004 and announced in 2005 that it would build a memorial to those murdered. However, as of 2012, no such commemoration existed. Artist Milica Tomic (Forensic Architecture 2015/2) described the action in terms of a 'presencing' (material and political) of the traumas of the Bosnian war, made manifest by the use of ore from the mine.

In an online essay read out at the press conference, Delhi-based Anirban Gupta Nigam (ibid) suggested that ArcelorMittal's 'arrogant actions might just mark the first significant act of corporate delinquency committed by an Indian company with global ambitions … Rather than condemn [sculptor] Anish Kapoor for doing business with ArcelorMittal, it might be more productive to see attempts to mark the Orbit as a memorial as ... radicalisation of Kapoor and Mittal's vision: what they promised only in rhetoric is now being done in practice. The questions raised about the ... use of public art of this kind can be turned on their head when a community stakes claim to this structure. These claims are made possible because of the material power of steel to forge a connection between two disparate localities, events and times … it is precisely in this contestation over marking and remarking that other, more significant connections might open up. These ... can link dispersed geographical regions where corporate power, aesthetic practice and large-scale mining are colliding in interesting and dangerous ways: the camp in Omarska, the Olympic tower in London, and the vast tribal regions of India where rampant, violent mining has become the norm.'

An interview with Forensic Architecture on their work around the ArcelorMittal Orbit can be found here: http://www.forensic-architecture.org/arcelor-mittal-orbit-declared-omarksa-memorial-exile.

– Other dubious sponsors

Other sponsors with 'criminal records' in the eyes of the activist left include: BP, McDonald's, Rio Tinto Zinc, Coca-Cola, G4S, Samsung and (sponsors of the Paralympics) Atos Origin.

In 2011, News International lost its exclusive access to British athletes after a phone hacking scandal that led to closure of News of the World. The corporation's other papers – The Times, Sunday Times and the Sun – lost their 'Official Newspaper of Team 2012' strapline (Cheyne 2011/2; Associated Press 2011).

– UK Bribery Act 2010

It is estimated that £100 million will have been spent on corporate events and hospitality during London 2012. The event was described as 'the ultimate test' for the UK Bribery Act 2010 (Abbott 2010). Under the Act, certain types of hospitality and gifts can be considered a bribe and may be illegal. Penalties include unlimited fines and heavy prison sentences (up to 10 years) for employees, directors and companies. Current guidance suggests that lavish corporate events may lead to undue influence, and there remain many grey areas. A single VIP hospitality package for 10 people to attend the London 2012 opening ceremony ran to more than £55,000 (Fournier 2011).

– Contesting copyright

Space Hijackers are the only Official Protestors™ of the Olympic Games™. We hold the sole rights to dispense tickets to the Official Protest™, and demonstrations held by non-registered malcontents will be considered illegitimate. LOCOG's retribution against such interlopers will be swift and merciless, and we advise our prospective Protest Customers™ to beware of imposters …

Space Hijackers (2012). 'Official Protestors™ of the Olympic Games™', Occupied Times, issue 15, July

Text below is taken from an article by east London-based urban pranksters, the Space Hijackers, published in Occupied Times of London, July 2012.

> With all the official sponsorship deals, including everything from Official Cereal Bar to the Official Sustainability Partner [BP], the Space Hijackers noticed that one omission was notable by its absence: there were no Official Protesters. We decided to step up to this challenge and fill the void.
>
> The first thing we did was change our Twitter avatar to an anarcho-coloured (black and red) version of the famous '2012' logo, and changed our bio to claim that we were the Official Protestors of London 2012. We started tweeting satirical messages, such as 'There are no rights but ©opyrights', and 'It's OK to protest Shell today, but once in the Games period please direct attention to BP, proud partner of the US Olympic committee.'
>
> Then, a funny thing happened: Twitter – that self-proclaimed champion of free speech and democracy during the Arab Spring – shut down our account. LOCOG had contacted Twitter and complained that we were 'using a trademark in a way that could be confusing or misleading with regard to brand affiliation', as Twitter told us in an email on May 22 – despite it being an obvious spoof.

> Twitter immediately capitulated and censored our account, before writing to us demanding that we change our profile to remove the offending image and bio details. In order to continue our campaign to raise awareness on Olympic issues, we complied with their requests, and were back tweeting our parody messages the [next] afternoon.
>
> Meanwhile, the Streisand Effect reared its beautiful head, and LOCOG's attempts to silence us resulted in the story of our Twitter ban being plastered all over the international press. We like to imagine the long and heated debates between LOCOG's legal and PR teams …
>
> [R]emember, if reading this article has made you want to speak out against the Olympic Nightmare™, you must not take part in any unauthorised protest that hasn't been licensed by the Space Hijackers … Join the official protest here! http://www.protestlondon2012.com

Just before the Olympics, in July 2012, the Space Hijackers commandeered billboard space near the Olympic park in east London, playing on the theme of IOC trademarked words, and joining what was billed as 'the world's first international, collaborative subvertising [or 'brandalism'] project.' Twenty-six artists pasted billboard-size artwork over existing advertising sites in London, Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham and Bristol (Battersby 2012).

2.5 Ticketing

Ticket prices at London 2012 caused outrage. Daily Star (Savage 2011) calculated that some seats cost nearly £400 an hour, nearly twice that of the (soccer) Champions League final at Wembley. Most value-enhanced ticketing was found at the women's 10m synchronized diving event, which cost £450 for 70 minutes, while top-tier seats at the women's all-round gymnastics final were priced at £225 an hour. Swimming finals cost £450 for between 80 and 110 minutes of action (making them £337 an hour). The most expensive view of the opening ceremony was £2,012 for a three-hour show, working out at £670 per hour or more than £11 per minute. Some events were much cheaper: an all-day ground pass to the Olympic tennis at Wimbledon was priced at £20 for a full eight hours of sport (just £2.35 an hour), while preliminary fencing matches cost £20 for more than seven hours. Quite why these sports were so downgraded, the Daily Star failed to explain. Official prestige tickets, which included food and drink as well as a seat, were among the most expensive in the history of sport. These were priced at £4,500 per head, and they could only be bought in blocks of at least 10 for corporate and governmental hospitality, according to a price list obtained by the Mail on Sunday (Harris 2011) then 'yet to be made public'.

Only 700,000 people out of 1.8 million applications were successful in the first round when tickets were offered for sale (Sunday Mirror 2011). Unsuccessful applicants were given first priority in the second round of balloting. A total of 6.6 million tickets were available (Peck 2011). Sunday Mirror discovered (ibid) touts selling-on tickets to hundreds of top events, including the men's 100m final and opening ceremony. The paper complained that instead of the tickets going to 'ordinary fans', they were being sold to 'foreign millionaires' in executive holiday packages costing up to £40,000. Touts (illegal ticket sellers) may have made up to £40 million in profit. Fines for touting were raised from £5,000 to £20,000 under the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Act 2006, which made reselling illegal. An official ticket reselling site for members of the public who found themselves with too many tickets opened in 2012.

LOCOG sold off some of the best tickets to three corporate hospitality agents, Thomas Cook, Jet Set Sports, and Prestige Ticketing, for a total of £40 million (Magnay 2011/2). These tickets were then sold-on at extortionate rates: packages for the men's 100m final were on sale for £270,000 for 10 tickets. LOCOG told the IOC that sales of corporate hospitality for the Games had been particularly strong and that commercial revenue raising was on track to deliver a self-financing Games budget of £2.15 billion. Their report to the IOC revealed that the high-end corporate market would be offered around 200,000 tickets. In addition, LOCOG sold extra rights to the Olympic torch relay, live sites (such as Victoria Park in Tower Hamlets) and (remarkably) the Volunteer Programme, to raise an additional £21 million, and was expecting a further £8 million from similar fringe events by Games time. LOCOG reported that 90 per cent of ticket requests from national Olympic committees and sponsors had been fulfilled.

Daily Telegraph reported (Robinson 2011) that the UK government had ordered 9,000 Olympic event tickets at the taxpayers expense – costing up to £750,000 – to entertain dignitaries (royalty and top business people) along with other international guests. However, the paper noted, civil servants who had worked on Games preparation would be forced to pay for their own tickets. London mayor Boris Johnson was in charge of buying allocations for the GLA, Metropolitan Police, TFL and London Fire Brigade, and had a reported 2,000 tickets at his disposal. Johnson had stated previously (ibid) that no public money would be expended on Olympic tickets, and that all tickets gifted by LOCOG would be used to ensure 'London's future and inward investment'. Local authorities were entitled to 100 prime seats for the Games. Eleven London boroughs refused to buy any Olympic tickets, fearful of council-tax payer response: Westminster, Kingston, Croydon, Havering, Barking and Dagenham, Barnet, Waltham Forest, Camden, Harrow, Bromley, and Redbridge. City of London Corporation bought its allocation out of private money (BBC News 2011/2; Cheyne 2011/3).

Children, initially promised 120,000 free tickets, were fobbed off with tickets for the football or Paralympic Games (Cheyne 2011/4). In London, it was reported (BBC News 2010/3) that one in eight schoolchildren was expected to get a ticket (a moral inflection here: '125,000 tickets are being set aside to be given to schoolchildren who will have to achieve something to earn them'), but only one in 24 might get to see a core event (Cheyne ibid). GLA member Dee Doocey commented: 'Children were a big part of the bid in Singapore, and the promise has always been to use the Games to inspire a new generation of sports fans. It seems the scheme is more about packing football stadiums than giving London's children the chance to see some of the most exciting events.' Chris Roberts, a Greenwich councillor, was more forthright: 'Olympic organisers have had five years to plan a ticket allocation which would permit the children of the host boroughs to attend the Games taking place on their own doorsteps. Instead, seven out of eight schoolchildren will be denied that chance. The children of the east end … have been called upon endlessly to take part in photo opportunities to build support for the Games and are even used in consultation groups to advise on how to run the Games and build a legacy. Repeatedly, the Olympic host boroughs have offered to buy tickets for their children but have been refused. LOCOG don't want the authentic east end, they don't want our money, they certainly don't want our kids' (Dowding 2010/1).

Tickets could only be bought with a VISA card (along with cash and cheques), due to an exclusive deal by LOCOG. There are 91 million VISA card holders in the UK, compared to 40 million Mastercard and 4 million AMEX card holders. LOCOG's agreement with VISA meant that Mastercard and AMEX card holders would not be able to draw cash from ATMs, or make purchases at any Olympic site with their cards. Such 'sweetheart deals' have been in place since the Seoul Olympics in 1988. Restrictions applied to UK card holders only; non-UK card holders would still have been able to use other cards to buy tickets. The Office of Fair Trading and European Commission were left to decide on legality (BBC News 2010/4). Ticket buyers were left wondering what events they had been successful in buying tickets for as notification was delayed for two weeks after the deadline for purchasing (Wallop 2011). LOCOG stated that the resale website, the only legal channel for people to sell unwanted tickets on, would not be operating until 2012. This meant that ticket buyers would have had to pay the interest on their credit cards for at least eight months, regardless of whether they were using the tickets or not. According to the Bank of England, the average credit card interest rate in 2011 was 18.84 per cent, which would mean that VISA could make around £50 million in Olympic-related interest payments before anyone could recoup their money (ibid)..

2.6 Olympic pay and bonuses

Wages were high at the ODA. The 228 permanent staff enjoyed an average salary of £67,000 with an average bonus of £13,700 on top, plus expenses (Dowding 2010/2; Ashworth 2011). Daily Express (Ashworth ibid) cited figures of £390,000 with a bonus of £214,000 in 2010 for the salary of former chief executive David Higgins, while Daily Mirror (2011) put the figure at £325,000 in salary, £179,000 in performance-related pay, and £40,000 in employers' pension contributions in a package worth £544,000. His replacement, David Horne was paid (according to the Mirror) £264,000 in salary, £79,000 in performance-related pay, and £48,000 in employers' pension contributions in a £401,000 package in 2010/11. Daily Mirror reported that packages for the executive management board ranged from £218,000 to £544,000 (presumably for Higgins himself). ODA accounts for the same period showed that directors received packages worth between £257,000 and £372,000. The exception being finance director Gerry Luck who received only £23,000 as a salary, £6,000 in bonuses and £3,000 in pension contributions. The executive management board, excluding the chief executive and finance director, were also in line for a share of £319,000 in bonuses.

ODA paid out vast fees to consultants – in one case, £2,800 per day to one staff member from accountancy firm Ernst & Young, who was helping with risk and audit operations (Ashworth ibid). Between 2008 and 2011, ODA's total expenditure for all employees ballooned from £18.7 million to £33.2 million, while bonuses shot up from £531,000 to £3.1 million (ibid). Accounts show that in 2008/09, ODA paid £151.6 million to CLM, the main delivery consortium, including £60.2 million in performance-related bonuses. In the previous year it had paid 'only' £16.1 million in bonuses out of a total payment of £87.6 million (Inside the Games 2009).

3. INFRASTRUCTURE OVERLOAD

3.1 Rail upgrades

A London Assembly report of 2011 claimed that '[t]ransport problems remain[ed] "one of the biggest risks" for London 2012. 'The report, by the assembly's transport committee, found the city's transport network was already running at near-full capacity. During the Games more than a million extra journeys were expected across the busiest nine days' (BBC 2011/2). Over five million visitors were expected in London during the Games period by the Daily Telegraph (Gosden 2011), and [note the inflation here] three million extra journeys were expected each day of the event. The government (in the guise of the Department of Transport) (Gosden ibid), wanted commuters and other Londoners to travel and work 'differently' during the Games. Long-distance commuters were urged to try different routes, stagger their journey times to avoid the busiest periods, work remotely or use video conferencing for meetings. Those who lived near their workplace were being urged to walk or cycle. Federation of Small Businesses considered advising its members to simply shut down during the Olympics rather than operate at 30 per cent capacity (Cheyne 2010/8).

- In September 2011, LOCOG were told to cut spectator capacity for an equestrian event in Greenwich Park by 25,000 or risk transport chaos. LOCOG faced losing more than £1 million in ticket revenues if it complied with TFL demands (Beard 2011).

– Rail Future recommendations

Back in 2005, lobby group Rail Future welcomed recognition by the House of Commons Transport Select Committee that Olympic proposals must fit into an integrated long-term transport plan and leave a transport 'legacy appropriate to the (ongoing) needs of [e]ast London'. However, they queried the extent to which the government had agreed to fund basic improvements to the London rail network.

Their submissions to the committee (Rail Future 2005, Pout 2005) highlighted numerous improvements to the London rail network necessary for local, London, regional and international spectators to be able to reach the LLV precinct and other Olympic venues. Information below concentrates on necessary improvements to the London network and is sourced from these submissions unless otherwise stated. Games Monitor is not able to comment on what changes have in fact been made since the reports were written. The text below amalgamates opinion from the two reports. Other sources are stated inline.

Channel Tunnel Rail Link/Javelin service

The Olympic Javelin service (Class 395) ran over High Speed 1 during London 2012 between St Pancras and Ebbsfleet International via Stratford International station. The line itself has been operational since autumn 2009. A fleet of Javelin trains was withdrawn in 2010 after frightened passengers complained of carriages 'wobbling' at their 140mph top speed. Operator Southeastern admitted the bullet trains, which cost a reported £258 million, were suffering from issues with 'sideways movement'. Twenty-nine carriage trains were being fitted with 'dampeners' to reduce the wobble (Hughes 2010). Rail Future suggested that rapid dispersion of crowds travelling to and from the Games on the Javelin would be inhibited unless the new St Pancras Midland Road station on Thameslink was fitted out and operational. Some Kent services may have lost trains to provide the Javelin shuttle. The campaign argued in 2005: 'The importance of this service has been overemphasised[;] ... an independent consultant has argued that its actual capacity could be as low as 8,500 passengers per hour in each direction.'

North London Line

Rail Future suggested that spectators would be forced to rely on the North London Line (NLL) if a core section of Crossrail to Stratford was not ready by 2012. In 2005, the short trains and quarter-hourly service could barely cope. The campaign recommended platform lengthening and signalling improvements to service longer and more frequent trains on the line (three-to-four minute operating headways), interchange improvement at West Hampstead and Willesden Junction, and a 'requadrupl[ing] [of] the route between Dalston West Junction and Camden Road'. They also anticipated diversion of freight traffic from the line during the Games. Rail Future noted that the scale of Olympic traffic demanded more frequent and longer six-car trains, running at least every

10 minutes, plus additional rolling stock, compatible with the new East London Line (ELL) trains. Richard Pout (2005) suggested that: 'Planners might explore the practicality of running direct services from Heathrow to Stratford over the NLL, as proposed route improvements could offer capacity for a half-hourly daytime service after the morning peak, complementing the Heathrow Connect services.' The line from Stratford to Chingford could be extended, providing a direct link for commuters from Chingford and Walthamstow to Stratford and Hackney. A feasibility study in 2001 funded by TFL costed this project at £18 million, but the extension disappeared from TFL's London Rail Plan and Olympic strategy.

East London Line

Rail Future proposed extension of ELL services to Highbury and Islington by 2012 (this line was planned to be operational only south of Dalston by 2012 but the Highbury extension was in fact completed in 2011). It also recommended extension to Finsbury Park to serve the new Arsenal stadium at Holloway, enhancement of platform and siding space at Stratford (to enable trains from East Anglia), plus additional stops at West Ham on the C2C route (for interchange to NLL or the Docklands Light Railway [DLR]), which required signalling changes. Rail Future suggested that the Dalston East Link towards Hackney should be reconstructed, permitting trains to Hackney and Stratford from Croydon, Clapham Junction or Crystal Palace.

In the second report, Pout (ibid) asserted reconstruction as 'fundamental to a long-term rail strategy for serving Hackney, Stratford and the Lower Lea Valley'. Extra capacity would be needed at Tottenham Hale, with additional track between Tottenham, Cheshunt and Bishops Stortford. Potential for park-and-ride at Angel Road, using waste ground and two large retailers' car parks, had not been considered. Two new local stations just north of the Olympic precinct, at Temple Mills and Lea Bridge, were also regarded as essential to improve local access.

Regarding connectivity to/from Stansted, the campaign suggested that an extra tunnel, prerequisite for airport expansion, would improve route capacity and operational flexibility. A proposed half-hourly service from Stansted to Stratford would require work by Network Rail.

Shenfield Line London Overground

Rail Future recommended upgrading of the Shenfield Line for the Olympics to deliver a five-minute interval metro service throughout the day to Gidea Park. This route would be required to handle city commuters and Stratford employees as well as Olympic visitors.

Thameslink

Rail Future thought that some Thameslink traffic could go via Loughborough Junction and Herne Hill. The campaign recommended upgrading these stations 'well before 2012' to connect with Javelin services from St Pancras. Enhanced Thameslink services would also benefit local access to the Wimbledon venue and provide long-term and much needed improvement to the Metro services on the Streatham–Wimbledon–Sutton loop. Links to the Olympic venue at Woolwich Arsenal needed 'further evaluation. There is still some uncertainty over the development of the Greenwich Waterfront Transit linking [the Dome and Woolwich Arsenal] to Charlton, Plumstead and Abbey Wood stations ... Local buses will be needed to provide a shuttle to and from Woolwich Arsenal Station.'

Chiltern Line

New Chiltern line platforms to serve Aylesbury trains at Wembley Park suffered from lack of funding. 'Claims that Chiltern's Wembley Stadium station cannot be rebuilt to accommodate three platforms are spurious. The Chiltern Line Evergreen II route expansion and service upgrade strategy does not include any enhancements to the Neasden and Wembley [or] South Ruislip section. Links between Stratford and Wembley are important. The provision of an alternative service over the NLL would be beneficial ... [E]nsuring adequate platform capacity is available at Wembley Central and Wembley Stadium rail stations is also important.'

Crossrail

Construction of Crossrail was not included in the Olympic plans. Thames Gateway London Partnership (a public-private partnership supported by all 12 local authorities) stated fears that the Treasury would use congestion caused by Olympic developments as excuse to delay the Crossrail funding package. (Arnold 2005). The Crossrail tunnel surfaces at Pudding Mill Lane in Stratford. Crossrail has still not been completed in 2015. Rail Future suggested that the core section from the Western Portal to Stratford, operational with three key stations (Paddington, Farringdon and Liverpool Street) could be open and working in time for the Olympics to enable a limited Shenfield–Heathrow service. This option was supported by the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors.

- Pout argued that more attention should be paid to private sector investment in rail and bus infrastructure. Three public transport conglomerates provided contracted bus services in the TFL area in 2005, but during the Olympics he thought that '[e]nsuring adequate modern accessible buses may ... be a problem, as contractors are unlikely to bear the risk of maintaining and servicing an enlarged fleet without some return on their investment'.

3.2 Olympic Route Network

The Olympic Route Network (ORN) comprised reserved road lanes intended to ease Olympic traffic – an estimated 82,000 Olympic athletes, facilitators, media and IOC dignitaries – around London and the UK. In London, ODA was granted legal authority (over TFL) to approve planned works on the ORN and to implement traffic regulation orders on the network during the Games. Unauthorised drivers were fined £130 for encroaching on the lanes with a possible car-pound release fee of £200 for illegal parking (TFL 2012), plus a maximum fine of £5,000 (ODA did reassure drivers that this would be for 'repeat offenders' only) (Satch 2007). Enormous disruption was anticipated. ODA was reported to be considering putting Olympic lanes into the Blackwall Tunnel (linking the Stratford precinct to venues in Greenwich), although this was described by ODA chair John Armitt as 'a last resort'. If this had gone ahead, traffic in Hackney and Tower Hamlets would have been gridlocked (BBC News 2009/4). Conservative London Assembly member Gareth Bacon called for the plan to be abandoned and London mayor Boris Johnson concurred. Somewhat craftily, TFL demarcated the Blackwall Tunnel approach roads as part of the ORN but not the tunnel itself.

Mike Wells (2012) detailed ORN strictures on Games Monitor: 'To avoid delays to VIPs, ordinary drivers will not be permitted right turns across the [l]anes. ... Inconvenience to the "Olympic Family" is also to be minimised by ... "suspension" of 48 "signalised junctions", closure of 50 side roads, closing of pedestrian crossings, and ... daytime suspension of parking and loading ... Electronic devices are to be located at traffic lights and fitted to the fleet of BMWs to ensure VIPs a green-light journey ... Black cabs, mini cabs, bicycles, buses and non-accredited cars will be banned from the VIP Lanes ... Emergency vehicles will be allowed in ... [l]anes only when [actually] on an emergency. For ordinary Londoners simple tasks such as picking kids up from day care is likely to turn into a time-consuming nightmare.'

The haulage industry was worried about effects on road delivery vehicles. 'There's no way we'll be allowed to just pull up outside a pub that's located within the ORN,' said James Crosk of Tradeteam (Hailstone 2009). Billingsgate Fish Market was on the route and faced difficulties receiving and sending out stock within the tight timetable. Restaurant owners in many parts of London were told that they would have to take their food deliveries at night (Millward 2011). 'We are facing 100 days of disruption, rather than just the 28 days of the Games', Natalie Chapman of the Freight Transport Association told the Daily Telegraph. The lanes covered 2.5 per cent of London's roads, and cost around £25 million (Dowding 2010/2).

- On September 9 2011, London's 25,000 black-cab drivers blockaded streets around St Pauls and Dorchester hotel to protest a ban on them using the ORN during 100 days around the Games (Evening Standard 2012/8). United Cabbies Group said that drivers would be forced to increase prices if they were not allowed to use ORN lanes. TFL offered dedicated drop-off and pick-up points at Olympic venues, but cab drivers felt they would be unable to reach the points because of lane restrictions. They were also protesting bans on right-hand turns and U-turns on key routes. In 2009, black-cab drivers caused gridlock when they drove *en masse* to central London in a dispute with private hire taxis. The taxi demonstration was arranged via text and Twitter within 12 hours, and resulted in many more taxis turning up than were actually needed to blockade the hotel. There was also traffic chaos around St Paul's Cathedral (Danny @m37411ic48 2011).

- A Channel 4 Dispatches documentary broadcast on February 14, 2012, showed two Olympic ticket resellers – Thomas Cook and JetSet Sports – including ORN access as part of hospitality packages (that is, offering speedy through-travel to non-sponsors) (Magnay 2012).

- TFL claimed another 'alternative' route network (AORN) in an attempt to ban protest during the Games. Around 43 campaign groups spent months negotiating with TFL, Metropolitan Police and Tower Hamlets council for a march on July 28, 2012. The AORN was put in place as contingency against blockage or security incident. Juilan Cheyne noted the official road system as a '35-mile ribbon of class privilege'. 'The idea that you can ban free speech and shut down democracy to ensure the rich have an alternative priority highway is an outrage,' he said. Peace activist Albert Beale, another CON spokesperson, commented: 'We've done everything we can to accommodate the authorities – giving early notice of our intention to march, avoiding the ORN network and immediate vicinity of the Olympic park, agreeing to use parks proposed by the local council, and so on. But we won't be denied our right to protest, so we will be marching down Bow Road, and if we are restricted to the pavement, the stupidity of resulting congestion and delay will be responsibility of TFL' (CON 2012/1). The march was attended by around 1000 people and supported by campaigns as diverse as Blacklist Support Group, several trades councils, anti-cuts and anti-militarist groups, Haldane Society of Socialist Lawyers, Jewish Socialist Group plus London Mining Network, War on Want, Athletes Against Dow Chemical Sponsorship and London Green Party. Representatives of NoSochi2014 and RioOnWatch also attended (CON 2012/2).

3.3 Energy and data capacity

Olympic energy demands were reported (falsely?) to be in direct competition with those of financial industries. In the Guardian, Pete Warren (2008) suggested that demand for cabling to provide power for data centres had outstripped supply. This combined with a shortage of electrical engineers and server space. Infrastructure for London 2012 would, he stated, demand more than 100km of electrical cabling and 100+ substations. 'The City has been told there can be no more computer centres until after the Games,' Warren claimed. He noted that the City was expected to need 80 per cent more capacity over the next five to seven years (existing = 1000MW), while Docklands might need an increase of 90 per cent (existing = 250MW). Telehouse, one contractor for Beijing 2008, was allowed to expand by 'official' energy supplier EDF. Coincidentally, the firm was also to provide the 9,000+ servers needed for the event. Revising this publication, we noted that the Guardian's reported weighting of power (MW) seemed odd.

4. LEGACY ARRANGEMENTS (STRATFORD PRECINCT)

4.1 Legacy responsibilities

London mayor Boris Johnson announced a shake up of metropolitan government institutions in June 2010. This included transformation of the legacy planning body – the OPLC – into a mayoral development corporation (MDC). Enabling legislation for the MDC received ascent with the Localism Act 2011. The new responsible authority for legacy planning – London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) – opened for business on April 1, 2012. LLDC assumed assets and responsibilities from existing regeneration agencies in the area, including the LTGDC. Its powers include planning and development control over the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park itself and surrounding hinterland (Norman 2012/1). The London mayor has the only veto of proposals put forward by legacy officials (jncluding prospective tenants of former Olympic venues) (Warner 2010). As of December 2015, chief executive of the LLDC is David Goldstone CBE, former chief finance officer at TFL and UK government's London 2012 finance director 2007–2012 (Mayor of London 2014).

LLDC predecssor, the OPLC, was set up at the beginning of 2009, joinly owned by the London mayor and central government (Hipwell 2009; Warner ibid). Described (uncomfortably) as a 'public-sector-led urban-regeneration-style company with no planning powers' or land ownership, OPLC's core mission was to secure investment and development from the private sector, and to set an economic development strategy for the five host boroughs. Property Week reported (Hipwell ibid) that 'heavyweight' UK developers were brought in as 'critical friends' to advise informally on legacy proposals and masterplan options. EDAW (now subsumed into transnational planning firm AECOM), KCAP and Allied & Morrison acted as lead masterplanning consultants, with (as of January 2008) Caruso St John, Maccreanor Lavington, Vogt Landscape, McDowell + Benedetti, Haworth Tompkins, Panter Hudspith, S333, Camlin Lonsdale, Buro Happold, Beyond Green, JMP, PMP, Vision XS and Nick Ritblat (Design-BuildNetwork.com 2015).

Transition between Olympic and post-Olympic responsible authorities was blurry. ODA suggested that it should close two years before its scheduled date in 2014, after chief executive David Higgins left in 2010 (Gardiner 2011). ODA was reported as keen to pass on responsibility for post-Olympic transformation works to avoid having to employ construction management staff while building work stopped effectively for a year in advance of the Games. However, this proposal was shelved, and the ODA was dissolved by parliament on December 2, 2014.

LLDC published its *Local Plan 2015–2031* in August 2014, available here:
https://queenelizabetholympicpark.co.uk/~/media/lldc/local%20plan/local%20plan%20aug14/local%20plan.pdf

4.2 Venues

Six venues are still *in situ* after the Games (UK Government and Mayor of London 2013: 35): the main stadium, aquatics centre, Copper Box (former handball venue), velodrome and cycle circuits, plus Eton Manor sports complex and hockey centre. The media centre, athletes' village, and ArcelorMittal Orbit also remain intact. Maintenance costs for redundant stadia will be significant. In 2005, London mayor Ken Livingstone allocated a mere £10 million per year for upkeep and management of all venues (Mendick 2005). Magnay (2013) suggested that 'It was always the case that £300 million of taxpayers' money would be spent reshaping the park after the Games, but the final budget looks like being more than double that amount. Government has already allocated a further £150 million, but more will be needed ... £650 million must be returned to the … Big Lottery Fund which was drawn down when the initial plans to have private enterprise pay for the … media centre and athletes village went belly-up with the recession.'

Arenas hosting waterpolo and hockey plus the original basketball arena will move (locations to be confirmed), and all structures in Greenwich Park (including the arena and cross-country jumps) have been taken down. Nine training swimming pools will be moved to other parts of the UK (Elkes 2014).

Speculation on future use has been rife with controversy. London Assembly's Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee released a report critical of legacy venue proposals on September 17, 2010 (Norman 2010/2). The report lambasted 'missed opportunities' in delivering two crucial venues for regeneration (the main stadium and media centre). Turning to the question of anchor tenant for the main stadium, the report criticised the government for terminating talks in early 2007 to secure a major football club 'only for OPLC to begin pursuing the option again three years later'. It added that it was 'very disappointing' that new facilities for elite athletics were prioritised in preference to 'regeneration legacy and the need to make the [s]tadium financially viable'. The report also suggested that ODA should never 'have been given lead responsibility for recruiting tenants, given that its primary role [was] to construct the venues'. It had significant concerns over marketing of the media centre by both LDA and Hackney council, and made clear that there were problems with transport accessibility to the complex (this was backed up by John Burton, director of Westfield Stratford City).

An earlier report by the committee also raised serious doubts about post-Olympics transformation of the park without a tenant in place for the main stadium (Cook 2009). It dismissed the initial masterplan proposals (10,000 new homes, four new schools, sports academy and 10,000 new jobs) as 'just aspirations'. 'None of these developments have agreed funding or identified delivery partners', the 2009 report complained, and concluded '[w]ithout decisive action, the stadium is in danger of becoming a white elephant'.

– Finding a future tenant for the main stadium

The Football Association (FA) named the main stadium as a potential (soccer) venue in their bid to host the World Cup in 2018 (Conn 2009). This would have disrupted the way the stadium was being constructed. Originally, plans were to remove 52,000 seats from its upper tier once the Games were over, leaving the stadium as permanent athletics venue to fulfill a pledge by Lord Coe to the IOC. 'The suggestion that the stadium could be retained with 80,000 seats until 2018 [was], however, dismissed as fanciful by government sources,' said the Guardian (Conn ibid). The paper reported that Olympics minister 'Tessa Jowell ... [was] said to put the cost [of transforming the stadium into a World Cup venue] at £100 million to £150 million, because as well as ongoing maintenance, corporate and other spectator facilities would have to be built into the upper tier, and segregation of fans organised, to fit Federation Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup requirements. One source dismissed the idea as "economics of the madhouse".'

West Ham FC with Newham Council, as well as rival Premier League team Tottenham Hotspur, put in bids for the stadium's post-Games use. Three years of talks with Leyton Orient and Saracens came to nothing (Conn ibid). The Guardian noted: 'Insiders put the ongoing cost at £1 million a year, and even some who see merit in the current downscaled plan also cringe that this modest venue is all London will be left with for its £537 million.' The saga of West Ham versus Tottenham, bids and counter bids to take over the main stadium, has gone through many twists, turns, accusations and false conclusions. Julian Cheyne (2011/5) summed up the state of play on Games Monitor:

> Still standing in the way are two football clubs. It had looked like Tottenham's bid was over, but then the high court agreed that Newham's £40 million loan to facilitate West Ham's east end hop from Green Street to Pudding Mill should be subject to judicial review. The prospect of that review stimulated BoJo to offer a different set of public funds to Tottenham, starting at £8 million with possibly more to come, to keep the club in north London. So, more than £48 million to keep two clubs in their home territories! That's on top of the £486 million [or £537 million depending on who you read – Ed] spent building the stadium. That looked like a done deal, except it wasn't. Tottenham, surprisingly, decided to pursue their judicial review [in August 2011].
>
> The waters have also been muddied by accusations of phone hacking against Tottenham, which West Ham and the OPLC claim that Tottenham has [proposed] to drop – in exchange for an end to the legal case – and of corruption against West Ham, since dismissed by the OPLC, although the high court judge thought they deserved further consideration. Then there's … Leyton Orient, whose chairman (sic) Barry Hearn, insisted the club would 'fight to the end to safeguard the future of [Leyton Orient] and if that means standing alone as the little guy against the powers that be in authority, then so be it'. [Leyton Orient worried that their third tier club would struggle if a bigger club moved to near its Brisbane Road stadium].
>
> Public funding of sports stadiums is presented as economic investment. Newham justifies its loan to West Ham as a way of 'boosting the economy through football'. Likewise, with Tottenham Hotspur, a spokesperson for BoJo declared: 'The hope is that all of this will allow Spurs to press ahead with stadium redevelopment. Boris has always been attracted to the idea that the football club should stay in Tottenham. ... Boris prioritised Tottenham as an important area for regeneration months ago.'

What Cheyne alludes to is a legal action by West Ham against Tottenham Hotspur and the Sunday Times over claims of 'secret' payments to a senior OPLC executive during the bidding process for the Stratford stadium (Gibson 2011/2). The club confirmed that a senior executive at OPLC carried out paid consultancy work on its behalf during the bidding process. But it insisted that payments were above board and transparent. The company believed that OPLC director of corporate services had authorisation to carry out the work. OPLC suspended the director pending further investigations, and said that she had no authorisation, but stated that there had been no impact on the bidding process. West Ham's counter phone hacking allegations relate to a private investigator acting unlawfully reportedly under instruction from Tottenham Hotspur. The investigator illegally acquired bank and telephone records belonging to senior executives at West Ham and OPLC. In 2011, the matter was with the police and the Information Commissioner's Office (Dowding 2011/2). In the event, West Ham's bid collapsed in October 2011 after an anonymous complaint to the European Commission, and by February 2012 there were 16 bidders (still including West Ham) wishing to take over the site.

Association of British Athletics Clubs (ABAC) backed Tottenham's bid (along with the suggestion that Crystal Palace athletics stadium would be redeveloped), claiming that retaining a running track – as West Ham would do – would provide little useful legacy for the sport (Daily Telegraph 2011). John Bicourt, an ABAC officer who competed in the 3,000m steeplechase for Britain at Munich 1972 and Montreal 1976, told the paper: 'Saying that there would be a proper athletics legacy merely by keeping the track at the Olympic stadium is a myth and a sham. The true reason for those touting the legacy myth is to save face over the wholly unrealistic promises made in Singapore by the Olympic bid team. West Ham, should they win the bid, would almost certainly demand the right to remove the track after a few years on the basis that the stadium is barely used for athletics enough to justify keeping it.' Bicourt said that ABAC viewed Spurs' bid as a 'realistic alternative' in that it would see the home of British athletics at Crystal Palace rebuilt as a 25,000 seat arena with the possibility of increasing the seats to 40,000 if needed. The same story appeared in the Evening Standard (January 31, 2011, no longer online) with this interesting aside: 'ABAC are viewed privately by UK Athletics as an unrepresentative group of troublemakers, and the governing body insisted that almost all athletes past and present support their [own] stance.' Local opposition to a major footballing tenant is pronounced: in 2011, fans of West Ham, Tottenham Hotspur and Leyton Orient lobbied OPLC, Premier League, the FA and UK government, in protest at any Premier League club moving into the main stadium (ESPN/Associated Press 2011).

- Financial pressures on Wembley Stadium could have escalated if the main Olympic stadium retained its 80,000 capacity after the Games. David Bernstein, Wembley's chairman (sic) argued in 2009 that there were only a maximum of 40 events a year that could fill a stadium with that capacity in London. Wembley made a loss of £23 million in 2008, once depreciation, interest payments, and tax were taken into account (Gibson 2009/2).

– Objections by cyclists to legacy provision

British Cycling and Eastway Users' Group expressed significant concern over the paucity of legacy provision in early masterplanning for road and off-road cycling competition and training. British Cycling stated to Singletrack magazine (Slavin 2007/3): 'The two disciplines of road racing and mountain bike cross-country in particular represent a large and thriving element of the sport and until they are adequately catered for in the legacy plan, British Cycling cannot endorse the legacy proposals ... [We have] resolved firstly to register [our] objections in respect of the legacy provisions directly at the highest level with the [ODA] with whom we have been working to achieve the right outcome. These "cycling project sponsors" need to understand that [British Cycling], the regions and ... user groups all share the same concern with what is being proposed as the legacy 'velopark' ... British Cycling will make a formal objection to the ODA planning decisions team including a "request for conditions to be imposed" on the relevant application. This will state the case for legacy cycling facilities to include a proper road circuit ... as ... replacement for what has been lost, and for an off-road competition facility that genuinely provides for racing at the level previously carried out at Eastway ... These ... conditions will cover the adequacy of the road and mountain bike facilities in the light of previous ... commitments made by the ODA and others[,] and specifically in light of the conditions ... attached to the Olympic planning consents ... granted in 2004 during ... Olympic bidding.' Cyclists at Eastway also complained of lack of consultation, and of the 'marginal' nature of proposed facilities. The road circuit they describe as 'unsafe' and say it does not allow for large fields to circulate; also that its layout is 'uninspiring' and squashed up/cut in half by the A12. There is no possibility for safe concurrent running of road and off-road sessions of any kind. The plans are not suitable, they claim, for any cycle sport outdoors.

4.3 Other infrastructure

– Media centre

Location of the International Broadcast Centre and Main Press Centre (known as the 'media centre') within LBH boundaries was justified by Hackney mayor Jules Pipe as mitigation for the loss of Metropolitan Open Land on Hackney Marshes (see BP1 §1.2) (Dowding 2012). However, convincing 'stakeholders' that the space might attract 8,000 jobs after the Olympics – something touted by the London Assembly in 2010 – proved troublesome. John Burton, director of Westfield Stratford City, thought the centre was too far from railway transport. Charlie Forman, chief 2012 officer for Hackney council, coyly suggested that 'it was not as future proofed as we would have liked'. Anna Harding, chief executive of art organisation Space Studios, criticised the media centre as a 'damned insult to Hackney' and 'outmoded' at a meeting of the GLA Olympics Committee (Cheyne 2010/9).

Games Monitor activist Steve Dowding detailed tribulations of finding tenants for the media centre in the Occupied Times of July 2012. Initial proposals for a 'creative hub' seem to have stuck – although the emphasis of managers Here East seem to be towards attracting tenants in broadcasting and high technology – but in the interim, as Dowding notes, the site has been considered as an indoor ski resort, sports retail hub, theme park, and data centre. Bidding for the legacy management contract on the 91,000m^2 of office space opened in November 2011. In the same year, the Wellcome Trust proposed a 'world class centre for technology and innovation' as part of its scenario for transforming the entire Olympic precinct area (including the athletes' village) as a science research park. This proposal fell to Delancey and Qatari Diar's bid for ownership solely of the athletes' village (see §2.1).

Dowding (ibid) notes the intensity of speculation on future use: '[T]here were reports of negotiations with the BBC, which considered using the centre as a studio … to film Eastenders and other programmes. OPLC produced a list of potential occupants including Channel 5 and Trumans Brewery … Then there were hopes that … Google would lease the media centre … reported as dashed in January 2012. Three months later a final bid was due from Oxylane, but they pulled out. Two rival bids were shortlisted [in April 2012]: iCITY … and UK Fashion Hub.' iCITY won the bid, and changed their operating name to Here East in February 2014 (Shead 2014). Chief executive Gavin Poole, appointed in April 2012 (Norman 2012/2), has a civil service background (Royal Air Force) and is a former executive director of Tory think tank, the Centre for Social Justice (Infinity 2015).

As of November 2015, confirmed tenants for Here East include BT Sport as anchor (broadcasting from the site since August 2013), Infinity SDC (billed as 'London's largest data centre'), Ericsson-owned Red Bee Media, Hackney Community College, Loughborough University, TechHub and Space Studios (Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park 2015; Bevir 2015). The refit – costing £100 million – also touted space for UCL's Bartlett School of Architecture (Bloomfield 2015).

– *ArcelorMittal Orbit*

London mayor Boris Johnson's decision to hold a private, invite-only competition for the observatory tower, which overlooks the main stadium and oxbow of the LLV towards the Thames, caused significant resentment in the architectural press and wider profession. Anish Kapoor's ArcelorMittal Orbit (designed in partnership with Arup engineer Cecil Balmond) won the commission, and a scaled model was revealed to the press in March 2010. It received a mixed reception, although one could argue that the Orbit's distinctive contorted profile and sinister nuance of its observation room, glowering over the LLV landscape seems fitting in context of massive disturbance of the Stratford area. Nicolas Grimshaw (Klettner 2011), architect and president of the Royal Academy, slated the tower as a 'missed opportunity'. Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) sent the proposals back to the drawing board, stating that the design had some 'mundane' flaws in its entrance pavilion, viewing platforms, lift and stairs (Cheyne 2010/10).

In an outspoken comment piece in Blueprint magazine, Tim Abrahams (2010) accused Munira Mirza, Johnson's director of cultural policy, for choosing the observatory tower's advisory panel from a narrow band of art-world curators ('Nicholas Serota, Tate Modern director; Julia Peyton Jones, director of the Serpentine and its curator Hans Ulrich; ODA 'art wonk' Sarah Weir; an ex-CABE chief, and a token engineer: these are individuals who don't need much encouragement to play safe'). These, he complained, then approached the usual suspects, against the advice of holding an open competition. Abrahams fulminated: 'The suggestion that there wasn't enough time to set up an open competition is a convenient nonsense, designed to deliberately preclude ideas that are truly challenging. It would've taken a small practice no longer to pull together a team and an idea than it would an established one.' He continued: 'Putting aside the fact that the mayor's office is privately riding roughshod over the very procurement laws that they support publicly, it has ignored the one thing that is actually a real quality of London's creative industries. There is at least a democracy of ideas here. A good idea, no matter where it comes from can thrive in London ... One senses in these organisations a genuine distaste for sporting ideals, particularly open participation. The cultural administrators are cynical about the idea of the Games as an open playing field upon which the world can participate and the best be rewarded. This will only end in bad art and design.'

– *Thames cable car*

East London now has London mayor Boris Johnson's promised cable car link across the Thames. The cable car (currently branded as the Emirates Airline) connects the Greenwich peninsula to the Royal Victoria Docks (or the O2 arena to the Excel Centre, both Olympic venues). The scheme's cost was estimated to be a mere £25 million when the project was first announced in July 2010 (Evening Standard 2012/9); by 2011 this had escalated to an estimated £50.5 million (Smale 2011). TFL told BBC News (2012/3) that the final figure was 'around' £60 million with £45 million spent directly on construction. Despite a raging debate over whether the scheme would be ready for the Games, it opened on June 28, 2012.

– *Mobile phone networks on the tube*

Johnson's dreams of a mobile phone network installed on the London Underground in time for the Games were dashed. TFL and mobile phone operators (including O2, Vodafone, Everything Everywhere and 3), along with French engineering company Thales, agreed to abandon the project over funding issues and the technical complexity of installing it in time (Mulholland 2011).

4.4 Housing

The projected 4,200 flats in the athletes' village were scaled back to 3,300 in June 2008, and then in the following October to 2,700 (Beard 2012/2). By the event, 2,818 apartments had been built (Smith 2013) across 11 blocks. The intensive nature of athletes' accommodation caused some alarm: the Guardian cited a figure of five athletes housed per flat (Booth 2008), Evening Standard thought six (Beard 2012/3). By 2012, there was a variety of accommodation – from one bedroom flats to five-bedroom townhouses (Hanna 2012), reflecting post-Olympic sale. Residents have been moving in since November 2013 (Smith ibid). Numbers of projected dwellings 2015–2031 stand at 24,000 for the LLDC area as a whole (LLDC 2014: 41). This figure is more optimistic than OPLC projections in 2010. OPLC had thought that only 5,000 units out of 8,000 would be constructed before 2019 (Cheyne 2010/11).

Initial legacy proposals promoted affordable and social housing quotas of 50 per cent. These have been reduced to 35 per cent (Hill 2011) thanks to Tory administrations in both City Hall and Westminster, although each borough retains a percentage of nominations. Historically, social housing has benefited the more wealthy working class, and New Labour's push towards part-mortgaged 'affordable' housing (minimum salary £26,000) and housing association lettings was no exception. On July 23, 2010, Inside Housing reported that Olympic developer Triathlon Homes demanded a lettings plan for the social housing component that would select majority of tenants for the athletes' village on the basis of whether they had a job (Duxbury 2010/2), a social discrimination. Guardian blogger Dave Hill commented (ibid): 'Soon "affordable" will demonstrate still greater elasticity. Next month [April 2011] Mayor Johnson will bring into effect his First Steps policy programme, making "intermediate" schemes available to family households with incomes as high as £74,000 a year – rather more than [MPs are] paid – compared with the present £60,000 ... Meanwhile, the government [has now brought in] what it calls its new 'affordable rent' model, which will underpin the finances of housing associations. This will require the introduction of housing association rents at a level of "up to 80 per cent of gross market rents" in the area concerned – a figure far higher than the highest at present.'

Architect Sir Terry Farrell asserted the need in 2006 for massive housing construction in the LLV and along the Thames rather than brownfield areas of Thames Gateway and John Prescott's other slated growth areas across the south east (Clover 2006). The scale of building in the (now former) Thames Gateway area has been attacked for lack of enforcement of sustainability criteria, and for deficits of supporting infrastructure, including water utilities (Green Building Press 2006). Developments around the river Lea and Bow Back rivers right down to the Thames were marketed without irony as part of the Water City vision (London 2012 2006; Chinese Olympic Committee 2006). Other critics have highlighted hazards of flooding (Leadbetter 2006) as well as the permanent displacement of low-income private-rental tenants (Slavin 2006). In its report *A Lasting Legacy for London* (May 2007), University of East London (UEL) cited a 2001 study by the Australian McQuarrie Bank which suggested that Sydney 2000 had only minor impact on the rental market (less than 0.5 per cent above the city average for 1996–2000). UEL proposed that all London and east London median rental values and house price changes be assessed both during and after the Games. Not surprisingly, given their prediction, they also won the contract to monitor displacement.

4.5 Questions surrounding the park

Following previous posts pointing out that the ... Olympic park is not the claimed 'largest new park in Europe in 150 years', there was some hurried hype revision. ODA downgraded it to the biggest 'park in the UK for 100 years' while other fellow traveller agencies drifted off message and settled for 'biggest new park in London for 100 years'. Ignoring small matters such as it not actually being a proper park at all (OPLC describes it as an 'urban space'), another park has been identified which (a) is in London, (b) is bigger than the open space promised in the Olympic park (110ha according to Ealing council against 102ha of 'virtual' Olympic parkland), and (c) was completed in 1996. As the Northolt and Greenford Countryside Park Society say on their web page, [the Ealing park is] the biggest park to be built in London in the last 100 years! That means that the Olympic park would possibly be the biggest new park in London for 16 years when it opens in 2012, except that most of the 'open space' won't be parkland, won't be completed or accessible for an indefinite period, or will be surrounded by building sites [until] kingdom come.

Charles Batsworth (2010/2) 'Oh no – it's not even the biggest park in London in 20 years ...', Games Monitor blog, December 30

The London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Bill 2005, drafted to set up the ODA, was criticised early on for a lack of legacy provisions on natural environment. Local lawyer Laurie Elks set out the problem in a letter to Meg Hillier MP, on November 7, 2005: Section 4(3)(a) requires ODA 'wherever relevant' under its executive functions to 'have regard to the desirability of maximising the benefits to be derived after the London Olympics'; §5(5)(b) provides that under its planning functions ODA should have regard 'in particular' for 'the desirability of maximising the benefits to be derived after the London Olympics from things done in preparation for them'. Elks charged that 'the bill envisaged the ODA as both developer and – in some sense – its own regulator', and suggested that ODA longer-term planning functions would not survive as part of the core mission once budget and time constraints start to hit in. He also suggested that while the planning applications contain commitments to landscaping and certain aspects of environmental restoration, it is 'wholly unclear where commitment resides for the maintenance of ecology and environment of the park after the Games are complete'. Responsibility, he said, could fall to local councils, Mayor of London, City of London Corporation or LVRPA, without any funding commitment to support it. In February 2012, it was announced that the park would be managed by Balfour Beatty Workplace, in conjunction with local regeneration company Renaisi and environmental charity Groundwork (Dowding, personal communication), while its ownership seems to reside (as of April 2012) with LLDC in partnership with LVRPA (Norman 2012/3). Groundwork involvement suggests that volunteer and forced labour will be deployed as part of the management strategy.

- The park, such as it is, has come under fire in aesthetic circles. Architecture critic Deyan Sudjic (2006) criticised design priorities of the masterplan for emphasising the 17-day event to the neglect of landscaping. Kathryn Moore (2006), president of the Landscape Institute, also criticised the ODA design panel for lack of a landscape architect among its members. However, development of the masterplan was in fact led by Jason Prior, a landscape architect and managing director of consultancy EDAW.

- ODA was criticised severely for neglecting design issues on three highway bridges proposed for the Olympic park's loop road (Wilner 2008). CABE noted: 'We continue to have serious concerns about the way the bridges have been procured and dealt with in the planning process. In particular, we challenge the ODA's practice of separating architecture and landscape from engineering and urge them to take steps to ensure that all infrastructure elements are designed as a coherent whole.' The comments were identical to criticisms CABE made of another Olympic highway bridge earlier in March that year.

- LLDC and Waltham Forest council have reneged on commitments to reinstate Marsh Lane Fields to open space, and to resite allotment plot holders (displaced from Manor Gardens) at or near their pre-Olympic location. In 2014, LBWF decided to create a meadow at Eton Manor, saving them 'millions' in extra remediation costs, and proposed that the temporary allotments at Marsh Lane become permanent (see BP1 §1.2 and §2.1). In December 2015, plot holders were due to move into the one new site provided, near

Pudding Mill DLR station. Even as late as 2012, discussions were continuing between ODA and Manor Gardening Society [MGS] in the planning of legacy allotment spaces. Writing before discussions began, MGS expressed desires that any new site should function as a 'community-in-itself', as part of the 'wider community', and as refuge for wildlife. They hoped to be sited on the western river bank alongside the media centre to capture some of the feel of the original plots and to ensure proximity to Hackney and Tower Hamlets, boroughs with inadequate allotment provision. ODA had promised more allotments as legacy than the 83 plots previously at Eton Manor, and that some allotments would be situated within the legacy park (sources: personal conversations).

- As Julian Cheyne (2010/12) and Charles Batsworth (2010/3) point out on the Games Monitor blog, the name 'Queen Elizabeth' is just another brand, market-tested with possible investors, local boroughs and businesses. According to Cheyne, the BOA was unhappy with the loss of sole brand rights to the park's name and tried to extract £10 million before it would agree to the compromise.

5. PAYING FOR AN ELITE

5.1 Financing elite athletes

Everywhere I look, there are 2012 posters and instead of filling me with excitement, they now make me feel sick, depressed and defeated. There are obviously large amounts of cash out there which are being spent on creating an attractive London arena for 2012, but not a penny is being spent on young British athletes who might bring home a gold medal.
Ben Brown, athlete on London 2012 bid posters, talking to the Evening Standard, February 16, 2006

Athletes waiting for grant funding to finance training complained of delays in 2006 by chancellor Gordon Brown in allocating money to the BOA (Harris and Waugh 2006). BOA stated that it needed £500 million to develop young athletes. Brown refused to announce a decision until after the March 2006 budget. Three athletes declared that they were quitting because finance had not been made available.

A meagre £15,000 a year would have enabled Ben Brown to train full time. Another gymnast, Daniel Carr, also said that he had been forced to quit because of a lack of money. Carr suggested that a grant of £2,000 a year for two years until he was 20, and then £6,000 a year until 2012, would have enabled him to carry on. The training facility both Brown and Carr used, Sutton School of Gymnastics (a school gymnasium), was reported to be considering closing at the end of 2006 unless it received funding to bring it up to national standards. If this happened, another Olympic hopeful, Laura Coggin, who appeared in the London 2012 promotional video and was tipped as a medallist, would also have been forced to give up training as there were no other suitable facilities nearby.

Treasury claims to be lining up £250 million for athletes' training, 'on top of another £250 million committed already' proved false. In the event, Gordon Brown delivered under half of BOA demands. On March 23, 2006, he announced a commitment to only £200 million over seven years to 'widen the pool' of athletic talent in addition to £60 million already targeted at athletes regarded as potential medal winners (Gray 2006). It was hoped a further £100 million would be forthcoming from the private sector. Announcements and pious hopes masked the extent to which the private sector was called on to finance sports and training of elite athletes in run-up to the Games. Mihir Bose of the Daily Telegraph (2006) noted that LOCOG aimed to raise another £600 million from the private sector, and that the British Athletics Association planned to link all the sports governing bodies to a FTSE 100 company. Sports bodies seeking money from the National Sports Foundation, with a budget of £37.5 million, were required to match funding pound for pound, again from firms. UK Sport was charged with looking for the £100 million sponsorship indicated in Brown's speech. Bose concluded: '[This] means business will have to provide close to £1 billion in sponsorship over the next six years.'

5.2 Sportswear is a sweatshop industry

– Labour conditions of flexible specialisation

There are five people living in this small narrow room. It is very hot, and some of us lose consciousness in the heat. Our living conditions are very bad. Our bosses make us pay so much of our salary for the 'boxes' we live in. They charge us high prices for electricity and water, even though we often do not receive it.
Garment worker, Cambodia, producing items for Fila and Puma, interviewed by Fair Olympics

'Postmodernity means if anything coercion' (Cooke 1988). The counterpoint of the disciplinary subject, honing a body without limits at corporate behest, the 'celebration of excellence', is sweated labour on the fringes of Europe and East Asia. Oxfam, fair trade and trade union campaigners highlighted factory exploitation and health hazard in the internationalised manufacture of sports clothing, footwear and other goods in the Fair Olympics (2004) report, *Play Fair at the Olympics, Respect Workers' Rights in the Sportswear Industry.*

The report is an indictment of the labour conditions of flexible specialisation, the postfordist regime hegemonic in international garment and footwear industries. Ruthless price competition in the US leaves suppliers in 'a market characterised by falling unit prices, juxtaposed with rising production costs ... [F]actories are now required to supply smaller amounts on the basis of monthly or even weekly orders. Lead times have been shortened' (ibid: 6). Corporate giants such as Puma, Fila and Nike, have split production, keeping design, marketing and (at times) retailing functions, and outsourced production, assembly, finishing and packaging to manufacturers in low-wage locations. Through aggressive buying policies, corporations apply intense pressure on intermediary and factory firms to compete. Contracts are based on short-term targets, and generalised insecurity in the industry. Relocation of production is frequent and across borders, and this leads to an avoidance of standards laid down by both national regulation and international labour covenants. Companies operating as mid-chain managing agents of outsourcing, often transnational players themselves, exert their own pressures toward cost cutting and speed-up of delivery, and impose fines on factories failing to meet these stringencies and deadlines. These sanctions are passed down to sweatshop workers, who are then fined for extra material needed to make good mistakes, fined for each individual faulty product, and expected to work unwaged in their own time to meet 'just-in-time' production targets.

We have overtime work until 11pm or midnight every day. The price they pay us is so low, so there is no point to us working such long hours. If our income was higher, I would have no complaints. But all we have now is exhaustion and a low income. Some of us do not even have enough money to spend on food. It is more than we can bear.
Garment worker in factory supplying Nike, Fila, Arena, Adidas and Reebok, interviewed by Fair Olympics

The report interviewed workers in Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Bulgaria and Turkey between May 2003 and January 2004. Those at the end of the supply chain bear the brunt of market and retail pressures, a situation exacerbated by pressure on national governments from institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. Governments often turn a blind eye to regulatory infringements. Factory discipline is founded on authoritarian relations of patriarchy and religion, with sexual harassment and verbal assault of sweatshop workers reported as common. Excessive working hours, steady erosion of piece rates, forced overtime (well beyond country legal limits), denial of rights towards collective organisation and bargaining, health injuries, casualisation and seasonal fluctuations in employment are the product of this demand-reflexive system. Wages of garment and footwear producers often slack to a minimum (or nil) during downtimes. While transnational sportswear companies maintain charters stipulating ethical commitments, the report states that evidence suggests 'factory managers [at a local level] simply falsify the evidence during social audits and carry on with business as usual once the inspectors have left'. Also, '[because] workers are not adequately involved in the current compliance processes ... few substantive or sustainable improvements have been made' (ibid: 7).

Sweatshop workers complain of health hazards inflicted by this regimen, including miscarriages brought on by compulsory overtime working following shifts, exhaustion, back pain, diarrhoea, dust allergies and respiratory diseases, stomach flu, eye damage, varicose veins, and repetitive strain injuries. Hours are excessive: one Chinese worker complained of working non-stop for 13–14 hours a day in peak time; an Indonesian woman was forced to work standing up in a factory all day, without much rest, water or food. Another woman spoke of disrupted relations with children and family (ibid: 20–21). Punitive sweatshop regimes have sparked factory strikes.

Fair Olympics demands (ibid: 9–10) that sportswear companies develop credible labour-practice directives to ensure suppliers meet international labour standards, including the right to a living wage based on a regular 48-hour maximum working week, no forced overtime, and a workplace free from harassment, along with labour and social protection, and an end to child labour. They state that sporting companies should change their purchasing practices to ensure that these do not exacerbate the exploitation of workers (that is, negotiate a 'fair' price with suppliers that reflects 'true' costs of production and allows the supplier to meet ethical labour standards, and to develop more long-term relationships with suppliers and factories). They also demand companies establish collective bargaining and trade union membership as a basic principle for trading. There should be an ongoing dialogue between sportswear companies and the International Garment and Leather Workers Federation via sectoral framework agreements. Finally, the report calls for transparency in the impact of these business operations on manufacturing workers.

The authors charge that the Olympic movement needs to make a serious commitment to respect of workers' rights in the sportswear industry. The IOC, via the various country Olympics and Games organising committees, should be insisting that the sportswear industry meet international labour standards. The report calls for the IOC to make a public commitment to workers rights in its charter and to reform its rules on licensing, sponsorship and marketing agreements in this light. Their demands are based on precedent:

- The report quotes the Code of Labour Practice, negotiated with the Australian Council of Trade Unions and Labour Council of New South Wales in 1998, which was adopted by the Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games (SOCOG) to cover manufacture of licensed goods. The code required payment of 'fair' wages, limitations on working hours, respect for rights of freedom of association and collective bargaining. Although enforcement measures in the initial agreement were superficial (relying on organising committees rather than trade union bodies themselves), after much campaigning by Australian unions, in 1999 SOCOG granted the Textile, Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia the right of access to information about workplaces producing licensed goods, and the right to send representatives to speak to workers (ibid: 48–49).

- On September 3 1996, the global regulatory body for soccer, FIFA, agreed to the Code of Labour Practice for FIFA-licensed products, after it was revealed that child labour was being used to manufacture FIFA-sponsored footballs in Sialkot, Pakistan. An estimated three quarters of the world's soccer balls are manufactured in the town. Criteria based on the International Labour Organisation (ILO) Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work were later included in FIFA licensing agreements. However, Clean Clothes Campaign (one of the sponsors of the Fair Olympics report) have charged FIFA with a lack of enforcement (ibid: 48–49).

- World Federation of the Sporting Goods Industry (WFSGI), a trade association including transnational sports brands, retailers and manufacturers, introduced a revised code of conduct in 2000 based on standards outlined in ILO conventions. The code acknowledges the industry's influence on the social and economic conditions of sporting goods manufacture, and commits its members to ensure compliance with the code in both their own operations and those of their suppliers. The report suggests again, that '[a]lthough the code is comprehensive on paper, WFSGI has done little to implement it' (ibid: 49).

Fair Olympics concludes (ibid: 51):

> The Olympics can directly influence the sportswear companies by including contractual obligations on labour standards in its licensing and marketing agreements relating to products bearing the Olympic emblem. At the very top of the hierarchy, IOC is the owner of the rights to the Olympic marks, including the five-ring emblem, and is responsible for the overall direction and management of all Olympic marketing and licensing programmes. While it is the national committees and the organising committees of the Olympic Games themselves that actually issue the licences and marketing contracts, IOC has the power to determine the overall policies and set the rules. If the movement as a whole made commitments to respect labour standards, similar to its commitments on protecting the environment, it could play an important role in achieving improvements to working conditions for the many workers who produce sportswear worldwide.

Comparisons between corporate profits and elite athlete sponsorship are galling. Pre-tax profits of sports corporations match Olympic finance. The report notes Nike 2003 profits of US$1.123 billion, Adidas 2002 US$408.9 million, Reebok 2002 US$195.5 million, and Puma 2003 US$320 million. Prominent sports people get paid over six-figure sums simply for an association with a corporate brand. In 2004, David Beckham, for instance, could expect US$161 million Adidas sponsorship over his lifetime, and basketball player Grant Hill received US$7 million 1997–2004 from Fila, tennis player Venus Williams, sponsored by Reebok, US$38 million over five years, runner Marion Jones US$800,000 per year from Nike, and swimmer Mark Phelps US$300,000 per year from Speedo (ibid: 31–32).

– Prelude to Beijing 2008

Playfair Alliance (an international grouping which includes the UK Trades Union Council [TUC]) has charged that child labour and sweatshop conditions were prevalent among manufacturers for Beijing 2008. At Le Kit Stationery, a company in Guangdong, researchers found 20 children on the production line. 'The youngest was only 12. These young people had been hired during the school holidays and were working from around 7.30am until 10.30pm, doing the same jobs as adults.

Forced overtime, harsh fines, punishment of workers, and wages less than half the legal minimum were among the various violations uncovered in the factory which did not give its 400 employees any contract of employment,' the Alliance said. It found 3,000 workers at Mainland Headwear Holdings' factory in Shenzen were paid as little as 45 per cent of the local minimum wage. They were forced to work overtime far in excess of the legal limit. 'Workers who resign are fined one month's wages by the company, while the whole workforce is given instructions on how to lie to outside inspectors about wages and conditions. Any worker who tells the truth faces dismissal, while those who follow the factory's "answer guidelines" are given a financial reward. The researchers also found exploitative practices at the Yue Wong Cheong company's production lines in Shenzen and Eagle Leather Products bag factory in Guangdong. Guy Ryder, general secretary of the International Trade Union Confederation, said: "We warned the IOC that failure to take the necessary action on labour standards would lead to situations such as these, bringing lasting damage to the name and reputation of the Olympic movement. Unfortunately, our call has been ignored. This must not happen again"' (Carvel 2007).

– Sweatshop labour and London 2012

Playfair 2012 produced a report *Toying with Workers Rights* that investigated working conditions in two factories in China producing London 2012 mascots, Wenlock and Mandeville, along with pin badges. The report is shocking, even for those who have read earlier Fair Olympics publications. Researchers worked undercover in the factory, at great personal risk, to verfy their findings below.

- Poverty pay, in some cases below the legal minimum. Workers were not paid enough to cover their most basic needs. Benefit payments for pensions and medical insurance were not paid in accordance with Chinese law. For example, a worker making an Olympic mascot could be paid as little as £26 a week, while (in the UK) a mascot sold for around £20. The report noted that an average Chinese living wage at the time was around £225 a month.
- Excessive overtime, sometimes up to 100 hours a month, nearly three times the legal limit in China. Some workers were doing 24-hour shifts, while others were working seven days a week. Overtime was often compulsory.
- Child labour was used in the factory producing pin badges.
- Workers were locked into a five-year contract and had to pay a fine if they tried to leave before this expired. At one factory, workers were not given a contract of employment, and in the other factory, workers did not receive payslips. In both factories, workers did not fully understand how their wages and overtime were calculated.
- Workers did not receive health and safety training in either factory, and would tend to forgo wearing protective equipment, when provided, so they could work faster and earn more. This was to top-up poverty pay.

- Workers were prevented from joining unions in both factories, and it was made clear to them that anyone engaging in trade union activities would be dismissed.
- The researchers also discovered evidence of audit fraud, with workers coached on how to answer auditors' questions, and in some cases bribed to give the 'correct' answers.

The coalition did much behind-the-scenes lobbying of both LOCOG and IOC. Belatedly, LOCOG agreed to the following concessions: (1) Publication of names and locations of factories in China and UK covering 72 per cent of licensed products produced for London 2012. (2) Making information about employment rights – based on national laws and on LOCOG's ethical code – available in Chinese and English, and establishing a Chinese-language hotline so that workers could complain if their rights were being violated. (3) Provision of rights awareness training to some of the workers in Olympic supply chains to make them more aware of their rights. (4) A commitment to work with Playfair 2012, the organisers of Rio 2016 and the IOC to ensure that future Olympic events benefited from the lessons learned.

According to the report, LOCOG has gone further than any other Olympic organising committee to protect workers rights. While the timing and agreement seem totally inadequate, the campaign will continue to work around other major sporting events, and one can only hope that more advanced inroads are made against sweatshop labour for other major sporting events, including at Rio 2016. The coalition comprises: Labour behind the Label; TUC; International Textile, Garment and Leather Workers Federation; International Trades Union Confederation; Clean Clothes Campaign; Maquila Solidarity Network; and Clearing the Hurdles.

Fair Olympics campaign: http://fairolympics.org
Play Fair at the Olympics, Respect Workers' Rights in the Sportswear Industry, 2004 can be accessed at http://www.labourbehindthelabel.org/news/item/580-play-fair-at-the-olympics-respect-workers?-rights-in-the-sportswear-industry

BIBLIOGRAPHY

All URLs were checked in 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.

24dash.com (2008). 'New London Olympic Stadium costs 'spiral to £525 million'', June 18. http://www.24dash.com/news/communities/2008-06-18-new-london-olympic-stadium-costs-spiral-to-525-million

Abbott J (2010). 'London 2012: the Olympics will be the ultimate test for the Bribery Act', Daily Telegraph, December 17. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/london-olympics-business/8207500/London-2012-the-Olympics-will-be-the-ultimate-test-for-the-Bribery-Act.html

Abrahams T (2010). 'The process behind the commission for an Olympic tower has sullied a potentially positive, democratic and creative outcome', Blueprint, January edition

Andrews A (2009). 'Advertising agencies withdraw from 2012 Olympics contract over sponsorship fee', Daily Telegraph, March 28. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/newsbysector/mediatechnologyandtelecoms/5067045/Advertising-agencies-withdraw-from-2012-Olympics-contract-over-sponsorship-fee.html

Arnold D (2005). '2012 Olympic win could delay Crossrail start by five years', New Civil Engineer, July 14. http://www.nce.co.uk/2012-olympic-win-could-delay-crossrail-start-by-five-years/532169.article

Ashworth R (2011). '2012 Olympics aides earn £3,000 a day', Daily Express, January 9. http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/221982/2012-Olympics-aides-earn-3-000-a-day

Associated Press (2011). 'News International dropped by Olympics partner after hacking scandal', Guardian, July 21. http://www.theguardian.com/sport/2011/jul/21/news-international-olympics-hacking

Barrand D (2006). 'London 2012 sponsor search hindered by clutter', Marketing, June 7. http://www.brandrepublic.com/article/563090/london-2012-sponsor-search-hindered-clutter

Batsworth C (2009/1). 'Olympic boroughs' hidden spending spree', Games Monitor, May 6. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/814

Batsworth C (2009/2) 'Visitors will shun 'Olympics hype' claims UK tourism quango chairman', Games Monitor, July 11. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/841

Batsworth C (2010/1). 'Olympic Park energy centre contractor wrecking Amazon rainforest', Games Monitor, April 19. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/946

Batsworth C (2010/2). 'Oh no – it's not even the biggest new park in London in 20 years …', Games Monitor blog, December 30. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1187

Batsworth C (2010/3). 'Not another Queen Elizabeth park', Games Monitor blog, October 15. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1135

Batsworth C (2011). 'The Olympic effect illusion', Games Monitor, September 2. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/1351

Battersby M (2012). 'Brandalism: street artists hijack billboards for 'subvertising campaign', July 18. http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/art/features/brandalism-street-artists-hijack-billboards-for-subvertising-campaign-7953151.html

Baudrillard J (1998). *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures,* London Sage

BBC News (2005/1). London 'set for house price boom', July 6. http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr//1/hi/business/4656927.stm

BBC News (2005/2). 'T5 builders in walk-out over pay', December 16. http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/london/4531844.stm

BBC News (2007). 'Pensioners protest Olympic levy', December 3. http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/london/7125832.stm

BBC News (2009/1). 'Olympic village handed more funds', May 13. http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/ england/london/8048098.stm

BBC News (2009/2). 'Russia cuts 2014 Olympic budget', February 14. http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/7894644.stm

BBC News (2009/3). 'Games firms sign 'gagging orders', January 26.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/7851358.stm

BBC News (2009/4). 'Games lane tunnel plan criticised', December 21.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/london/8425507.stm

BBC News (2010/1). 'IOC chief visits 2014 Winter Olympic site', June 7.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/10257581

BBC News (2010/2) 'Dozens conned over 'Olympic' land in east London', November 8.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-11695453

BBC News (2010/3). '2012 London Olympic Games ticket prices released', October 15.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-11546228

BBC News (2010/4). 'Olympics 2012: fans must use Visa for tickets', June 24.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/10394970

BBC News (2011/1). 'London 2012: India 2012 Olympics protest in Bhopal burns Coe effigy', November 2.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-india-16001266

BBC News (2011/2). 'Ten London councils refuse 2012 Olympics ticket offer', March 15.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-12744205

BBC News (2012/1). 'London 2012: Dow Chemical in Olympics sponsorship row', January 23.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-16089139

BBC News (2012/2). 'London 2012: Olympic watchdog member quits over Dow links', January 26.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-16721838

BBC News (2012/3). 'Thames cable car in London opens for passengers', June 28.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-18619936

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

BBC News (2014/1). 'Homes in Olympic park area increase by £120,000 since 2005', July 25.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-28478814

BBC News (2014/2). 'London Olympic park aquatics centre reopens', March 1.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-26402718

Bdonline.co.uk (2011). Grimshaw: Olympic tower could have been a 'great symbol', July 6.
http://www.bdonline.co.uk/news/grimshaw-olympic-tower-could-have-been-a-great-symbol/5021125.article

Beard M (2008). 'Taxpayers could foot whole bill for £1bn Olympic village', Evening Standard, October 8

Beard M (2009). 'East end 'must wait a decade for 2012 legacy', Evening Standard, October 2.
https://www.questia.com/newspaper/1G1-208929714/east-end-must-wait-a-decade-for-2012-legacy

Beard M (2011). 'Cut crowd size or risk rail and Tube chaos, Olympic chiefs told', Evening Standard, September 9. https://www.questia.com/newspaper/1G1-266586961/cut-crowd-size-or-risk-rail-and-tube-chaos-olympic

Beard M (2012/1). 'IOC sponsorship to hit $1 billion', Evening Standard, April 12.
http://www.standard.co.uk/news/ioc-sponsorship-to-hit-1-billion-6650396.html [WAS Beard M (2008). 'IOC sponsorship to hit $1 billion', Evening Standard, February 25]

Beard M (2012/2). 'Olympic village loses 600 flats in bid to cut bill', Evening Standard, April 5.
http://www.standard.co.uk/olympics/olympic-village-loses-600-flats-in-bid-to-cut-bill-6836231.html
[WAS Beard M (2008). Olympic village loses 600 flats in bid to cut bill', Evening Standard, October 21]

Beard M (2012/3). 'Athletes won't feel squeeze in Olympic village', Evening Standard, April 13.
http://www.standard.co.uk/news/athletes-wont-feel-squeeze-in-olympic-village-6902347.html [WAS Beard M (2008). 'Athletes wont feel squeeze in Olympic village', Evening Standard, October 27]

Bevir G (2015). 'Ericsson eyes Olympic park move for Red Bee operation', BroadcastTech, June 18.
http://www.broadcastnow.co.uk/techfacils/ericsson-eyes-olympic-park-move-for-red-bee-operation/5089516.article

Bhopal Medical Appeal (2011?) Bhopal Medical Appeal v Dow London Olympic stadium wrap – briefing.
http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/files/BMA%20Briefing.pdf [note: http://bhopal.org; http://bhopal.org/dow-and-the-olympics; http://dropdownow.org/page/3]

Bloomfield R (2015). 'Here East: Stratford's £100-million project and new digital hub for start-ups, students and big corporations', Homes and Property, September 23.
http://www.homesandproperty.co.uk/property-news/news/here-east-stratfords-ps100-million-project-and-new-digital-hub-start-ups-students-and-big

Blowe K (2004). 'London's Olympic myths', Radical Activist Network newsletter [no longer online]

Blowe K (2005) 'Bidding for disaster', Radical Activist Network newsletter [no longer online]

Booth R (2005). 'MPs call for transparency in Olympic venue deals', Guardian, July 29.
http://www.theguardian.com/business/2005/jul/29/olympics2012.greaterlondonauthority

Booth R (2008). '2012 Games: athletes forced to cosy up as £250m shortfall hits London's Olympic village', Guardian, September 6. http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2008/sep/06/olympics2012.housing

Bose M (2006). 'Brown's £300m Games pledge comes with catch', Daily Telegraph, March 23. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/2334169/Browns-300m-Games-pledge-comes-with-catch.html

Bose M (2011). 'Row over stadium caused because government did not think London would win 2012', January 23. http://www.mihirbose.com/index.php/row-over-stadium-caused-because-government-did-not-think-london-would-win-2012 [WAS Evening Standard (2011). 'Row breaks out between athletics bodies over London Olympic Stadium', January 31]

Bramham D (2009). 'Olympic marketing pushes brand Canada to (almost) top of tourism list', Vancouver Sun, November 27 [no longer online]

Bray A (2009). 'Travelodge raises funds for 2012 Olympics expansion', Self-catering-Breaks News, December 14. http://www.self-catering-breaks.com/news/57121545.html

Breen L (2012). 'Olympic trade mark laws even tougher', Shoesmiths.co.uk, February 3. http://www.shoosmiths.co.uk/no-search/Olympic-Trade-Mark-laws-even-tougher-2186.aspx

Brooke M (2012). 'Olympics have been flop for us say Curry Mile traders', Docklands and East London Advertiser, August 9

Bryant M (2014). 'Olympic velodrome reopens for BMX and mountain biking – and costs as little as £4', Evening Standard, March 12. http://www.standard.co.uk/news/london/olympic-velodrome-reopens-for-bmx-and-mountain-biking-and-costs-as-little-as-4-9185923.html

Bryce A (2006). 'LOAR of the Rings', The Times, July 31

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

Carpenter J (2008). '"Major risk" to Olympic homes', Regen.net, June 18 [no longer online]

Carvel J (2007). 'Children exploited in Olympics goods factories, says TUC', Guardian, June 11. http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2007/jun/11/Olympics2012.london

Chappuis M (2012). 'The Olympic properties', World Intellectual Property Organisation, webpage. http://www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/2012/03/article_0003.html

Chennaoui O (2011). '"White Elephant" warning for 2012 organisers', Sky News, April 6. http://news.sky.com/story/847654/white-elephant-warning-for-2012-organisers

Cheyne J (2009) 'European Tour Operators Association critiques (sic) of alleged tourism benefits from hosting the Olympics', Games Monitor, November 30. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/888

Cheyne J (2010/1). 'London 2012 – Welsh hit out at lottery allocation', Games Monitor discussion list, April 27. https://uk.groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/gamesmonitor/conversations/messages/3567

Cheyne J (2010/2). 'Council cuts "could jeopardize Olympic legacy"', Games Monitor discussion list, December 18. https://uk.groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/gamesmonitor/conversations/messages/4181

Cheyne J (2010/3). 'Another Olympics, another overspend!' Games Monitor blog, September 17. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1086

Cheyne J (2010/4) 'Businesses can see their money but not touch it', Games Monitor blog, September 20. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1096

Cheyne J (2010/5). 'Olympics "toxic" to tourism', Games Monitor, September 21. http://gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/1100

Cheyne J (2010/6). 'Now Delhi demonstrates tourism and Games don't mix', Games Monitor blog, October 4. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1116

Cheyne J (2010/7). 'The LDA clarifies its CPO information', Games Monitor, January 22. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/903

Cheyne J (2010/8). 'It's a kind of nightmare! Small businesses advised to close for Olympics', Games Monitor blog, September 20. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1095

Cheyne J (2010/9). '2012 media centre – "a not-future-proofed insult to Hackney"!' Games Monitor blog, July 21. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1009

Cheyne J (2010/10) 'Kapoor's bit of steel needs "mundane" redesign', Games Monitor blog, August 13. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1046

Cheyne J (2010/11). 'Less and less housing for the "legacy"', Games Monitor, July 6. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/988

Cheyne J (2010/12). 'What's in a brand? Royalty "market-tested" for Olympic park rebranding', Games Monitor blog, October 12. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1133

Cheyne J (2011/1). 'JAC Travel tells hoteliers to jack in LOCOG', Games Monitor blog, May 10. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/1270

Cheyne J (2011/2) 'Murdoch papers set to lose 2012 Olympics deal', Games Monitor discussion list, July 21. https://uk.groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/gamesmonitor/conversations/messages/4687

Cheyne J (2011/3) 'Ten London councils refuse 2012 Olympics ticket offer', Games Monitor discussion list, March 15. https://uk.groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/gamesmonitor/conversations/messages/4385

Cheyne J (2011/4). 'The uses of children for London 2012', Games Monitor blog, September 5. http://gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1359

Cheyne J (2011/5). 'Raiders of Pudding Mill stadium', Games Monitor, September 5. http://gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/1355

Chinese Olympic Committee (2006). 'London 2012 inspires "Water City"', May 24. http://en.olympic.cn/news/world/2006-05-24/862403.html

Chinese Olympic Committee (2009) 'Rio de Janeiro reveals cost of their winning Olympic campaign', November 12. http://en.olympic.cn/news/olympic_news/2009-11-12/1919974.html

Clover C (2006). 'Ditch plans to concrete south', Daily Telegraph, July 22. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/1524538/Ditch-plans-to-concrete-South.html

Conn D (2009). 'World Cup bid tears up Olympic blueprint', Guardian, November 25. http://www.theguardian.com/sport/david-conn-inside-sport-blog/2009/nov/25/olympic-stadium-world-cup

Constantineau B (2009). 'Hotels promise to be secure, but not to the point of being "unfriendly", Vancouver Sun, December 4

Construct2012.co.uk (2006). 'Energy costs hit Games', May 4. http://www.construct2012.co.uk/nav?page=construct2012.news.mainandview_resource=4746359

Contract Journal (2006). 'Olympic delivery partner role goes to Laing O'Rourke's CLM consortium', August 30 [no longer online]

Cook B (2009). 'Report: Doubts about Olympic legacy', Regen.net, July 1 [no longer online]

Cooke P (1988). 'Modernity, postmodernity and the city', Theory, Culture and Society, Postmodernism, 5(2–3): 475–492

Counter Olympics Network (CON) (2012/1). 'Counter Olympics protestors will defy demo ban', July 12. https://counterolympicsnetwork.wordpress.com/2012/07/12/press-statement-counter-olympics-protestors-will-defy-demo-ban

Counter Olympics Network (CON) (2012/2). 'Counter Olympics march in Bow', July 31. https://counterolympicsnetwork.wordpress.com/2012/07/31/july-28th-counter-olympics-march-in-bow

Cracknell D (2008). 'Home Counties tax hike needed to fund Olympics', Sunday Times, January 6

Crerar P (2012). 'Games "could leave no sporting legacy"', Evening Standard, April 13. http://www.standard.co.uk/news/games-could-leave-no-sporting-legacy-6851488.html [WAS Crerar P (2008). 'Games "could leave no sporting legacy", Evening Standard, October 14]

Crookson M (2004). 'Making the Games work: a sustainable employment legacy' in Vigor A, Mean M and Tims C (eds) *After the Gold Rush,* London: IPPR, Demos

Culf A (2006). 'VAT bill could add £250m to cost of Olympics', Guardian, November 7. http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2006/nov/07/uk.london

Daily Express (2011). 'Olympic build bosses paid £2m', July 13. http://www.express.co.uk/sport/othersport/258632/Olympic-build-bosses-paid-2m

Daily Telegraph (2011). 'London Olympics 2012: Association of British Athletics Clubs goes toe to toe with UK Athletics over running track', January 31. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/8294290/London-Olympics-2012-Association-of-British-Athletics-Clubs-goes-toe-to-toe-with-UK-Athletics-over-running-track.html

Daily Telegraph (2012). 'London 2012: police told to empty crisps into plastic bags to avoid advertising rival brands in Olympics', July 17. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/news/9405910/London-2012-Police-told-to-empty-crisps-into-plastic-bags-to-avoid-advertising-rival-brands-in-Olympics.html

Danny @m37411ic48 (2011). 'Taxi !!!!!', Games Monitor, September 10. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1365

Derriman P (2006). 'Good time for US equals bad time for everyone else', Sydney Morning Herald, August 5

Design-BuildNetwork.com (2015). 'London 2012 Olympic park master plan, United Kingdom', webpage. http://www.designbuild-network.com/projects/2012olympic-park

Dines G (2006). 'Gummer's water bill', East Anglian Daily Times, May 18

Docklands and East London Advertiser (2012). 'Swings and roundabouts for publicans', August 9

Dowding S (2010/1) 'That broken promise we'd all been anticipating', Games Monitor blog, October 15. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1136

Dowding S (2010/2). 'Where there's a Zil there's a way', Games Monitor blog, July 29. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1022

Dowding S (2011/1) 'Tessa's little legacy lie', Games Monitor blog, July 27. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1322

Dowding S (2011/2) 'Methods claimed', Games Monitor blog, August 4. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/blog/1331

Dowding S (2012). 'In search of legacies lost', Occupied Times of London, issue 15, July. http://theoccupiedtimes.org/?p=5852

Duman A (2012). 'AdiZones: rewriting the 2012 Olympic legacy as permanent branding', Games Monitor, July 27. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/1800

Duxbury N (2010/1). 'Landlords and Ikea strike Olympic deal', Inside Housing, July 16. http://www.insidehousing.co.uk/landlords-and-ikea-strike-olympic-deal/6510752.article

Duxbury N (2010/2). 'Olympic village looks to favour those in work', Inside Housing, July 23. http://www.insidehousing.co.uk/olympic-village-looks-to-favour-those-in-work/6510825.article

East End Life (2010), issue 801, March 22–28

Elks L (2005). 'The Olympic Games and legacy proposals', letter to Meg Hillier MP, November 7, unpublished

Elkes N (2014). 'Sparkhill to get former London 2012 Olympic swimming pool', Birmingham Mail. http://www.birminghammail.co.uk/news/midlands-news/sparkhill-former-london-2012-olympic-6841419

Ellen L (2010). *Protecting Sponsors at the London Olympics.* http://www.mishcon.com/assets/managed/docs/downloads/doc_2413/Protecting_Sponsors_at_the_London_2012_Olympics_doc_%282%29.pdf

ESPN Olympic Sports/Associated Press (2011). 'Fans protest against football at Olympic Stadium', February 2. http://sports.espn.go.com/espn/wire?section=oly&id=6082597

European Tour Operators Association [ETOA] (2006). *Olympic Report.* http://www.etoa.org/docs/default-source/Reports/ETOA-reports/2006-etoa-olympic-report.pdf?sfvrsn=2

European Tour Operators Association [ETOA] (2010). *Olympic Hotel Demand: Sydney, Athens, Beijing.* http://www.etoa.org/docs/default-source/Reports/ETOA-reports/2010-etoa-olympic-report.pdf

European Tour Operators Association [ETOA] (2011). 'Tour operators report 50% decline in inbound business for UK in Olympic year', March 14. http://www.etoa.org/media/all-news/news-item/tour-operators-report-50-decline-in-inbound-business-for-uk-in-olympic-year

Evening Standard (2005). 'Luton plans new air terminal', October 25 [no longer online]

Evening Standard (2007). 'Broken promises and spiralling costs', December 10. https://www.questia.com/newspaper/1G1-172273033/broken-promises-and-spiralling-costs-roof-row-the

Evening Standard (2012/1). 'Dame Judi's alarm over theatre funding lost to pay for Games', April 13. http://www.standard.co.uk/news/dame-judi-s-alarm-over-theatre-funding-lost-to-pay-for-games-6779563.html [WAS Evening Standard (2009). 'Dame Judi Dench has called for arts funding to be ring-fenced', December 11]

Evening Standard (2012/2). 'Top hotel chains in crisis talks with 2012 Olympics organizers over "rip-off" re-sale packages', April 12. http://www.standard.co.uk/news/top-hotel-chains-in-crisis-talks-with-2012-olympics-organisers-over-rip-off-re-sale-packages-6383993.html [WAS Beard M (2011/1). 'Top hotel chains in crisis talks with 2012 Olympics organizers over 'rip-off' re-sale packages', Evening Standard, March 23]

Evening Standard (2012/3). 'Property price rise double in east thanks to the Olympics effect', April 12. http://www.standard.co.uk/news/property-price-rise-double-in-east-thanks-to-the-olympics-effect-6520577.html [WAS Bar-Hillel M (2010). 'Property price rise double in east thanks to the Olympics effect', Evening Standard, October 4]

Evening Standard (2012/4). 'Property firms take a big bet on London Olympics effect', April 10. http://www.standard.co.uk/business/markets/property-firms-take-a-big-bet-on-london-olympics-effect-6457374.html [WAS Duncan H (2010). 'Property firms take a big bet on London Olympics effect', April 9]

Fair Olympics (2004). *Play Fair at the Olympics, Respect Workers' Rights in the Sportswear Industry.* http://www.labourbehindthelabel.org/news/item/580-play-fair-at-the-olympics-respect-workers?-rights-in-the-sportswear-industry

Farquharson H (2006). 'Counting the Olympic cost: mayor Ken's council tax hike', This is Local London, February 14. http://www.thisislocallondon.co.uk/londonolympicbid/display.var.690893.0.counting_the_olympic_cost_mayor_kens_coucil_tax_hike.php

Forensic Architecture (2015/1). 'Arcelor Mittal Orbit declared the Omarksa Memorial in Exile', webpage. http://www.forensic-architecture.org/arcelor-mittal-orbit-declared-omarksa-memorial-exile

Forensic Architecture (2015/2). 'A memorial in exile', webpage. http://archive.forensic-architecture.org/explorations/a-memorial-in-exile

Fournier E (2011). 'Bribery Act to hit Olympics', CityAM, March 31

Fraser A (2005). 'The 2012 marketing minefield', BBC News, August 16. http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport1/hi/other_sports/olympics_2012/4748077.stm

Gamesbids.com (2005). 'London 2012 costs could double but tourism will benefit', November 3. http://gamesbids.com/eng/other-news/london-2012-costs-could-double-but-tourism-will-benefit

Gardiner J (2009). 'Olympic bosses to rethink 10,000-home legacy plan', Building, June 12. http://www.building.co.uk/olympic-bosses-to-rethink-10000-home-legacy-plan/3142505.article

Gardiner J (2011). 'ODA could wind up 18 months early', Building, January 25. http://www.building.co.uk/news/breaking-news/oda-could-wind-up-18-months-early/5012197.article#ixzz1CJj04jdk

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 (2009/1). 'Government forced to bail out major Olympic projects', Guardian, January 21. http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2009/jan/21/olympics-2012-funding-bailout

Gibson O (2009/2) 'London's Olympic stadium poses financial threat to Wembley', Guardian, November 17. http://www.theguardian.com/football/2009/nov/17/wembley-stadium-2012-olympic-games

Gibson O (2010) ‘Olympic village complex seeks private investors’, Guardian, October 1. http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2010/oct/01/olympic-village-london-property-investment

Gibson O (2011/1). ‘2012 games pool in danger of being expensive hole to fill’, Guardian, January 28. http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/jan/28/olympics-london-aquatics-centre

Gibson O (2011/2). ‘West Ham to sue over “secret” cash during bid for Olympic stadium’, Guardian, July 3. http://www.theguardian.com/football/2011/jul/03/hammers-sue-spurs-sunday-times

Gilligan A (2009). ‘Olympic-sized overspend on London 2012 pushes cost to at least £12bn’, Daily Telegraph, November 7. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/london-2012/6519736/Olympic-sized-overspend-on-London-2012-pushes-cost-to-at-least-12bn.html

Gosden E (2011). ‘London 2012 Olympics: transport minister says Londoners should work from home during Games’, Daily Telegraph, August 3. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/8678980/London-2012-Olympics-Transport-minister-says-Londoners-should-work-from-home-during-Games.html

Gray L (2006). ‘Spending spree aims to encourage the medal-winners of the future’, Scotsman, March 23. http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P2-13078138.html

Green Building Press (2006). ‘Demand for more London homes puts environment at risk’, March 21 [no longer online]

Green M and Blitz R (2006). ‘Olympics “to succeed because foreigners in charge”’, Financial Times, April 3. http://news.ft.com/cms/s/b1c0d21e-c2ad-11da-ac03-0000779e2340.html

Hailstone L (2009). ‘Talk to clients to cut Olympics disruption’, December 15. http://www.commercialmotor.com/latest-news/talk-to-clients-to-cut-olympics-disruption

Hanna L (2012). ‘London 2012: athletes' apartments unveiled in Olympic village’, Daily Mirror, March 15. http://www.mirror.co.uk/sport/other-sports/london-2012-athletes-apartments-unveiled-762513

Hannigan J (1998). *Fantasy City, Pleasure and Profit in the Postmodern Metropolis,* London: Routledge

Harris E and Waugh P (2006). ‘Olympics poster star gives up as ministers dither over funding’, Evening Standard, February 16. https://www.questia.com/newspaper/1G1-142163617/shameful-exclusive-olympics-poster-star-gives-up

Harris N (2011). ‘£270,000! Hospitality tickets for 2012 Olympics will be most expensive ever’, Daily Mail, February 20. http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sport/olympics/article-1358713/Hospitality-tickets-2012-Olympics-expensive-ever.html

Hemming R (2010). ‘Telford Homes shares bounce thanks to Olympics buildup’, Guardian, April 13. http://www.theguardian.com/business/marketforceslive/2010/apr/13/market-forces-live-telford-homes-olympics

Hill D (2010). ‘2012 Olympics: “unresolved” debt and legacy’, Guardian, October 14. http://www.theguardian.com/uk/davehillblog/2010/oct/14/2012-olympics-land-debt-london-development-agency [WAS Norman P (2009). ‘LDA’s Olympic debt forecasts and the public purse’, Estates Gazette Blog, December 17]

Hill D (2011). ‘Who will live in Olympic park homes?’ London blog, Guardian, March 22. http://www.theguardian.com/uk/davehillblog/2011/mar/22/who-will-live-in-london-olympic-park-homes?INTCMP=SRCH

Hill J (2007). ‘Olympic effect boosts east London house prices’, Reuters, February 2. http://uk.reuters.com/article/2007/02/02/britain-olympics-idUKNOA25034020070202

Hipwell D (2009). ‘Olympic legacy vehicle revealed’, Property Week, February 5. http://www.propertyweek.com/news/olympic-legacy-vehicle-revealed/3133388.article

House of Commons (2006). ‘Written answers’, April 27. http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmhansrd/vo060427/index/60427-x.htm

House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts (2007). *Report on Preparations for the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games Risk Assessment and Management.* http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200607/cmselect/cmpubacc/377/377.pdf

House of Commons Department of Culture, Media and Sport Select Committee (2007). *Caring for Our Collections,* June 7. http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200607/cmselect/cmcumeds/176/176i.pdf

House of Commons Transport Committee (2006) *Going for Gold: Transport for London’s 2012 Olympic Games,* March 16. http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmselect/cmtran/588/588i.pdf

Hughes A (2010). ‘London 2012: Javelin trains withdrawn after safety concerns’, SportsBeat, September 9 [no longer online]

Huntley V (2012). ‘Olympics has left us a ghost town’, East London and Docklands Advertiser, August 9

icSouthLondon.co.uk (2006). ‘Falling at the first hurdle’, July 21 [no longer online]

Illman J (2009). ‘Councils battling over Olympic logo’, LGCplus.com, January 22. http://www.lgcplus.com/news/councils-battling-over-olympic-logo/1970874.article

Independent Catholic News (2009). ‘London hotels “unfit for Olympics” say campaigners’, March 27. http://www.indcatholicnews.com/news.php?viewStory=5785 [citing London Citizens and Unite (Central London Hotel Workers Branch) (2009). *Rooms for Change. Putting London Hotels on track for the Olympics,* March – not online]

Infinity (2015). ‘iCITY London appoints Gavin Poole as CEO’, webpage. http://infinitysdc.net/news-item/icity-london-appoints-gavin-poole-as-ceo/

Inside the Games (2009). 'Higgins receives six-figure bonus, ODA accounts reveal', August 25. http://www.insidethegames.biz/articles/3233/higgins-receives-six-figure-bonus-oda-accounts-reveal

Insley J (2010). 'London Olympics fans be warned – no Visa card, no tickets', Guardian, June 24. http://www.theguardian.com/money/2010/jun/24/london-olympics-visa-card-tickets

Jameson A (2005). 'Thames Water under pressure to raise charges over Olympics', The Times, September 12. http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/business/industries/utilities/article2197832.ece

Jenkins S (2010). 'Forget the hype and just enjoy the Olympics; too many people are overselling the benefits of 2012. Treat the Games as a mad two-week party for London', Evening Standard, September 21. https://www.questia.com/newspaper/1G1-237547419/forget-the-hype-and-just-enjoy-the-olympics-too-many

Jensen I (2009). 'Firm gearing up for David and Goliath battle', This is Local London, July 17. http://www.thisislocallondon.co.uk/news/4498643.WALTHAM_ABBEY_firm_gearing_up_for_David_and_Goliath_battle

Johnson C and Piper L (2006). 'We won't pay Olympics tax', News Shopper, March 29. http://www.newsshopper.co.uk/news/bexley/717346.we_wont_pay_olympics_tax

Kaskey J (2010). 'Dow Chemical to sponsor Olympics Games through 2020', Bloomberg Business, July 16. http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2010-07-16/dow-chemical-agrees-to-worldwide-sponsorship-of-olympics-through-2020

Kelso P (2007). 'Rising Olympic costs slammed as catastrophic', Guardian, November 15. http://www.theguardian.com/sport/2007/nov/15/Olympics2012.politics

Kelso P (2008). 'Secrecy of £95m Olympic village grant angers Conservatives', Daily Telegraph, October 15. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/london-2012/3199205/Secrecy-of-95m-Olympic-village-grant-angers-Conservatives-Olympics.html

Kelso P (2011). 'London 2012 Olympics: aquatics centre was over budget from the start', Daily Telegraph, February 22. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/8341896/London-2012-Olympics-Aquatics-centre-was-over-budget-from-the-start.html

Kemp Little (2015). 'Olympics Newsletter – London 2012 and the protection of exclusive rights – a powerful tool for sponsors, a legal minefield for the rest', webpage. http://www.kemplittle.com/site/articles/kl_bytes/london_2012_and_the_protection_of_exclusive_rights.html

Kernon S (2006). 'Laing O'Rourke chosen for 2012 Olympics construction', Bloomberg, August 30. http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=aajsiKbT_XjUk

Klettner A (2011). Grimshaw: Olympic tower could have been a 'great symbol', Bdonline.co.uk , July 6. http://www.bdonline.co.uk/news/grimshaw-olympic-tower-could-have-been-a-great-symbol/5021125.article

Kollewe J (2011). 'Olympic village snapped up by Qatari ruling family for £557m', Guardian, August 12. http://www.theguardian.com/sport/2011/aug/12/olympic-village-qatari-ruling-family

Korporaal G (2006). 'Higgins runs rings around London games', Australasian Business Intelligence, March 21. http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-143490640.html

Kvist E (2012/1). 'Nobody knows we are here', Docklands and East London Advertiser, August 9

Kvist E (2012/2). 'It's a rip off, fumes Lance as signs are taken down by Olympic officials', Docklands and East London Advertiser, August 9

Kvist E (2012/3). 'All's quiet in east end as tourists stay away', Docklands and East London Advertiser, August 9

Leadbetter E (2006). 'Flood threat puts Britain at risk', BBC News, August 23. http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/5277650.stm

Legal Week (2006). 'Property, planning and construction: The gold rush', May 4. http://www.legalweek.com/legal-week/news/1158215/property-planning-construction-the-gold-rush

Lloyd T (2009). 'Half of Olympic village homes will be affordable', Inside Housing, June 22. http://m.insidehousing.co.uk/half-of-olympic-village-homes-will-be-affordable/6505184.article

London 2012 (2006). 'London 2012 inspires "Water City"', May 22. http://www.london2012.com/news/2006/05/london-2012-inspires-water-city.php

London Development Agency [LDA] (2004/1) *Retail, Leisure and Sport Impact Assessment Appendices. Lower Lea Valley Olympic and Legacy Planning Applications. Appendix 4 to the Environmental Statement,* London: LDA

London Development Agency [LDA] (2004/2) *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 Legacy Development Corporation [LLDC] (2014). *Local Plan 2015 to 2031,* London: LLDC. https://queenelizabetholympicpark.co.uk/~/media/lldc/local%20plan/local%20plan%20aug14/local%20plan.pdf

Mackay D (2012). 'End of Olympic blackout period marked by high profile advertising campaigns', Inside the Games, August 16. http://www.insidethegames.biz/articles/18269/end-of-olympic-blackout-period-marked-by-high-profile-advertising-campaigns

Magnay J (2011/1) 'London 2012 Olympics: capital braces itself for displacement effect from hosting Games', Daily Telegraph, April 12. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/8445807/London-2012-Olympics-capital-braces-itself-for-displacement-effect-from-hosting-Games.html

Magnay J (2011/2) ‘London 2012 Olympics: corporate ticket sellers in line for huge profits after snapping up key events for £40m’, Daily Telegraph, July 8. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/8625643/London-2012-Olympics-Corporate-ticket-sellers-in-line-for-huge-profits-after-snapping-up-key-events-for-40m.html

Magnay J (2011/3). ‘London 2012 Olympics: fraudsters posing as fake builders stole £2m from Olympic Delivery Authority’, Daily Telegraph, April 18. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/8459647/London-2012-Olympics-fraudsters-posing-as-fake-builders-stole-2-million-from-Olympic-Delivery-Authority.html

Magnay J (2012). ‘London 2012 Olympics: Mayor of London Boris Johnson asked to clarify status of Games Lanes’, Daily Telegraph, February 15. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/9083978/London-2012-Olympics-Mayor-of-London-Boris-Johnson-asked-to-clarify-status-of-Games-Lanes.html

Magnay J (2013). ‘One year on: the transformation of London's Olympic park’, Daily Telegraph, June 25. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/10127550/One-year-on-the-transformation-of-Londons-Olympic-park.html

Mark (2009). ‘ODA loses £10m after failing to attract investors’, Games Monitor discussion list, July 17. https://uk.groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/gamesmonitor/conversations/messages/2693 [citing Hayman A (2009). ‘ODA loses £10m after failing to attract investors’, Regen.net, July 17]

Marzouk L (2006). ‘£24m Olympic levy unfair’, This is Local London, March 9. http://www.thisislocallondon.co.uk/londonolympicbid/display.var.702976.0.24m_olympic_levy_is_unfair.php

Mathiason N (2005). ‘Ministers pass Olympic buck’, Observer, August 14. http://www.theguardian.com/business/2005/aug/14/communities.olympics2012

Mathiason N (2006). ‘Brown hit by Olympics contract row’, Observer, July 23. http://www.theguardian.com/business/2006/jul/23/money.politics

Mathiason N (2009). ‘New Olympic funding row as agencies dodge £800m debt’, Observer, September 20. http://www.theguardian.com/business/2009/sep/20/olympics-2012-budget-crisis

Mayor of London (2014). ‘Mayor announces David Goldstone to lead London Legacy Development Corporation’, press release, June 27. https://www.london.gov.uk/media/mayor-press-releases/2014/06/mayor-announces-david-goldstone-to-lead-london-legacy

McColgan A (2009). ‘The 2012 Olympics: Big Brother comes to town?’, Index on Censorship, January 29. https://www.indexoncensorship.org/2009/01/the-2012-olympic-big-brother-comes-to-town

Mendick R (2005). ‘An east end transformed by the Games’, Evening Standard, July 5. https://www.questia.com/newspaper/1G1-133784508/an-east-end-transformed-by-the-games-tomorrow-s-crucial

Millward D (2011). ‘Olympics could lead to 100 days of road chaos’, Daily Telegraph, June 13. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/motoring/news/8573160/Olympics-could-lead-to-100-days-of-road-chaos.html

Moore K (2006). ‘London games need landscape architects’, EuropaConcorsi.com, June 10 [no longer online]

Mulholland H (2005). ‘Jowell rules out Olympics council tax cap’, Guardian, October 26. http://www.theguardian.com/money/2005/oct/26/publicfinances.Olympics2012

Mulholland H (2009). ‘Olympic spending jeopardises Boris Johnson’s plans for London’, Guardian, September 11. http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2009/sep/11/boris-johnson-olympic-games

Mulholland H (2011). ‘Plans for mobile network on London underground shelved’, Guardian, April1. http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2011/apr/01/mobile-network-london-underground-shelved

Murray C (2012). ‘Olympic Games set to break $8bn revenues barrier in four-year cycle ending with London 2012’, Sportcal.com, issue 26 (special feature: London 2012 Olympic Games). http://www.sportcal.com/pdf/gsi/Sportcal_Issue26_6-9.pdf

Murphy B (2004). ‘Athens gambles future’, Associated Press, August 1. http://www.deseretnews.com/article/595081162/Athens-gambles-future.html

National Grid (2003). Letter to Waltham Forest Planning Department, October 8, unpublished

Norman P (2010/1). ‘LDA abolition would leave £387m of “unresolved” Olympic debt’, Estates Gazette blog, October 12. http://www.egi.co.uk/news/lda-abolition-would-leave-387m-of-unresolved-olympic-debt

Norman P (2010/2). ‘London Assembly tackles Olympic legacy’, Estates Gazette blog, September 17 [no longer online]

Norman P (2012/1). ‘Baroness Ford on her Olympic legacy’, Paul Norman’s London 2012 blog, February 8. https://costarnews.wordpress.com/2012/02/08/baroness-ford-on-her-olympic-legacy

Norman P (2012/2). ‘Olympic media centre bidder recruits CEO’, CoStar, April 18. http://www.costar.co.uk/en/assets/news/2012/April/Olympic-media-centre-bidder-recruits-CEO

Norman P (2012/3). ‘Property’s biggest job – Olympics tsar – back in play’, Paul Norman’s London 2012 blog, February 8. https://costarnews.wordpress.com/page/3

Northern Echo (2006). ‘There’s no need to make it up’, June 5. http://www.thenorthernecho.co.uk/features/782538.theres_no_need_to_make_it_up_editors_chair

Observer (2005/1). ‘Has Bechtel shot its bolt in Britain?’, September 11. http://www.theguardian.com/business/2005/sep/11/theobserver.observerbusiness9

Observer (2005/2). ‘Olympics 2012 supplement’, July 10

Observer (2006). ‘Don’t make grassroots pay for Olympics’, March 26. http://www.theguardian.com/sport/2006/mar/26/Olympics2012.politics

O'Connor A (2008). '£1bn deal to build 2012 Olympic village venue faces collapse over credit crunch', The Times, June 21. http://www.global-report.com/hongkong/a340603-1bn-deal-to-build-2012-olympic-village-venue-faces-collapse-over-credit-crunch

Olivera O (2006). 'The voice of the people can dilute corporate power', Guardian, July 19. http://www.theguardian.com/society/2006/jul/19/comment.guardiansocietysupplement

Ormsby A (2012). 'Olympics – London firms stumble over trademark hurdles', Reuters, June 1. http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/01/oly-london-trademark-idUSL5E8GHF4U20120601

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

Peck T (2011). 'A million people failed with 2012 ticket bids', Independent, October 23. http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/a-million-people-failed-with-2012-ticket-bids-2293863.html

Penrose J (2011). 'Olympic touts set to make millions from posh flats scam', Daily Mirror, July 10. http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/olympic-touts-set-to-make-millions-140678

Playfair 2012 (2012). 'London 2012 signs ground-breaking agreement with the Playfair 2012 campaign to protect workers' rights', press release, February 23. http://www.playfair2012.org.uk/2012/02/playfair2012agreement

Pocock I (2006). 'Olympic flats will be sold on for up to £1m', Sunday Times, June 11. http://www.thesundaytimes.co.uk/sto/news/uk_news/article180347.ece

Pout R H (2005) *Going for Gold: Delivering Excellent Transport for London's 2012 Olympics,* London: Rail Future

Press Association (2006). 'MPs warn over Chunnel Link costs', Guardian, May 4

Press Trust of India (2012). 'Bhopal–Dow Olympic row: Outrage in UK House', February 22. http://www.ndtv.com/india-news/bhopal-dow-olympic-row-outrage-in-uk-house-571656

Property Week (2008). 'LDA faces £3m bill after CPO failure', March 5. http://www.propertyweek.com/news/lda-faces-%C2%A33m-bill-after-cpo-failure/3107936.article

Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park (2015). 'Here East', webpage. http://queenelizabetholympicpark.co.uk/the-park/business/here-east

Quilter J (2009). 'O2 Arena forced into Olympic rebrand following sponsor clash', September 28. http://www.brandrepublic.com/article/941349/o2-arena-forced-olympic-rebrand-following-sponsor-clash

Raco M (2004). 'Whose gold rush? The social legacy of a London Olympics' in Vigor A, Mean M and Tims C (eds) *After the Gold Rush: A Sustainable Olympics for London,* London: IPPR, Demos

Raco M (2012). 'Taking the politics out of the Olympics: privatisation and the London Olympics', Occupied Times of London, issue 15, July

Rail Future (2005). 'Transport in and around east London at and beyond the 2012 Olympics: A response to the Transport Select Committee call for evidence', press notice, July 21

Rawlinson K (2011). 'Café Olympic? Not if the lawyers have their way', Independent, February 8. http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/cafe-olympic-not-if-the-lawyers-have-their-way-2207438.html

Rawlinson K, Hall R, McCann J and Ewan H (2011). 'Rents could top £2,000 a week during Games', Independent, May 27. http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/rents-could-top-1632000-a-week-during-games-2289711.html

Robinson M (2011). 'Government orders 9,000 Olympic tickets to entertain dignitaries', Daily Telegraph, February 18. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/news/8331702/Government-orders-9000-Olympic-tickets-to-entertain-dignitaries.html

Satch (2007). 'Drivers face £5k VIP lane fines', posting on MBClub.co.uk, November 12. http://www.mbclub.co.uk/forums/general-discussion/43658-drivers-face-%A35k-vip-lane-fines.html

Savage T (2011). 'Fans blast London 2012 ticket prices', Daily Star, April 24. http://www.dailystar.co.uk/news/latest-news/187684/Fans-blast-Olympic-prices

Sharp R (2011). 'Battle for 2012: arts event that fell foul of Olympics', Independent, June 14. http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/battle-for-2012-arts-event-that-fell-foul-of-olympics-2297088.html

Shead S (2014). 'iCity tech hub in London's Olympic Park gets renamed Here East', TechWorld, February 26. http://www.techworld.com/news/startups/icity-tech-hub-in-londons-olympic-park-gets-renamed-here-east-3504012

Sherman J and Goodbody J (2006). 'Bill for Games hits £7bn as cost of venues soars', The Times, November 22. http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/sport/olympics/article2378843.ece

Sinclair J (2007). 'Drivers face £5k VIP lane fines', Auto Express, November 11. http://www.mbclub.co.uk/forums/general-discussion/43658-drivers-face-%A35k-vip-lane-fines.htm

Slavin M (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, London City Airport, September 25

Slavin M (2007/1). 'Public accounts committee report on Olympic preparations', Games Monitor, June 12. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/452

Slavin M (2007/2). ‘The Olympic effect leaves Thames Gateway short of development funds’, Games Monitor, August 2. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/456 [citing Gardiner J (2007). ‘East London chief in Olympic funds plea’, Regeneration and Renewal, April 13]

Slavin M (2007/3). ‘Eastway cyclists struggle with the ODA planners’, Games Monitor, July 4. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/446 [WAS Singletrack Magazine (2007). ‘Olympic Legacy – British Cycling Board confirms stance against legacy masterplan’, June 11]

Slavin M (2008/1). ‘The International Olympic Committee’s tax free billions’, Games Monitor, May 15. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/626

Slavin M (2008/2). ‘Very critical House of Commons Select Committee Olympic report published’, Games Monitor, May 3. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/622

Slavin M (2011). ‘University College London propose redevelopment of the Carpenters Estate Stratford’, Games Monitor, November 25. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/1435

Smale K (2011). ‘Pillars have been built for Thames cable car project to connect Greenwich to Newham’, NewsShopper, August 8. http://www.newsshopper.co.uk/news/9183501.Construction_of_Thames_cable_car_underway

Smith J (2013). ‘Ready, steady ... move in! London 2012 athletes' village gets its first residents after accommodation was turned into flats’, Daily Mail, November 26. http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2513872/First-residents-London-2012-Athletes-Village-accommodation-turned-flats.html

Smith M (2012). ‘Olympic housing crunch: London landlords evict tenants to gouge tourists’, NBC.com, February 2. http://worldnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/02/02/10288441-olympic-housing-crunch-london-landlords-evict-tenants-to-gouge-tourists?lite

Smithers R (2015). ‘Water bills fall but Thames customers will pay extra for “super sewer”’, Guardian, February 3. http://www.theguardian.com/money/2015/feb/03/water-bills-fall-thames-ofwat-uk

Space Hijackers (2012). ‘Official ProtestorsTM of the Olympic GamesTM’, Occupied Times, issue 15, July. http://theoccupiedtimes.org/?p=5838

Spitzenprodukte (2012). ‘AdiZones and Lo-Lifes’, Games Monitor, July 22. http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/1785 [republished from: http://spitzenprodukte.tumblr.com/post/25787084822/adizones-and-lo-lifes]

Stewart H (2005). ‘Financial hurdles may kill off Olympic dream’, Observer, August 14. http://www.theguardian.com/business/2005/aug/14/olympics2012.theobserver

Sudjic D (2006). ‘Where are the Olympic building plans heading?’ Observer, May 28. http://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2006/may/28/architecture.olympicgames2012

Sumner J (2007). Report on Manor Gardening Society allotments for the Olympic panel of Waltham Forest Council, October 9, unpublished

Temko N (2006). ‘MPs warn of shortfall in Channel rail link funding’, Observer, April 30. http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2006/apr/30/transport.world1

TheOlympicBorough.com (2011). ‘Café Olympic in name row as LOCOG cracks down on trade marks’, February 8 [no longer online]

Thompstone R (2006). ‘Olympics will be great, but sort out who pays for it’, letter to Edgware and Mill Hill Times, April 6. http://www.times-series.co.uk/news/725303.print

Transport for London [TFL] (2012). ‘Olympic Route Network ends operation midnight on Tuesday’, press release, August 12. https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/media/press-releases/2012/august/olympic-route-network-ends-operation-midnight-on-tuesday

TravelMole.com (2011). ‘Olympics puncture inbound sales by half’, March 15. http://www.travelmole.com/news_feature.php?id=1146792

Tusa J (2007). ‘A cultural Olympiad? Great idea – now give us the money’, Observer, August 5. http://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2007/aug/05/art.artsfunding

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

UK Government and Mayor London (2013). *Inspired by 2012: The Legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games,* London: Cabinet Office https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/224148/2901179_OlympicLegacy_acc.pdf

University College London [UCL] (2015). ‘UCL East’, webpage. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ucl-east

University of East London [UEL] (2007). *A Lasting Legacy for London,* London: GLA

Vancouver Courier (2009). ‘Olympic cover up’, December 16 [no longer online]

Walker L (2008) ‘Devolved nations seek 2012 money’, Regen.net, June 26 [no longer online]

Wallop H (2011). ‘London 2012: UK credit bill mounts after last minute ticket rush’, Daily Telegraph, April 25. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/news/8472192/London-2012-UK-credit-card-bill-mounts-after-last-minute-ticket-rush.html

Warner A (2010). ‘Mayor aims for total control of 2012 legacy’, BBC News, June 15. http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/adrianwarner/2010/06/mayor_stakes_a_claim_for_contr.html

Warren P (2008). ‘City business races the Games for power’, Guardian, May 29. http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2008/may/29/energy.olympics2012

Watson K (2014). ‘Brazil property prices: fears of 'bubble' in home costs’, BBC News, May 1. http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-27218510

Web Snippets (2011). ’Rents for 2012 Olympics up to 35 times their norm’, April 12. http://websnippetsblog.blogspot.co.uk/2011/04/rents-for-2012-olympics-up-to-35-times.html

Webster P (2006). ‘Costs soar for London Olympics’, The Times, July 6. http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/sport/olympics/article2378864.ece

Wells M (2012). ‘VIP Lanes: we'll take the low road and they'll take the VIP lanes’, Games Monitor, February 16 (amended February 17). http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/1495

Wikipedia (2015). ‘Venues of the 2012 Summer Olympics and Paralympics’. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Venues_of_the_2012_Summer_Olympics_and_Paralympics [accessed November 16 2015)

Wilner T (2008). ‘Olympic park designs slammed’, Regeneration and Renewal, September 18

Wilson B (2008). ‘London 2012 on “ambush” alert’, BBC News, April 25. http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/7364391.stm

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

Workers’ Liberty (2004). ‘Strike action brewing over the Laing O'Rourke “contrick”’ October 27. http://workersliberty.org/node/3313

Young Foundation (2006). *Bridging the Gap: The London Olympics 2012 and South Asian-Owned Businesses in Brick Lane and Green Street,* London: Young Foundation