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Chapter 1
Fig. 1-1: Historical evolution of Olympic urbanisation
(Source: Author)
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Fig. 1-2: Different types of venues clustering in the host cities since 1964
(Source: Author)
Fig. 1-3: SOP (during the Olympic Games)
(Source: SOPA)

Fig. 1-4: LOP (during the Olympic Games)
(Source: London 2012)
The LOP (now renamed the London Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park) was built in the 1.3.2 The London Olympic Park (LOP)

Homebush Bay. Given the financial difficulty of operating both facilities in Homebush

The current spatial character of the SOP and Homebush Bay has two folds. On the one hand, it is surrounded by a rich natural environment, with the Parramatta River,

characterised as one of the most multi-cultural places in the whole of Australia, as well

character represented by industrial and warehousing buildings, socially the area is

(Author, 2009)

A historical study of the SOP site reveals the industrial development of Homebush Bay.

The industrial character of this area began with the opening of the State Abattoir and the

brickworks in the beginning of the twenty century, and these State-owned industrial

facilities developed along with the economic growth of the Sydney region. However,

the subsequent trend of relocating industrial facilities to the outskirts of the region and

concentrated industrial area, and warehouse-type buildings in a relatively large lot of

utilised as dumping sites, and this has caused the significant contamination of

long-term industrial use of the site, various areas in Homebush Bay have been

awarded Sydney's Olympic bidding campaigns in region. Although Sydney was

right to stage the Games and this spurred the regeneration of Homebush Bay and "the

regional growth of Homebush Bay has been concentrated towards the western part of the region, and south the Sydney CBD and Parramatta River, and the SOP has been situated in the local municipality of the SOP; the Auburn Council has been characterised as an "industrial commercial and warehousing municipality" (Kennedy and Kennedy, 1982, p. 12). In particular, the south and west sides of the SOP site have developed as a

"industrial and warehousing municipality" (Kennedy and Kennedy, 1982, p. 12).

On the other hand, it sits within a significant industrial neighbourhood and artificial

landscape along the Parramatta Road. Indeed, the industrial use has been of significance

the re-structuring of the manufacturing industry led to the decline of both. Further, along

with long-term industrial use of the site, various areas in Homebush Bay have been

"industrial commercial and warehousing municipality" (Kennedy and Kennedy, 1982, p.

"industrial commercial and warehousing municipality" (Kennedy and Kennedy, 1982, p.

"industrial commercial and warehousing municipality" (Kennedy and Kennedy, 1982, p.

"industrial commercial and warehousing municipality" (Kennedy and Kennedy, 1982, p.

fig. 1-7 (left): The SOP in the Sydney Region

Fig. 1-6 (right): The SOP in the local context
(Source: Author)

Fig. 1-7 (left): The LOP in the London region

Fig. 1-8 (right): The LOP in the local context
(Source: Author)
Furthermore, as briefly discussed in the previous chapter, Liao and Pitts further suggest that since the 2000 Sydney Games, the age of urban sustainability has begun (Liao and Pitts, 2006). Sydney is considered as the first to adopt this strategy and London is the latest example, but there are also Athens and Beijing, which hosted the Games in 2004 and 2008. However, it is understood that when Athens and Beijing won the bids in 1997 and 2001, the IOC’s commitment to the Olympic legacy had not begun or had just begun (Fig. 2-2).

Thus, it was in London that the IOC’s actions started to take effect, and the IOC’s president Jacque Rogge declared that “London is the first city which adopted the IOC’s commitment to the Olympic legacy.” Given this historical context, one of my great motivations in employing Sydney and London as case studies is to consider the significant impact of the IOC’s changing commitment to the Olympic legacy.

### 2.2.3 Research timeframe and challenges met

A time-change analysis and contrasting case studies are the two methodological backbones of my thesis. I will therefore conduct analysis of the planning process for the legacy of the Olympic Park in the pre-bid, the post-bid, and the post-event phases for both Sydney and London. It is then critical to define the timeframe for each phase in each case, and identify the methodological challenges in my thesis. Table 2-2 indicates the periods of each phase in Sydney and London.

---

**Fig. 2-1: The SOP (left) and the LOP (right) on the same scale**

(The translucent part of the SOP is the Parklands and the opaque white part represents the urban core.)

(Source: Author)

---

**Fig. 2-2: The Olympic host cities since 1993**

(Source: Author)
Chapter 3
Fig. 3-1: Homebush Bay Sports Complex, Scheme-A proposed by Walter Bunning
(Source: Bunning, 1973)

Fig. 3-2: Olympic venues in Homebush Bay including the relocated RAS showground.
(Source: Sydney Olympic Games Citizen's Council, 1988)
Fig. 3-3: Vision of the Sydney Olympic Park  
(Source: Sydney Olympics 2000 Bid Ltd., 1993)

Fig. 3-4: Auburn Municipality, Industrial area (1986)  
(Source: Department of Industrial Development and Decentralisation, 1986)
Fig. 3-5: Increase in the area of landfill from the 1930s to 1988
Fig. 3-6: Functional plan in the Cumberland Plan (1948)  
(Source: Spearritt and DeMarco, 1988)

Fig. 3-7: Functional plan in the Sydney Outline Plan (1968)  
(Source: The State Planning Authority of NSW, 1968)

Fig. 3-8: Functional plan in the Metropolitan Strategy (1988)  
(Source: Department of Planning, 1988)
The legend of these diagrams is shown in the following page.
The number of Competition Venues in Homebush Bay

Fig. 3-10: The number of proposed competition venues in each Olympic Bid. (Source: NSW Government, 1979; Sydney Olympic Games Citizen's Council, 1988; Sydney Olympics 2000 Bid Ltd, 1993)
Fig. 3-11: Presentation model of the Sydney Olympic Park for the 2000 Olympic bid
(Source: Kindly provided by the Australian Centre for Olympic Studies)

Fig. 3-12: The land-use plan of Homebush Bay for the Olympic bid proposals for the 2000 Games
(Source: Author)
Fig. 3-13: Different visions for utilising the Homebush Bay Brickpit
(Source: HBDC, 1992)

Fig. 3-14: Homebush Bay land ownership and the HBC planning boundary
(Source: HBDC, 1993)
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Fig. 4-1: Two potential sites for the 1988 Olympic Games
(Source: GLC, 1979)

Fig. 4-2: The site of the Docklands-based option
(Source: GLC, 1979)
Fig. 4-3: Developing axis and potential Olympic site
(Source: Coopers&Lybrand/Deloitte, 1990)

Fig. 4-4: The potential Olympic sites in Docklands
(Source: Coopers&Lybrand/Deloitte, 1990)
Fig. 4-5: Two images presented at the final presentation of the host city election in Singapore in 2005
(Above: The Olympic Park during the Games, Below: the Olympic Park after the Games)
(Source: ODA)
The East London sub-region is the largest of London's sub-regions, covering 10 boroughs on both sides of the Thames (the City of London, Hackney, Tower Hamlets, Newham, Barking & Dagenham, Havering, Redbridge, Lewisham, Greenwich and Bexley) and is home to two million people. It is shown on Map 5C.1. The London part of the Thames Gateway, a national priority area for regeneration, is contained in the East London sub-region.

Fig. 4-6: Social and Functional Analysis in presented the "County of London plan"
(Source: Abercrombie and Forshaw, 1943)

Fig. 4-7: East London sub-region presented in the “The London plan”
(Source: Mayor of London, 2004)
Fig. 4-8: London Thames Gateway area including the Olympic Park
(Source: London Thames Gateway Development Corporation, 2005)

Fig. 4-9: Stratford City, overall image
(Source: Chelsfiled et al., 2003)
Fig. 4-10: Stratford City, land-use plan
(Source: Chelsfield et al., 2003)

Fig. 4-11: Diagram showing functional relationship between Stratford City and adjacent areas
(Source: Chelsfield et al., 2003)
Fig. 4-12: Land-use vision for the LLV by Newham Council in 2000
(Source: London Borough of Newham, 2000)

Fig. 4-13 (right): Land-use vision for Hackney Wick by Hackney Council in 1995
(Source: London Borough of Hackney, 1995)
Fig. 4-14: The Olympic masterplan (left) and the legacy masterplan (right)
(Source: LDA, 2004)

Fig. 4-15: Development of the London Olympic Park
(Source: LDA, 2004)
Fig. 4-16: Land use within and outside the Olympic Park
(Source: LDA, 2004)
Fig. 4-17: The London Olympic Park and adjacent neighbourhood
(Source: LDA, 2004)
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Government Olympic Planning Structure (pre 1995)

Fig. 5-1: Government Olympic Planning Structure before June 1995
(Source: Kindly provided by Michael Knight)

Fig. 5-2 (left): Land-use plan of Homebush Bay proposed in the Sydney Regional Environmental Plan. 24
(Source: Department of Planning, 1994)
Fig. 5-3 (right): Jean Nouvel’s proposed masterplan for Homebush Bay
(Source: Nouvel, 1994)

Fig. 5-4: Government Olympic Planning Structure after June 1995
(Source: Kindly provided by Michael Knight)
Fig. 5-5: Image of Homebush Bay proposed at the time of bidding
(Source: Sydney Bid Committee, 1993)

Fig. 5-6: Design study of the Homebush Bay masterplan by Cox Richardson Architects & Planners
(Kindly provided by the Sydney Olympic Park Authority)
Fig. 5-7: The image of Homebush Bay presented in the new masterplan in 1995
(Source: OCA, 1995)

Fig. 5-8 (right): Homebush Bay road network proposed in 1995
(Source: OCA, 1995)
Post Atlanta Olympics

Fig. 5-9: Government Olympic Planning Structure after the Atlanta Games in 1996
(Source: Kindly provided by Michael Knight)

Fig. 5-10: The modified image of Homebush Bay unveiled in 1997 (artist’s impression)
(Source: OCA, 1998)
Fig. 5-11: Masterplan for Homebush Bay, Games period, proposed in 1995
(Source: OCA, 1995)

Fig. 5-12: Masterplan for Homebush Bay, legacy period, proposed in 1995
(Source: OCA, 1995)
Fig. 5-13 (left): Auburn Council’s land-use plan
(Source: Auburn Council, 2000)
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Fig. 6-1: London Olympic planning structure
(Source: ODA, 2007a)
Fig. 6-2: Pre-bid masterplan planning boundary
(Source: ODA, 2007a)

Fig. 6-3: ODA planning boundary (Red lines indicates the local borough’s political boundary lines.)
(Source: ODA)
Fig. 6-4: LOP masterplan, Games mode
(Source: ODA, 2007c)

Fig. 6-5: LOP masterplan, legacy transformation mode
(Source: ODA, 2007c)
3.4.6 As noted earlier in this document the development of the site is a phased process that has to accommodate the development of the core site, infrastructure and public realm elements to both short-term Olympic and long-term Legacy requirements. The phased process of developing the site from the existing water courses and topography through to the Legacy Transformation stage are illustrated by the cartoons in Figures 3.5.1 to 3.5.6.

3.4.7 Firstly, the creation of the parklands entails improvements to the existing waterways and remodelling the existing topography of the site to create flat development platforms - the Upper Plateau - either side of the River Valleys (Figure 3.5.2).

3.4.8 Secondly, the River Valleys will be landscaped and habitats created prior to the Games, and the junction between the River Valleys and the Upper Plateau called the ‘River Valley Rim’ will be installed as a permanent feature between the upper and lower levels of the parklands (Figure 3.5.3).

3.4.9 Thirdly, the Games venues will be developed alongside the largely temporary Olympic Concourse on the Upper Plateau with the permanent north-south Promenade (Figure 3.5.4).

3.4.10 Fourthly, after the Games the removal of temporary elements including venues, the opening of the River Valleys as soon as possible after the Games, and the conversion of the Concourse into Legacy parkland (Figure 3.5.5).

3.4.11 Fifthly, progressive opening of the Legacy parkland as the Concourse and front-of-house areas are re-landscaped (Figure 3.5.6).

Fig. 6-6: Diagram showing the transformation of the LOP (Source: ODA, 2007g)

Fig. 6-7: Proposed plan for the evolution of the stadium and the surrounding area (Source: EDAW Consortium, 2008)
Fig. 6-8: Different areas designated in the LMF masterplan
(Source: LDA, 2009b)

Fig. 6-9: Diagram showing the Olympic Park and the surroundings (Olympic and legacy modes)
(Source: KCAP)
Fig. 6-10: Various options for the post-Olympic Park massing study
(Sources: LMF Design Team, 2008)

Fig. 6-11: Image of the LOP in 2030
(Source: LDA, 2009c)
Fig. 6-12: Illustrative legacy masterplan for public consultation 2008  (Source: OPLC, 2011)

Fig. 6-13: Illustrative legacy masterplan for the LCS  (Source: OPLC, 2011)

Fig. 6-14: Olympic village, view from the above  
(Source: http://archboston.org/community/showthread.php?p=150417)
Fig. 6-15: The London Olympic Stadium, the artist’s impression and the conceptual drawing
London Olympic stadium could be flattened at the end of 2012 Games

The HOK and Peter Cook-designed London Olympic stadium could be demolished when the 2012 Games are finished.

The *Metro* reports that the London Development Authority (LDA) fears the 80,000-seat venue in Stratford, East London, may be too expensive to subsidise after the event.

Instead, it is looking at the possibility of demolishing the £525 million stadium and, in partnership with a private developer, building a Premier League football ground in its place.

This would scupper the original plan to remove 55,000 seats after the games to turn it into a 25,000-seater athletics venue.

But the LDA said demolition was one of a range of options being looked at for the stadium.

An LDA spokesman said: 'The LDA has left no stone unturned in examining all legacy options for the Olympic venues and is still looking at a range of potential sporting uses including athletics, football and rugby for the Olympic stadium.'

A spokesman for the Mayor of London's office said: 'The London Development Agency has rightly been looking at a range of options but the Mayor has no plans, and is not aware of any plans to demolish the stadium.'
Boris: Olympic Stadium won’t host a top-flight football club

Private schools told to play their part

**Private schools were being urged today to open up more of their sport facilities to state schools ahead of the 2012 Games.**

An Evening Standard survey of independent schools found some had no arrangements for allowing state-educated children to use their pools, pitches or gyms.

Critics said these institutions — which charge thousands of pounds a term — must do more to help children in their communities and ensure a legacy for grassroots sport from the Olympics.

Private schools also face growing pressure to help poorer children in order to justify the tax breaks that accompany charitable status.

The Standard is campaigning to secure a sports legacy from the 2012 Games through boosting participation and improving community facilities. Children’s

**DELIVER THE 2012 SPORTING LEGACY**

**STANDARD CAMPAIGN**

**MATTHEW BEARD**

Sports News Correspondent

Boris Johnson today ruled out a Premiership football club moving to the Olympic Stadium in 2013.

The Mayor said the cost of converting the 30,000-seat venue was too much to bear during the financial crisis.

He said MPs it was too late to reverse plans to move the stadium in Stratford to a 25,000-capacity athletics venue.

With both West Ham United — the most likely top-flight side to move there — likely to be caught up in the economic turmoil in their fabled nestland, his words appeared to seal the £200 million venue’s fate.

In his first appearance as mayor before the Commons culture, media and sports committee, Mr Johnson said the state of the financial markets meant Games organisers were having to “cut their coat according to their cloth”.

He said: “We are spending large sums of money on the stadium and we would like to see a proper legacy use to get permanent benefits. But no single deal has emerged although we have to have facilities in the mix.”

“The issue is how we make that happen while satisfying the needs of a Premier League football club. That is extremely difficult and we have not solved it yet. There is a way you could do a massive conversion so the (football) and athletics could co-exist, but it’s extremely expensive and probably more than the budget can bear in the current economic conditions.”

The mayor signalled a new era of austerity in planning for 2012. “The whole thing about the Games has changed in the sense that market conditions have changed and we have to cut our cloth according to our coat,” he said.

He said that economic turmoil meant he could not be bound by the rules of the International Olympic Committee or the commitment of his predecessor Ken Livingstone. Asked if he would stand down from the Games, he responded: “I have a desire for the Games to succeed but I have to balance that against cost. Every argument is about how to save the taxpayer costs without jeopardising the Games.”

“Be honest I am not so used to the architecture of the IOC. My issue is not with previous undertakings. I learnt a wonderful Games but one that is not too expensive.”

Mr Johnson also came under pressure over the athletics village and media centre in the Olympic Park, the two venues reliant upon private sector investment.

He admitted it was “stunning” the media centre cost £200 million, of which £100 million had been expected from developer Carillion Iqbal prior to the credit crunch. He pledged to investigate ways of building a more cost-effective venue for 30,000 journalists. But he warned: “It’s got to deliver a centre which is useful because otherwise they [the media] will attack the London Games as they did in Atlanta.”

On the cash crisis affecting the 11 billion athletes’ village, he said he would try to delay a raid on the contingency fund within the existing 13 billion Games budget. Ministers could move to help villages developer Landsec next week, when Games chiefs are expected to request a £200 million bail-out.

---

**Fig. 6-17: News articles discussing the legacy of the Olympic stadium in London**

(Source: Evening Standard (7 October 2008))
Fig. 6-18: The London aquatic centre, the artist’s impression during (above) and after the Games (below)
PLANS for a £40 million leisure pool and fitness centre to be built in the Olympic Park are set to be scrapped due to financial pressures, the Evening Standard can reveal.

The complex was intended to deliver a lasting sports legacy for East End boroughs, whose residents are among the most inactive in Britain.

It was to have been built after 2012 as an extension to the aquatics centre, which has been designed by architect Zaha Hadid and will cost around £300 million.

Local councils Newham and Tower Hamlets agreed to contribute £5.5 million and £1.5 million respectively to the cost of building the leisure facilities.

The pool was to have featured slides, flumes and wave machines and council chiefs hoped it would be a stepping stone to more serious swimming in the adjacent aquatics centre, which will have two Olympic-sized pools. But Newham has mothballed the cash and frozen plans to commission architects’ drawings because it fears that the majority of the funding from private developers may not materialise.

Changes to the pool plans came after it emerged last week that the legacy plans for the Olympic media centre have been drastically reduced.

With the pool, much of the estimated cost — £26 million for the leisure facility and £11 million for the fitness centre — was to have come from the private developers of a residential and retail scheme in the park.

But council chiefs are concerned that this “section 106” cash — a developers’ contribution as part of planning consent — may go instead towards a number of diverse projects such as a new bridge or school to convert the park after the Games.

Latest designs for the leisure facility came from a feasibility study of “Legacy Plus” options completed by the Olympic Delivery Authority six months ago. The leisure pool would have been linked to the aquatics centre with a shared entrance and changing areas.

Originally, the scheme was to have been housed within the aquatics centre site at a cost of up to £30 million. But this was squeezed out when a cost review by the ODA scaled back the site of the aquatics centre. The aquatics centre itself will not be entirely for the elite as booms and moveable floors will be added after 2012 for nursery use.

Paul Brickell, Newham’s executive member for the Olympics, said: “We were not keen to commit the money and order the designs because we can’t be sure the extra funds will be forthcoming. The problem is that nobody knows how much it will cost to decommission the Olympic venues and turn the area into a park after the Games.”

PIPPA CREBAN
City Hall Editor

THE 2012 Olympic Games could leave little or no sporting legacy unless major investment is put into grassroots organisations now, an influential committee warned today.

The London Assembly’s Economic Development, Culture and Sport committee said Boris Johnson’s plans were at risk of failure.

Chairman Dee Doocy told the Standard: “I have concerns about delivery I have no doubt he wants to have a sporting legacy but unless somebody starts putting some money in very quickly I can’t see how it can be done.” Ms Doocy was speaking ahead of an evidence session today with Kate Hoy, the Mayor’s Commissioner for Sport. The former sports minister will be under pressure to explain how she will boost participation in sport in the capital without substantial extra funds.

The Mayor is expected to announce additional money when he unveils his sporting strategy next month but there are fears it will not be enough.

Assembly members are worried gaps in the provision of sports facilities are unlikely to be tackled by 2012 and if new facilities open, there will not be enough cash to guarantee their future public use.

Ms Doocy warned Mr Johnson unless he could guarantee a significant sporting legacy he should be careful about making the promise. “If he can’t deliver he must be honest about it,” she said.
Fig. 6-20: Land-use strategy proposed in "the LLV Opportunity Area Planning Framework" in 2007
(Source: Mayor of London, 2007a)
Fig. 7-1: The precinct plan of the SOP
(Source: OCA, 2000)

Fig. 7-2: Urban grain proposed by Tony Caro Architects (Source: OCA, 2001)

Fig. 7-3: Urban rhythm proposed by Lacoste + Stevenson (Source: OCA, 2001)
Fig. 7-4: The 2002 masterplan, overall precinct map
(Source: SOPA, 2002)

Fig. 7-5: The 2002 masterplan, land-use plan
(Source: SOPA, 2002)
Fig. 7-6: Proposed development in the post-Olympic site during 2007-2008
(Source: SOPA, 2008)

Fig. 7-7: Four-stage development of the QUAD Business Park

Fig. 7-8: Series of hotel developments in the SOP
(Source: http://accortrade.info/Pullman_SydneyOlympicPark)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue Name</th>
<th>Usage during the Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2000</th>
<th>Post Olympic Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ANZ Stadium (Stadium Australia):</td>
<td>Opening/Closing ceremony, Athletics, Football</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acer Arena (Sydney Super Dome):</td>
<td>Basketball, Gymnastics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aquatic Centre</td>
<td>Diving, Swimming, Synchronised Swimming, Water Polo, Modern Pentathlon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. State Sports Centre:</td>
<td>Table Tennis, Taekwondo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hockey Centre:</td>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tennis Centre</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Baseball Stadium</td>
<td>Baseball, Modern Pentathlon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Dome</td>
<td>Basketball, Handball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pavilions</td>
<td>Handball, Modern Pentathlon (Pavilion 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Archery Park</td>
<td>Archery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Athletic Centre</td>
<td>Rhythmic Gymnastics, Badminton (Pavilion 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sports Hall</td>
<td>Volleyball (Pavilion 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Skate Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Golf Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7-9: Different uses of the stadia in the SOP after the Games
(Source: Shirai, 2009)

Fig. 7-10: Various spaces used for business events at the ANZ Stadium (Stadium Australia)
(Source: Author (photo taken in 2008))
Fig. 7-11: The number of visitors coming to various events in the SOP
(Source: SOPA, data obtained from Cashman, 2011)

Fig. 7-12: Annual visitation of the SOP from 2002 to 2009
(Source: SOPA, data obtained from Cashman, 2011)
Fig. 7-13: The number of event days in each month at the ANZ Stadium (above) and Acer Arena (below) in 2007

Fig. 7-14 (left): Olympic Boulevard on a day without a major event
(Source: Photo taken by the author in 2009)
Fig. 7-15 (right): The Commonwealth Bank office in the Town Centre, morning
(Source: Photo taken by the author in 2009)
Fig. 7-16: Annual revenue from the land assets
(Source: SOPA, data obtained from Cashman, 2011)

Fig. 7-17: The NSW Government subsidies to the SOPA
(Source: SOPA, data obtained from Cashman, 2011)
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Fig. 7-18: The future image of the SOP  
(Source: SOPA, 2004c)

Fig. 7-19: The land-use plan (Comparison between the 2002 post-Olympic masterplan (left) and the Vision 2025 (right))  
(Source: SOPA, 2002 and SOPA, 2004)
Fig. 7-20: The proposed evolution of the SOP (2005–2025)
(Source: SOPA, 2004c)

Fig. 7-21: The SOP in 2006
(Source: SOPA, 2010)

Fig. 7-22: Future image of the SOP in 2030
(Source: SOPA, 2010)
Fig. 7-23: The land-use plan (Comparison between the Vision 2025 (left) and the Masterplan 2030 (right))
(Source: SOPA, 2004c and SOPA, 2010)

Fig. 7-24: Cities in city concept diagram in the Sydney region
(Source: NSW Government, 2005)
identify and protect key corridors for future expansion of the transport network

Corridors required to support identified Metropolitan Transport Plan projects require protection. While other corridors relate to projects outside the Plan’s 10 year funding envelope, their importance to future growth necessitates corridor protection now.

identify for further investigation corridors with long–term potential

Future corridors offer the opportunity to unlock urban renewal potential in established areas and further increase the proportion of people living within close proximity to their workplaces. They will also address cross regional journeys between employment centres as well as links to major activity centres such as health and education precincts. It is likely the role of public transport in these corridors would need to change over time in response to growth in demand.

Long Term Corridors for Investigation

Fig. 7-25: West Metro proposal by the Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Fig. 7-26: Proposed Western Metro Link
Fig. 7-27: The planning boundaries of the OCA (blue) and the SOPA (red)
(Source: SOPA, 2002)

Fig. 7-28: The SOP within the urban context
(Source: Author, 2009)
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Fig. 8-1: LLDC Planning boundary
(Source: GLA, 2012)

Fig. 8-2: Structure of the planning policies
(Source: GLA, 2012)
Fig. 8-3: Difference between the Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance (blue) and the LLV Opportunity Area Planning Framework (red) boundaries (Source: GLA, 2012)

Fig. 8-4: Five Olympic Fringe areas defined in the Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance (Source: GLA, 2012)
Fig. 8-5 (left): Different planning responsibility area: LCS area
(Source: OPLC, 2011)
Fig. 8-6 (middle): Different planning responsibility area: Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance boundary
(Source: GLA, 2012)
Fig. 8-7 (right): Different planning responsibility area: LLDC planning boundary
(Source: GLA, 2012)

Fig. 8-8: New “neighbourhood” created in the LOP
(Source: LLDC, 2012e)
Fig. 8-9: iCity location and proposed uses
(Source: iCity, 2012)
Fig. 8-10: The Hackney Wick Area Action Plan area and the Olympic Park
(Source: London Borough of Hackney, 2012)

Fig. 8-11: Proposed different characteristics in Hackney Wick
(Source: London Borough of Hackney, 2012)
Fig. 8-12: Post-Olympic stadium and the community track (indicated in red)
(Source: LLDC, 2012b)