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Executive Summary

1.0 Introduction

The Field Studies Council seeks to:

‘Develop a regional and national centre of excellence in urban education specialising in education for sustainable development, enabling young people to become successful learners, confident individuals and responsible citizens through the development of positive out-of-classroom educational experiences in sites and communities in East London’

The purpose of this study is to provide a business and policy review and analysis of the capacity to realise this vision in the context of the opportunities offered by the development of the London 2012 Olympic Park.

In summary:

- Interviews with East London schools and community-based organisations reveal strong support for the proposed London Education Centre in the Olympic Park. The interviewees have stressed the importance of the FSC developing strong and ongoing partnership links.

- The London Education Centre concept would provide outdoor education experiences that would cover a wide variety of curricula and meet the sustainability, social inclusion and citizenship agendas.

- Contemporary government policy, the direction of current debates and recent developments in curricula suggest that the out-of-classroom learning of the kind practiced by the FSC, and which informs the objectives of the London Education Centre, can make a significant contribution to translating government policy into practice.

- The viability of a centre arises from its potential for multiple use as an education and residential centre and in its capacity to attract partners to develop, for example, (environmental) business incubator facilities for small firms; offices for community/voluntary organisations and visitor ‘attractions’ to enhance footfall.

- The options outlined provide a number of possibilities for the establishment of a viable and successful London Education Centre. Option A – the “pavilion plus model” is the preferred option.

2.0 Terms of Reference: Aims and Scope

This study recognises the considerable strengths of the FSC which currently operates 17 field centres in the UK with over 100,000 visitors attending day and residential courses. In particular, the FSC has long established links with London schools, especially at secondary level, and a proven track record of providing out-of-classroom learning activities that focus upon a diverse range of themes, including the environment and sustainable development.
This report:

- benchmarks the education centre proposal with reference to previous Olympic and major event host cities;
- reviews the vision of the FSC in relation to the aspirations of partners and stakeholders involved in London 2012 and its legacy;
- maps the UK educational curriculum and identifies the potential for developing out-of-classroom educational experiences for young people and other potential target groups;
- references the high level of support from the GLA, the LDA, local schools and community organisations;
- identifies initial options for developing a sound business plan for an Education Centre in the London 2012 Olympic Park;
- provides a summary SWOT analysis;
- provides an initial vision of the type of sustainable build and materials envisaged as part of the centre.

3.0 London 2012 and the FSC

Context

- The government has outlined Our Promise(s) for 2012 which includes ‘making the Olympic park a blueprint for sustainable living’, ‘inspiring a generation of young people to take part in volunteering and cultural and physical activity’ and ‘transforming the heart of East London’.
- LOCOG has published a sustainability plan Towards a one planet 2012 that emphasises a thematic legacy around climate change, waste, biodiversity, social inclusion and healthy living.
- LOCOG, the ODA, Mayor of London and the London Boroughs are engaged in a complex consultation exercise designed to consolidate proposals for the legacy ownership, management and development of the Olympic Park and its permanent facilities post-2012.
- A feasibility study, commissioned by the DCMS (March 2007) presented proposals for the establishment of an Architecture and Built Environment Centre (CABE and Open Space: 2007) designed to provide two main foci – ‘showcasing’ architecture (information, education and debate) and providing a Visitor Centre - for hospitality, information and media presentations.
- LOCOG is considering the development of a (temporary) Pavilion facility aimed at providing an educational attraction that highlights all the sustainable development themes taken up in the creation of the Olympic park.

Interviews at national and regional level suggest that the key organisation in legacy planning for the Olympic Park is the LDA. The LDA will own the Park post-2012 thus giving it a vital role to play in legacy planning, including the leasing of facilities post-2012. The LDA is funded by central government but governed by the Mayor of London. LOCOG is responsible for holding a successful event and ensuring that the Park development takes place within policy guidelines and regulations but is reliant upon commercial sponsors for funding. The ODA is LOCOG’s delivery partner. In brief the key stakeholders are government (especially the DCMS) and the LDA.

4.0 Stakeholders, Partners and Project Development

Interviews with East London schools and community-based organisations reveal a high level of support for the proposed London Education Centre in the Olympic Park. The interviewees have stressed the importance of the FSC developing strong and ongoing partnership links. Responses distinguished between the residential and non-residential components of the proposal; with schools, in particular, asking for greater clarity concerning the ‘value-added’ by the residential facility in the post-2012 context. Recommendations arising from the interviews included:
Post-2012 ‘Centre’ Facility:

- Should be multi-purpose, with flexible usage including educational, residential facilities and business incubator units for enterprises (and/or social enterprises) broadly engaged with environmental/horticultural and sustainability themes;
- Include office facilities for community-based organisations and those engaged in ‘Civic Facilities Management’;
- Involve multiple rental/tenancy agreements to guarantee income;
- Provide educational/learning facilities for targeted but diverse groups.

Curriculum Development, Educational Provision:

- In the London context, the curriculum requires schools and colleges to engage with citizenship and social inclusion initiatives. The London Education Centre concept may provide ‘A level’ conference facilities and ‘outdoor education experiences’ that would meet the social inclusion and citizenship agendas thus enhancing the existing curriculum provision;
- Schools have mixed funding sources to support these activities e.g. in London ‘Aim Higher’ funding.
- Curriculum should include sports participation;
- BTec and other vocational programmes provide opportunities for developing sports management, travel, leisure and tourism courses – all encompass environmental themes;
- Capel Manor is engaged with specialised diplomas (which are intended to bridge the vocational and academic divide). Five Diplomas at 3 levels, each level is conceptually a wrapper/bundle. Horticulture and land based studies curriculum expansion is taking place at Capel Manor who are looking for growth opportunities. Currently it is working with Newham which has formed a coalition of 4 schools each with a 4 student strong cohort per school per level looking at the urban contexts of land use studies.

5.0 Mapping the Curriculum

The Policy Framework

*The Children’s Plan* (DCFS: 2007) aims to ‘Develop an entitlement for all young people to participate in positive activities which develop their talents including piloting a new offer to take part in cultural activities in and out of school (p17). This builds on the ambitions contained within the Every Child Matters legislation, and carries the expectation that ‘every school… be uncompromising in its ambitions for achievement sitting at the heart of the community it serves (p18).

Environmental Education

Research reported in *Environmental Education in the 21st Century: theory, practice, progress and promise* (Palmer: 1998) shows that a sense of care for the environment is conditioned in childhood through prolonged, repeated interaction with the natural world. The fieldwork showed that, whilst children learn about environmental challenges and environmental solutions with relative ease, the ‘attachment to environmental issues, in the sense of noticing and caring about the way local environments look, is already well established by the time children are able to grasp properly the technical concepts of environmentalism.’ This leads in the report to a call for stronger links between spontaneous discovery of nature and formal environmental education.

The report makes a number of recommendations:

1. New ways are found to facilitate environmental education through out-of-school learning and green school design
2. Better consideration is given to children’s needs in decision-making on the design of public space
3. The link between children’s well-being and the environment is embedded in national policy
4. Children from disadvantaged backgrounds are given more opportunities to access quality public space
5. The environmental dimension of the public health agenda is given greater emphasis in public policy

The second recommendation has a certain resonance with the fourth objective in the Education for Sustainable Development Action Plan of the DfES which states:

"We will make effective links between education and sustainable development to build capacity within local communities."

In doing this there is an explicit desire to actively involve children and young people in developing and delivering the sustainable development agenda and some implicit messages about involving them in decisions about their local environment. This would tap into the fact that, according to MORI Social Research Institute for CABE (Commission for the Built Environment) Education, nearly half of young people aged 11-16 want to be involved in changes to the area in which they live. However, it is still true to say – as DEMOS/Green Alliance point out – that:

"Policy on children remains only loosely connected to policy on sustainable development…there is no organisation that champions children’s perspectives on the environment on a sustained basis."

Subsequent iterations of this work and other projects on allied areas, for example Seen and Heard – reclaiming the public realm with Children and Young People (Demos: 2007) Building Health – creating and enhancing places for healthy, active lives (National Heart Forum, Living Streets and CABE: 2007) and Home Zones (www.londonplay.org.uk) all point to the conclusion that there is an imperative to enable children to reengage with the area that they live and to be active in that area. The Children’s Plan (DCSF: 2007) states that ‘Keeping children and young people safe from harm must be the priority and responsibility of us all. However, children need also to be able to learn, have new experiences and enjoy their childhoods, so we will help families strike the right balance between keeping children safe and allowing them the freedom they need’ (p7)

In summary, contemporary government policy, the direction of current debates and recent developments in curricula suggest that the out-of-classroom learning of the kind practiced by the FSC, and which informs the objectives of the London Education Centre, can make a significant contribution to translating government policy into practice.

**Humanities Subjects and the London Education Centre**

A variety of global issues may be integrated (as themes/strands of thinking/structures for courses etc) into urban studies that span the breadth of the humanities subjects e.g. diversity of urban/metropolitan cities; transformation of childhood; fair trade; ethical fashion; connections between leisure/sport/industrialisation and capitalism; sustainability; Human Rights; Poverty and social justice; media literacy; environmentalism and perhaps most importantly critical literacy.

**Sports and Physical Activities Subjects and the London Education Centre**

The new *PE & Sport Strategy for Young People* (to be launched 2008) forms part of a Public Service Agreement:
"To deliver a successful Olympic Games and Paralympic Games with a sustainable legacy and get more children and young people taking part in high quality PE and sport".

Alongside this there are ambitious targets regarding active participation of young people. The London Education Centre based at the Olympic Park could provide curricula based PE activities that use the physical sporting legacy of the park itself.

In summary, there is evidence of local schools engaging creatively with London 2012 through curriculum and out-of-school activities. The FSC may facilitate this activity and enrich it through combinations of outdoor, virtual and on-site educational activities. Second, Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) is an important component of curriculum development across the arts, humanities and sciences, the FSC may play an important role in facilitating its further development in partnership with Schools. Finally, a brief mapping of the humanities curriculum demonstrates the huge potential for the FSC to develop its ‘Olympic’ educational activities across a wide range of the school and college curriculum.

6.0 FSC Financial Position

The FSC operations are currently financially sound. The financial challenges it faces in the period 2007-10 relate to the following:

- Sustaining levels of income and controlling costs to enable the expansion of the Development Fund;
- The matching of the Development Fund with other donations/income to meet the capital costs arising from the need to improve centre facilities;
- The necessity to improve occupation rates in ‘outlying’ centres, to reduce cross-subsidising of activities;
- Shifting the funding model (especially in the London context) to ensure that surplus arises from a balance between the fees received from the ‘outdoor education provision’ – the core activity - and the residential component of that provision.

While the financial strategy meets existing needs, clearly the FSC cannot alone provide the capital to meet the costs of establishing a permanent education facility on the Olympic site. It needs funding partners to deliver its vision for 2012.

7.0 Stakeholders in 2012 and FSC Options

The options identified below recognise the necessity for the FSC to engage with London 2012 in the pre-event phase as a precursor to its potential involvement in the post-2012 Olympic Park site. Engagement is a complex affair given the nature of governance of 2012. The key stakeholders required to support any FSC initiative are likely to be:

- Central Government (DCMS and Department of Communities and Local Government);
- LOCOG/ODA;
- Mayor of London/LDA;
- Five Olympic boroughs, especially Newham;
- London Schools
- A corporate sponsor(s) committed to a significant investment to facilitate the creation or conversion of a building on the Olympic park for the FSC as a residential education centre facility.

Of the above, evidence from consultations and interviews points to the LDA as the primary agency concerned with legacy. The LDA is central government funded and controlled by the Mayor’s office. It will have formal ownership of the Olympic Park on completion of the games, hence its strategic importance concerning legacy.
LOCOG is dependent almost entirely upon sponsor donations to fulfil its brief for staging the event. Whilst the LDA is the key agency, support for the London Education Centre concept must be secured from the other stakeholders.

8.0 Options

Option A: ‘Pavilion Plus’ – the preferred model

Engagement in the pre-event period is critical to the FSC’s long term involvement with the Olympic Park in its legacy phase. Government and LOCOG are committed to the creation of a showcase pavilion to highlight sustainability themes:

One Planet Pavilion:

This will be a state-of-the-art, environmentally-designed pavilion within the Olympic Park. It will serve as the primary showcase for London 2012 Sustainability Partners and contribute to the visitor experience during the Games. (Source: LOCOG 26 November 2007)

The pavilion is associated with ‘the promotion of respect for the environment, through the one planet education programme’ (London 2012 Sustainability Programme, November 2007, p12). This commitment represents an important opportunity for the FSC, with Newham Council and others, to become engaged as a partner in the delivery of the sustainability education programme by demonstrating how an idea for a visitor centre may be transformed into a centre for school students and visitors that benefits from the FSC’s expertise in providing outdoor and on-site education that addresses each of the five sustainability themes – climate change, waste, biodiversity, inclusion, and healthy living.

The ‘Plus’ component of this option relates to the leverage gained by the FSC as a partner in the provision of the Pavilion education/visitor attraction. It is possible that LOCOG and other partners may consider the retention of the Pavilion on a permanent basis, especially if there is evidence of its viability as an education centre. If this is countenanced, it may be possible to secure sponsorship from an Olympic or other sponsoring enterprise to develop a purpose-built residential facility to provide accommodation for visiting school students and other UK and international visitors to the Olympic Park post-2012. It may be possible to establish such a centre as a component of the proposed permanent facilities already earmarked for the site. The viability of a Centre arises from its potential for multiple use as an education and residential centre and in its capacity to attract partners to develop, for example, (environmental) business incubator facilities for small firms; offices for community/voluntary organisations and visitor ‘attractions’ to enhance footfall.

The Pavilion Plus option requires:

- FSC involvement in the ‘One Planet’ education programme and the Pavilion by demonstrating to the 2012 partners a capacity to provide a high quality workshop and outdoor educational experience for London’s school students and other visitors;
- The rapid development of an outline educational programme designed to address the five sustainability themes of London 2012 and relate to the UK Schools and Colleges curriculum;
- Engagement with potential commercial partners to secure sponsorship for funding a permanent education facility on the Olympic Park;
• Specification of the residential facility required – one, two, four bedroom facilities with dining area and other amenities to house up to 120 students/visitors per night; at a capital cost of between 10 and 15 million pounds.

Option B: A Voluntary/Public/Private Sector Partnership (VPPP)

Option B is a flexible variant of Option A. Clearly engagement with educational and visitor event provision prior to 2012 remains an important goal for the FSC. Through negotiations with partners it is possible that a ‘wider’ vision of outdoor educational provision in East London and the Thames Gateway may provide the capacity for the Olympic Park to be one important component of an educational strategy that establishes a London Education Centre with residential facilities off the Olympic Park site but within close proximity to the Park and within reach of several important environmental sites along the Thames Gateway. The Olympic Park would remain a central focus for educational provision but would become part of a wider urban environment programme.

A key partner in developing the London Education Centre off, but close to, the Olympic Park, would be Newham and/or other Olympic boroughs for whom other major project developments (Carpenters Park, Stratford City) are taking place in parallel to the Olympic site development. These developments may provide opportunities for the FSC to join with public and private sector partners to develop a residential facility that provides a base for outdoor educational activities to take place in the Olympic Park and more widely within the Thames Gateway. Newham, for example, is the location of a Regatta Centre (Royal Docks) which already has a 30 bed dormitory facility. Enhancement of such a facility could enable the local authority with partners to develop its sports participation and environmental educational provision through the development of a multi-purpose residential site.

The VPPP option requires:

• Strong support from local authorities;
• A commercial sponsor committed to constructing an Education Centre, possibly as part of a ‘Section 106’ form of development near to the Olympic Park;
• A development plan that demonstrates the economic viability of the London Education Centre, including its flexible use as an educational, business and office facility;
• Use of the Olympic Park post-2012 to examine the ‘best practice’ habitats, buildings and environmental projects, including their wider application in the Thames Gateway and UK.

Option C: London Olympic Park Education Centre and Outsourced Residential Facilities

Outsourced residential facilities may be obtainable from an existing institution or enterprise – a local hostel or budget hotel. At this time, however, there are no local hostels or hotels that could effectively meet these requirements. Of course, there are a number of hotels (and presumably hostels) that will be established in the area closer to 2012 to accommodate visitors, spectators and the media. It is very difficult to estimate the room rates for these providers in the lead up to the Games, or in post-Games environment. Two other possibilities in terms of accommodation provision have also been explored.

• The use of UEL student accommodation outside of the university term time, however this could be of limited use due to the clash of academic dates.
• The use of the London Regatta Centre. The Centre can only accommodate 30 in a combination of dorm rooms (2 rooms with 8 beds), plus a mix of rooms with 4 and 2 beds. There are en suite showers and w.c's. The current group rate is very reasonable – 15 pounds per person per night. Expansion of this facility would require strong support from Newham local authority as the precursor to approaching the Regatta Centre.
It is possible to envisage outsourced residential accommodation, such as the above, being available prior to 2012.

Option C would require:

- Strong support from the local authority (Newham) or another partner with appropriate accommodation;
- A commitment from the local authority to expand the use of leisure/recreation and outdoor education facilities provided by the Regatta Centre and its related buildings;
- Acceptance within the FSC of the principle of splitting accommodation and education provision;
- Outline plans for inter site travel between outsourced accommodation and the activity area.
- An analysis of the threats posed by the outsourced accommodation provider establishing their own version of related activity.

**Option D: The ‘No Change’ Scenario**

This option assumes no significant change to the FSC Strategic Plan and no new capital resources to enable FSC engagement with London 2012. The main opportunity presented by London 2012, therefore, arises from the extension of existing activities to engage with the environmental and scientific developments taking place in and around the Olympic Park in East London.

The FSC would become a key education provider, organising school pupil access to the Olympic site in the pre and post event phases offering a combination of residential and day school programmes that could, for example, build upon the principles and values underpinning the FSC’s ‘London Outdoor Science’ initiative. This option requires:

- Continuation of the ‘good practice’ values of the London Challenge project, as an education initiative in the post-2007 period;
- Central government support and funding;
- Support from London schools;
- Curriculum development that explores the potential of A level conferences; civic and social inclusion programmes; the environmental aspects of vocational programmes such as leisure, tourism and travel;
- Exploration of the potential for outdoor education provision to be a component of programmes for overseas visitors and tourists;
- Expansion of FSC resources to enable the ‘Olympic Park’ programme to commence from, say, 2010 and continue into the post-event legacy phase;
- Concentration on day provision or day provision plus the renting from a third party (YMCA, University – Epping Forest is a non-residential FSC facility) of ‘off-site’ residential facilities.

**9.0 Costing The Options**

**Option A**

The FSC London Education Centre plan proposes a 3,000 sq metres facility over 3 floors with residential accommodation for up to 150. Based upon 2008 prices the estimated cost of constructing this facility is between £10 and £18 million. This estimate reflects the capital costs of construction in Stratford, East London in 2008. The estimate should be treated with caution since:

- The estimate is based upon an outline rather than detailed specification;
- It is assumed that the LDA will continue to own the land with no costs for land purchase but costs based upon as yet unspecified leasehold arrangements;
The estimate is based upon current prices and divides into – residential, teaching, services, office/incubator units – the degree of ‘flexible’ use of the centre depends upon many factors including partnership arrangements with other institutions/enterprises (see Option B)

**Option B**

The main distinction between Options A and B is that the recurrent costs would be shared by multiple users of the London Education Centre; those institutions who may take incubator or office space. It is likely that the FSC is the lead partner in this flexible use option. Evidence from potential stakeholder partners suggests that such an option is feasible with partners emerging through the process of discussion with LOCOG, LDA and other institutions engaged in legacy consultations.

**Option C**

The main obstacle to this Option is the lack of identifiable facilities in East London (as at Winter, 2008) and the proposed division of residential and educational experience that runs counter to FSC educational philosophy. It is likely that the development of rentable facilities would require capital investment from a partner institution such as Newham Council or corporate sponsor/partner. The facilities development may be possible if attached to an existing plan for the re-development of existing premises, such as the Regatta Centre at Docklands. The advantage of this Option to the FSC is that rented accommodation does not carry significant capital and recurrent costs relating to maintenance, depreciation etc. The main component of recurrent cost is the cost per night of accommodation for staff and students. At 2008 prices the cost per night of accommodation in the area varies between £18-25 for hostel accommodation and £40-48 per night for basic hotel accommodation (typically, excluding meals).

**Option D**

Option D adds an Olympic dimension to the FSC’s current educational and financial models with delivery being based upon non-residential provision. It is likely that the FSC could achieve sufficient student numbers for Option D to realise a surplus from this activity alone;

**10.0 FSC Organisational Development**

It is recommended that, if successful in engaging with ‘London 2012’ and associated policy agendas the FSC considers the following:

- The establishment of a London base;
- The development of a marketing strategy to ‘re-launch’ the FSC in the urban setting;
- A review of existing Education Centres – including numbers, locations and utilisation/occupancy rates with a view to maximising (development fund) investment in growth areas of FSC business i.e. the possibility of relocation of resources form less viable centres to the London Education Centre;
- The establishment of an institutionalised network of London schools and other partnership agencies involved in Olympics education
1.0 Introduction

The Field Studies Council seeks to:

‘Develop a regional and national centre of excellence in urban education specialising in education for sustainable development, enabling young people to become successful learners, confident individuals and responsible citizens through the development of positive out-of-classroom educational experiences in sites and communities in East London’

The purpose of this study is to provide a rigorous business and policy review and analysis of the capacity to realise this vision in the context of the opportunities offered by the development of the London 2012 Olympic Park.

In summary:

- Interviews with East London schools and community-based organisations reveal strong support for the proposed London Education Centre in the Olympic Park. The interviewees have stressed the importance of the FSC developing strong and ongoing partnership links.

- The London Education Centre concept would provide outdoor education experiences that would cover a wide variety of curricula and meet the sustainability, social inclusion and citizenship agendas.

- Contemporary government policy, the direction of current debates and recent developments in curricula suggest that the out-of-classroom learning of the kind practiced by the FSC, and which informs the objectives of the London Education Centre, can make a significant contribution to translating government policy into practice.

- The viability of a Centre arises from its potential for multiple use as an education and residential centre and in its capacity to attract partners to develop, for example, (environmental) business incubator facilities for small firms; offices for community/voluntary organisations and visitor ‘attractions’ to enhance footfall.

- The options outlined provide a number of possibilities for the establishment of a viable and successful London Education Centre. Option A – the “pavilion plus model” is the preferred option.

2.0 Terms of Reference: Aims and Scope

This study recognises the considerable strengths of the FSC which currently operates 17 field centres in the UK with over 100,000 visitors attending day and residential courses. In particular, the FSC has long established links with London schools, especially at secondary level, and a proven track record
of providing out-of-classroom learning activities that focus upon a diverse range of themes, including the environment and sustainable development.

This report:

- benchmarks the London Education Centre proposal with reference to previous Olympic and major event host cities;
- reviews the vision of the FSC in relation to the aspirations of partners and stakeholders involved in London 2012 and its legacy;
- maps the UK educational curriculum and identifies the potential for developing out-of-classroom educational experiences for young people and other potential target groups;
- references the high level of support from the GLA, the LDA, local schools and community organisations;
- identifies initial options for developing a sound business plan for an Education Centre in the London 2012 Olympic Park;
- outlines the financial implications of the Options;
- provides a summary SWOT analysis;
- provides an initial vision of the type of sustainable build and materials envisaged as part of the centre.

3.0 Olympic Parks and Education Centres – Benchmarking

Educational and cultural programmes, events and facilities are a characteristic feature of the physical legacy of the Games and are enshrined in the values of Olympism. Each city (and regional, national government) has used the opportunity of hosting the Games to promote social and cultural values and education programmes within the city and across the region and nation (with the exceptions of Athens and Atlanta) and has used the Olympic Park as a post-Games venue for a variety of educational and cultural events and exhibitions.

In brief:

- Sydney Olympic Park (2000) has an education centre and residential facility that hosts education programmes for young people – it is perhaps the best example of Education Centre provision located in an Olympic Park, with residential facilities run by the YMCA;
- Barcelona hosts a ‘Barcelona Field Study Centre’ which provides day and residential courses mainly aimed at the 11-13 years, 14-16 years, 16-19 years students. Courses last between 2-7 days with the residential facilities provided, out of season, by 2* and 3* hotels located along the coast at Sitges. The courses are provided by a private company;
- Beijing (2008) and Sydney (2000) have the most comprehensive approach to incorporating Olympic education into the schools and colleges curriculum at national level;
- All host cities have used the Olympic Park as a location for cultural and social events in the post-Games period providing, for example, performing arts events and venues for permanent museums and sculpture parks;
- All Olympic Parks have visitor facilities, incorporating tours, lectures and workshops that celebrate ‘green spaces’ and other features of best practice such as sports facilities, architecture and environmental design;
- Olympic Park educational legacy varies from ‘formal’ institutional provision (Sydney, Barcelona, Beijing) to ‘informal’ community-based festivals and fun-days (Atlanta);
All Olympic parks have legacy ‘visitor facilities’ that conduct tours, day workshops, seminars and leisure, recreational events that focus upon sport, culture, art, urban and environmental themes.

Table 1: Summary of Host City Education Provision in the Olympic Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Facilities – non-sports</th>
<th>Activities &amp; Target Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seoul 1988</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Kindergarten arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Exhibition</td>
<td>Exercise for residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sculpture park</td>
<td>Conferences, seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global Village Garden</td>
<td>School visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental (water)</td>
<td>Tourist visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage, ancient site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona 1992</td>
<td>Green spaces</td>
<td>Tourist visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sculpture/Arts installations</td>
<td>School visitors and students;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban studies/Environmental studies for Spanish and international groups</td>
<td>Group sizes approx from 12 to 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta 1996</td>
<td>Green spaces</td>
<td>Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community events</td>
<td>Tourist visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘informal’ education, crafts and art classes</td>
<td>Business tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney 2000</td>
<td>Education Centre</td>
<td>School students – day and residential;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential facility</td>
<td>Tourist visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental and urban studies</td>
<td>Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens 2004</td>
<td>Cultural Tours</td>
<td>Tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing 2008</td>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>Chinese schools, colleges and universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sculpture park</td>
<td>Visiting/exchange scholars;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of a new ‘city’ within Beijing</td>
<td>Tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olympic Special Schools</td>
<td>‘new’ city dwellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion of curriculum e.g learning English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0 London 2012 and the FSC

The government has outlined Our Promise(s) for 2012 which include ‘making the Olympic park a blueprint for sustainable living’, ’inspiring a generation of young people to take part in volunteering and cultural and physical activity’ and ‘transforming the heart of East London’. In turn, LOCOG has published a sustainability plan Towards a one planet 2012 that emphasises a thematic legacy around climate change, waste, biodiversity, social inclusion and healthy living. In pursuing these themes LOCOG, the ODA, Mayor of London and the London Boroughs are engaged in a complex consultation exercise designed to consolidate proposals for the legacy ownership, management and development of the Olympic Park and its permanent facilities post-2012. A feasibility study, commissioned by the DCMS (March: 2007) presented proposals for the establishment of an Architecture and Built Environment Centre (CABE and Open Space: 2007) designed to provide two main foci – ‘showcasing’ architecture (information, education and debate) and providing a Visitor Centre – for hospitality, information and media presentations. LOCOG, in turn, is considering the development of a (temporary) Pavilion facility aimed at providing an educational attraction that highlights all the sustainable development themes taken up in the creation of the
Olympic park, LOCOG, however, is dependent upon 2012 corporate sponsors to meet the costs of the Pavilion. These, and other, policy initiatives provide an important set of opportunities and threats for the proposed FSC project (see the SWOT analysis).

The Department for Communities and Local Government is proposing the setting up of an Institute of Urban Renaissance in the East of London. This will include planning and architecture courses from level 3 to 4 upwards. However, the GLA provides little support for this proposition since it does not seize the opportunity to engage heavily with local communities in the area, and it seems exclusive – while high level courses in regeneration are needed, in this context the Institute of Urban Renaissance does not really attract the breadth of community engagement envisaged. An FSC Centre that teaches the themes of regeneration, sustainability and urban renaissance to a broad spectrum of users (from the 11-14 year old core market, through to adult community based learners) would, according to a GLA senior officer, be of more use, and would add real value to the Olympic legacy proposition, especially if that vision included the expansion of the centre’s role to include the developments in the Thames Gateway.

5.0 Stakeholders, Partners and Project Development

Interviews with East London schools, consultancies, small and medium sized creative enterprises and community-based organisations reveal strong support for the proposed London Education Centre in the Olympic Park; particularly from local boroughs (Hackney, Newham) and the Hammersmith and Fulham Urban Studies Centre. The interviewees have stressed the importance of the FSC developing partnership links with institutions to develop the Centre concept. For example, Newham has ‘Fairplay House’, a small scale urban studies centre whose work would complement that of the London Education Centre in the Olympic Park. Responses distinguished between the residential and non-residential components of the proposal; with schools, in particular, asking for greater clarity concerning the ‘value-added’ by the residential facility in the post-2012 context.

However, testimonials by local teachers using FSC Margam Park – a residential centre managed for Neath and Port Talbot Borough Council by FSC, and situated in within the borough which is one of the most deprived in Wales – show the full potential of local residential experiences.

The Education Centre in Margam Park, has been open since September 1998 and has run to capacity during term time ever since. Despite being on the doorstep of the majority of students that stay there, it provides a residential experience and offers a multitude of opportunities to explore their social, moral and cultural development, as well as being a fantastic learning experience. Indeed, the fact that they attend a local residential centre gives them, in our experience, the confidence to seek development experiences further a field.

With all schools utilising the Residential Experience coming from between 2 and 25 miles of the centre, the majority of such students who stay at the Centre have never stayed away from home without parents before and the proximity of the centre to the schools can be reassuring for children and parents alike. Indeed, it is proven that the intensity of a well run residential experience enhances living and retention and the focus on living within local environment, has proven direct links to enhanced learning in the schools setting.

However, one of the things that impresses me most and reinforces my keen support is the fact that children who visit the centre and are keen to revisit the park and often bring parents and extended family with them.

Karl Napieralla, Corporate Director of Education, Leisure & Lifelong Learning, Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council
“As a school we attend 3 different, but very local, residential centres in years 4, 5 and 6 and have done for many years. Whilst these centres are close to home, staying at them rather than visiting for the day has many benefits.

- **Children have a chance to try staying away from parents. If staying away is too much for them, parents are not too far away to come and get them**

- **Whilst the centres are close to home, they have things that we don’t have, such as green areas and safe areas without traffic. These elements are especially useful in a residential setting as children can be taken out safely at night or in the evening for camp fires, bat watches, moonlight walks, etc.**

- **Children staying away from home often benefit from a change of place, especially in areas with gangs or violence. In certain areas children limit themselves because they feel they need to conform, away from this peer pressure, they can feel freer to grow.**

- **Children with poor or limited diets have to try new foods in residential settings. With the current emphasis on healthy eating, this cannot be underestimated.**

- **Children sharing sleeping/living areas need to learn to compromise and work together to keep areas clean and tidy. They also need to learn to be considerate to the needs and feelings of others. They also tend to learn how to resolve disputes without adult intervention.**

All in all – Residential centres, whether close by or far away, allow children to develop and experiment with leaving home in a safe, controlled environment.

**Being close by has the benefits of**
- Proximity to parents
- Reduced costs of travel”

Sian Charlton - Manselten Primary School

“The week was fantastic! Our pupils were safe, active and thinking all the time. The quality of the teaching and opportunities provided for our pupils was first rate. The fact that the centre was close to home also added to the success of the week. Knowing that family was not too far way gave some of our pupils the confidence to attend; a decision they may not have had had the centre been further away. Some of our pupils have also taken family and friends back to the park as a result of their visit, which again would not be possible if the centre was not on our doorstep.”

Having such a quality experience close at hand is a resource we value highly and is a situation we would recommend to others.

Lloyd Jones - Tonnau Primary Community School

**Other recommendations for the London Education Centre arising from the interviews included:**

Post-2012 ‘Centre’ Facility:

- Should be multi-purpose, with flexible usage including educational, residential facilities and business incubator units for enterprises (and/or social enterprises) broadly engaged with environmental/horticultural, the built environment and sustainability themes;
• Include office facilities for community-based organisations and those engaged in ‘Civic Facilities Management’;
• Involve multiple rental/tenancy agreements to guarantee income;
• Provide educational/learning facilities for targeted but diverse groups.

Curriculum Development, Educational Provision:

• In the London context, the curriculum requires schools and colleges to engage with citizenship and social inclusion initiatives. The London Education Centre concept may provide ‘A level’ conference facilities and ‘outdoor education experiences’ that would meet the social inclusion and citizenship agendas thus enhancing the existing curriculum provision;
• The London Education Centre offers an important opportunity to bring together people and projects and include staff development activities – a model being the Royal Geographical Society’s INSET programme;
• Schools have mixed funding sources to support these activities e.g. in London ‘Aim Higher’ funding.
• Curriculum should include sports participation;
• BTEC and other vocational programmes provide opportunities for developing travel, leisure and tourism courses – all encompass environmental themes, e.g. eco-tourism;
• Capel Manor is engaged with specialised diplomas (which are intended to bridge vocational and academic divide). 5 Dips at 3 levels, each level is conceptually a wrapper/bundle. Horticulture and land based studies curriculum expansion is taking place at Capel Manor who are looking for growth opportunities. Currently it is working with Newham which has formed a coalition of 4 schools each with a 4 student strong cohort per school per level looking for urban contexts of land use studies;
• Currently, the RSPB centre at Rainham, Essex has an education team and provides educational activities for school groups: below from their webpage:

  ‘The Education team offer a comprehensive and exciting array of curriculum linked field study visits for all school levels. We have Woodland, Reedbed and Marshland Discovery Zones, an Environment and Education centre, fully equipped classrooms, specific study areas, pond dipping areas…. A selection of lifelong learning courses on a variety of topics are run throughout the year, along with a range of children’s activities, including holiday clubs’.

• Philip Allen – a branch of Hodder – run study days for teachers: this has included a study tour of East London for which they charge £200 a day. They ran this for an estimated 200 teachers in 2006. The tours continued in 2007. Teachers from all over the UK attended, including numbers from the independent sector. When attending this tour, the impression gained is that the teachers were looking to bring their pupils to the area and are looking for a base. By and large these were geography teachers. This example suggests that there is market potential in staff development programmes provided by the London Education centre.

Finally, institutions raised questions concerning the residential component of the London Education Centre idea, especially in the context of London based school students. Funding for the residential component is difficult to find for many London schools and the emphasis of residential programmes has to be upon the enhancement of the student’s c.v. or ‘social capital’ e.g. overseas travel, volunteering projects etc. While London based students will provide a large and local market for the
centre, the ‘social capital’ provision of a residential stay for non-London UK students and European students has also been identified.

### 6.0 Mapping the Education Curriculum

#### The Policy Framework

*The Children’s Plan* aims to ‘Develop an entitlement for all young people to participate in positive activities which develop their talents including piloting a new offer to take part in cultural activities in and out of school (p17). This builds on the ambitions contained within the Every Child Matters legislation, and carries the expectation that ‘every school… be uncompromising in its ambitions for achievement sitting at the heart of the community it serves (p18). The extent to which these ambitions are met will depend, to a large extent, on the accountability procedures that are put in place. QCA tasked *FutureLab* to look at ways of developing and accrediting personal skills and competencies.

The aims of the exercise were to:

- draw together a review of current projects and initiatives which provide insights into different approaches to developing young people’s skills and competencies (broadly classified as ‘21st century skills’) through non-subject led approaches
- identify the skills and competencies that young people need to survive and flourish
- explore how we prepare young people for life, leisure and work today

Broadly speaking the report recognised that these questions are being raised by employers, governments, parents, educators and young people themselves in response to the changing social, economic and technological landscapes of the 21st century. This is leading to calls for a richer conception of curriculum.

#### Environmental Education

Research reported in *Environmental Education in the 21st Century: theory, practice, progress and promise* (Palmer: 1998) shows that a sense of care for the environment is conditioned in childhood through prolonged, repeated interaction with the natural world. The fieldwork showed that, whilst children learn about environmental challenges and environmental solutions with relative ease, the ‘attachment to environmental issues, in the sense of noticing and caring about the way local environments look, is already well established by the time children are able to grasp properly the technical concepts of environmentalism.’ This leads in the report to a call for stronger links between spontaneous discovery of nature and formal environmental education.

The report makes a number of recommendations:

6. New ways are found to facilitate environmental education through out-of-school learning and green school design
7. Better consideration is given to children’s needs in decision-making on the design of public space
8. The link between children’s well-being and the environment is embedded in national policy
9. Children from disadvantaged backgrounds are given more opportunities to access quality public space
10. The environmental dimension of the public health agenda is given greater emphasis in public policy.

Recommendation 6 has a certain resonance with the fourth objective in the Education for Sustainable Development Action Plan of the DfES which states:

“We will make effective links between education and sustainable development to build capacity within local communities.”

In doing this there is an explicit desire to actively involve children and young people in developing and delivering the sustainable development agenda and some implicit messages about involving them in decisions about their local environment. This would tap into the fact that, according to MORI Social Research Institute for CABE (Commission for the Built Environment) Education, nearly half of young people aged 11-16 want to be involved in changes to the area in which they live. However, it is still true to say – as DEMOS/Green Alliance point out – that:

“Policy on children remains only loosely connected to policy on sustainable development…there is no organisation that champions children’s perspectives on the environment on a sustained basis.”

Subsequent iterations of this work and other projects on allied areas, for example Seen and Heard – reclaiming the public realm with Children and Young People (Demos: 2007) Building Health – creating and enhancing places for healthy, active lives (National Heart Forum, Living Streets and CABE: 2007) and Home Zones (www.londonplay.org.uk) all point to the conclusion that there is an imperative to enable children to reengage with the area that they live and to be active in that area. The Children’s Plan (DCSF: 2007) states that keeping children and young people safe from harm must be the priority and responsibility of us all. However, children need also to be able to learn, have new experiences and enjoy their childhoods, so we will help families strike the right balance between keeping children safe and allowing them the freedom they need (p7).

A recent DCMS press statement (January 28, 2008) announced that a study would be undertaken into establishing a school in the Olympic stadium post-2012:

JOINT DCMS/DCSF PRESS RELEASE

Olympics Minister Tessa Jowell and Schools Minister Jim Knight today announced that they have commissioned a review to explore the possibility of establishing a school at the Olympic stadium site after the 2012 Games.

The review will advise Ministers this summer. It will be led by Ian Stewart, who retired last year as Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire County Council, and has previous experience both as a senior civil servant in the departments responsible for education and as a footballer and football manager.

The review's terms of reference are “To advise Government on potential options for securing an educational legacy at the Olympic Stadium site after the 2012 Games”. The review will consult widely among the many expert stakeholders: sporting, educational, local and Olympic.

In summary, contemporary government policy, the direction of current debates and recent developments in curricula suggest that the out-of-classroom learning of the kind practiced by the FSC, and which underpin the objectives of the London Education Centre at the Olympic Park, can make a significant contribution to translating policy into practice.
Humanities Subjects and the London Education Centre

A variety of global issues may be integrated (as themes/strands of thinking/structures for courses etc) into urban studies that span the breadth of the humanities subjects e.g. diversity of urban/metropolitan cities; transformation of childhood; fair trade; ethical fashion; connections between leisure/sport/industrialisation and capitalism; sustainability; Human Rights; Poverty and social justice; media literacy; environmentalism and perhaps most importantly critical literacy.

Such a centre can also enhance opportunities for teachers to consider what education for sustainable development (ESD) is about. There are opportunities for ESD across all humanities subjects; case studies of developing practice in ESD across the full range of these subjects and contexts; and guidance on, and case studies of, the management of school development of ESD.

A summary ‘mapping’ of humanities subjects (sociology; citizenship; history; psychology; and geography) highlighting some of the units relevant to an urban education centre is provided below. This list is not exhaustive and good teachers will find connections across most of their units – but what follows are some of the more obvious ones:

Sociology:
Relevant Units: culture and identity; power and politics; education; world sociology; research methods; media; crime and deviance; stratification; sociology of the family.

Key themes: globalisation; gender/ethnic/class identities; industrialisation; sociology of sport; racism; media portrayal of sporting identities; gatekeepers and news production; migration; sociology of work; surveillance; zones of transition; social construction of identities; identity and disability; shifting housing patterns; homelessness; employment; the role of the police and surveillance in public events; relationship between sport and advertising; demographics and relationships to athletes and different sporting audiences; changes in family structures.

Citizenship:
Relevant Units: Identity and multiculturalism; rights and responsibilities; human rights; active citizenship; the global world; government and politics; the media; the economy; careers.

Key themes: Racism; ethics (e.g. in public spending bids; performance enhancing drugs etc); policy making; immigration and diversity; decision making; human rights (e.g. linked to China Games); roles of the voluntary sectors; campaigns/protest groups; personal health and well-being.

History:
Relevant Units: Ancient Civilisations; Black people’s America; Nazi Germany; Local History (research projects); local studies and social history; post-war Britain and the world; Science and technology.

Key themes: developing research skills; prejudice (e.g. Owens Berlin 1936; Black Power Mexico 1968); History of sport and of the Olympics; discrimination; civil rights; globalisation; industrialisation/post-industrialisation; jobs, housing and leisure; rural/urban transformation; core/periphery;
Psychology:
Relevant Units: Causes of aggression; anti-social behaviour; motivation; personality; gender development; health psychology; psychology of sport; psychology of environment; crowds and collective behaviour; personal space and territory; density and crowding; architecture and behaviour;

Key themes: developing research skills; psychology behind advertising; effects of games on prejudice/racism within the community; theories behind different social identities; drug related dependency in sports; self-efficacy; social learning theory; personality types and sport; physiology of sport and alleviation of depression; theories of motivation; psychology and environmental/architectural planning;

Geography:
Relevant Units: Rivers; population pressure and resource management; settlements; Tourism; economic activity; urban/rural environments and development; eco-systems; tourism and development; population and migration; sport, fashion and shopping;

Key themes: Map work skills; investigations and projects; urbanisation; gentrification; land use; employment patterns; environment and environmentalism; the global economy; diversity of cities around the world; fair trade and ethical fashion; migration; competing resources; consumerism

Examples of activities that could be run by centre that embrace all areas of Humanities:

- Day courses to provide short research training courses for pupils researching the area before carrying out research on and in the area;
- writing the next bid for the Olympics;
- base for trips to London museums/heritage sites;
- meeting point for local museum staff/politicians/policy makers/community staff/subject teachers etc;
- Collation and access to statistics/photographs from Olympic games around the world;
- student design of Olympic posters;
- historic study of the development of the Thames/waterways;
- projects on 'why London was chosen for the Games';
- study on effects of the Games on public services and infrastructure;
- students to walk area taking photographs of key aspects of changing landscape (could lead to photographic exhibitions);
- Residential exchanges for pupils from other Olympic cities around the world;
- design alternative logo for Games;
- research on history of Paralympics (local and international);
- Expert talks on effects of Paralympics on sporting/media identities;
- organised trips to Olympic site for fieldwork;
- impact on environment (flora and fauna);
- Investigate/analyse skilled/unskilled migrant labour patterns in host cities;
- Exhibition on role of Olympic Games in democratic participation;
- venue for police to talk about policing and surveillance strategies;
- design an exercise/health plan for 2012 future athletes;
• art/poetry competitions on themes related to games;
• a museum of local history resources linked History to both Geography and Ecology;

The Olympics and the London Education Centre:

- A significant ‘glocal’ connection would be to look at the docklands development compared and contrasted to the development and legacy of the Olympics. This parallel contains within it themes that could be of interest on a number of levels i.e. East London, the UK and any international audience. The Museum in Docklands does not really cover this particular comparison nor does the Museum of London.

- The new diplomas (in particular: creative and the media; engineering; construction and the built environment; land-based and the environment; hospitality and catering; sport and leisure) would also be well-served by such a centre both in the run up to games and in the aftermath. Any educational developments for this could be resourced on-line for national/consortia usage.

- Bow Boys School run a compulsory GCSE Humanities for all of KS4. In year 11, there is a coursework component which they have turned in to an investigative piece on the extent to which the 2012 Games will benefit 14-16 year olds in Tower Hamlets. Students visit the site to visually assess the air and amenity quality and conduct interviews with youths living in Tower Hamlets. They then compare their findings with the experience of other Olympic cities. More able students compare what they have discovered with the official press releases/publicity so far released by the boroughs and Olympic committee. They plan to run this coursework unit every autumn term until the Games take place in 2012.

In summary, there is evidence of local schools engaging creatively with London 2012 through curriculum and out-of-school activities. The FSC may facilitate this activity and enrich it through combinations of outdoor, virtual and on-site educational activities. The potential for such combined ‘curriculum+adventure’ courses is demonstrated through the FSC’s own experience of delivering over 850 residential courses to 34,000 secondary school pupils over the past three years as part of the London Challenge programme. Through a combination of teacher training and awareness development the popularity of courses which combine sport, adventure activity and curriculum subjects (such as science and geography) has grown to the point where they are now more popular than courses which treat each of these education areas in isolation from each other.

Second, Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) is an important component of curriculum development across the arts, humanities and sciences, the FSC may play an important role in facilitating its further development in partnership with Schools. Finally, a brief mapping of the humanities’ curriculum demonstrates the huge potential for the FSC to develop its ‘Olympic’ educational activities across a wide range of the school and college curriculum.

Sports and Physical Activity at the London Education Centre

The new PE & Sport Strategy for Young People (to be launched 2008) forms part of a Public Service Agreement:
'To deliver a successful Olympic Games and Paralympic Games with a sustainable legacy and get more children and young people taking part in high quality PE and sport'.

Alongside this there are ambitious targets regarding active participation of young people. The London Education Centre based at the Olympic Park could provide curricula based PE activities that use the physical sporting legacy of the park itself. This type of day and residential sports development programme has been successfully established in Sydney as part of the legacy programme there.

7.0  FSC: The Current Business Model

Currently, the FSC has 17 education centres; three of these are non-residential and 14 residential. The smallest residential facility provides accommodation for 48, the largest for 130. Of the 14 centres, one third is owned (following donation of the building), one third is rented and one third is run in partnership with another institution. It is noted that:

- In the early 1970s there were between 400-500 field centres in the UK, this has fallen to 250 with a large number of providers now being from the private sector;
- Most facilities in the private and voluntary sector now provide maximum 3 day residential courses with an eleven month per annum operating cycle;
- For the FSC 68-70% capacity utilisation is the target though 40% is the current norm, remote centres such as those in Scotland and Northern Ireland may operate at 20 percent, though the lowest in the rest of the UK is 36 percent;
- The FSC has a National Pricing Structure with four bands and seasonal variations in price; given assessment schedules for school pupils the peak activity periods are largely circumscribed hence the impact upon capacity utilisation;
- Costs across FSC facilities vary per visitor night; the surplus achieved by the FSC is mainly created by the residential facility (see Table 2 below);
- FSC operating surplus per average 90 bed centre per annum is based on approximately 13000 bed nights (40% occupancy per annum) x £7.35 = £95,550 per annum.
- The FSC has a significant core of skilled, trained staff including: 330 permanent staff – 100 tutors and 230 service staff - and 300 Associate Tutors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Ave. Cost Per Visitor Night</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Salary</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff Salary</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Costs (HQ, rent major maintenance etc)</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Average Costs/Income per Visitor Night in £s (costs/income are based upon the average of 10 FSC Centres, first half year 2007)
The FSC’s Corporate Plan (2007-10) seeks to raise £40 million in income from services over the period 2007-10, welcome 450,000 people to its Centres over the same period, sell 750,000 publications and reach a further 1.2 million people via its web based resources. Between 2004 and 2006, FSC income from charitable activities rose by 4.5% to achieve the £10 million per annum level required by the Corporate Plan; to continue to fulfil the Plan’s objectives the FSC must sustain its 2006 performance in subsequent years.

It should be noted, however, that FSC total costs rose by 8.76% over the period 2004 to 2006 and total income rose by 8.79% (Table 3). The FSC has a financial strategy based upon securing a surplus to invest in a Development Fund (to be used for improving existing centres). In 2006 the Development Fund was £2.5 million. The available evidence suggests that the Corporate Plan’s growth targets may not in themselves facilitate the expansion of the Development Fund to meet all FSC needs. However, such a conclusion should also acknowledge the relatively sound financial basis upon which the FSC, as a charity, operates.

Table 3 Income and Expenditure by Financial Activity 2004-2006

Source FSC Annual Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incoming Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Income</td>
<td>139,187</td>
<td>184,929</td>
<td>168,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for Generating Funds</td>
<td>118,923</td>
<td>336,376</td>
<td>393,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>77,886</td>
<td>122,406</td>
<td>159,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from charitable activities</td>
<td>9,321,257</td>
<td>9,467,052</td>
<td>10,139,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income/resources</td>
<td>44,316</td>
<td>171,172</td>
<td>163,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Incoming Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,701,569</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,281,935</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,025,205</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources Expended</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of goods sold and other costs</td>
<td>138,918</td>
<td>156,910</td>
<td>140,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of charitable activities</td>
<td>8,131,136</td>
<td>8,822,727</td>
<td>9,312,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance costs</td>
<td>821,152</td>
<td>738,000</td>
<td>923,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resources Expended</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,091,206</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,717,637</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,376,294</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs as % of Total Income</strong></td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The FSC operations are currently financially sound. The financial challenges it faces in the period 2007-10 relate to the following:

- Sustaining levels of income and controlling costs to enable the expansion of the Development Fund;
- The matching of the Development Fund with other donations/income to meet the capital costs arising from the need to improve centre facilities;
- The necessity to improve occupation rates in ‘outlying’ centres, to reduce cross-subsidising of activities;
- Shifting the funding model (especially in the London context) to ensure that surplus arises from a balance between the fees received from the ‘outdoor education provision’ – the core activity - and the residential component of that provision.

While the financial strategy meets existing needs, clearly the FSC cannot alone provide the capital to meet the costs of establishing a permanent education facility on the Olympic site. It needs funding partners to deliver its vision for 2012.

8.0 Initial Exploration of Options for the Olympic Park

The Background

London 2012 is positioning itself to be the Sustainable Games. Beijing (2008) represents China’s progress on the international stage, with the Olympic Park emerging as a large scale development with iconic permanent constructions reflecting the scale of China’s rapid economic expansion. By contrast, London 2012 is seeking to project a project that establishes a ‘new city’ that will achieve an important socio-economic, environmental and cultural legacy for East London; a legacy that justifies the costs of the event and the infrastructure that is developing around it.

By the spring of 2008, it is anticipated that the key stakeholders in London 2012 will be able to identify the legacy uses of all the permanent structures to be utilised for the 2012 Games. Legacy will be an integral element of the developments that take place in the pre-event phase. It is likely, therefore, that the post-2012 inheritors of the 2012 Olympic park site will need to be engaged in the pre-event phase as stakeholders in the Park’s development. This engagement may take a variety of forms:

- Becoming an ODA contractor as a result of the successful tendering for specific construction and service provision requirements;
- Being a 2012 sponsor, typically as a result of a significant investment by a multinational enterprise or financial institution thus accessing the Olympic brand and logo;
- Being a recognised partner in the post-event management of a permanent site;
- Engaging with the pre-event phase demonstration events and Cultural Olympiad;
- Providing volunteers and other social/community resources to facilitate sports participation, enhance environmental awareness, develop skills and employment opportunities and undertake visitor events and other pre-2012 festival activities.

East London Infrastructure and the Centre’s Location
The London Education Centre at the Olympic Park offers the potential for school students and visitors to be located at a public transport ‘hub’ – a location that is easy to access from all parts of the UK and Europe. Infrastructural developments facilitating 2012 include;

- The creation of ten public transport lines feeding into Stratford, representing the capability of a train arriving in the area every 15 seconds.
- The introduction of the ‘Olympic Javelin’, taking seven minutes on the St Pancras-Stratford International section of High Speed 1 (formerly Channel Tunnel Rail Link). Capacity will be up to 25,000 people per hour each way between St Pancras and Olympic Park. It will also extend to Ebbsfleet International on the south-eastern edge of London for motorway park-and-ride access, also offering connections with Eurostar services from France and Belgium without having to go into central London.
- Between 2006 and 2011, £1bn annually will be invested in the Underground, on projects including station refurbishment and track upgrading. The Underground will be the speediest way between central London venues and the concentrations to the east, notably via the Jubilee and Central lines. The key project is designed to achieve a 45% increase in capacity on the Jubilee line which will serve Olympic Park as well as the O2 Arena (former Millennium Dome) and central venues.

The proposed Centre benefits in several ways from this significant expenditure upon infrastructure. Residential and day visitors may access the Park by public transport; students on courses may access central London speedily on public transport and, finally, the Centre ‘as workplace’ would require minimal car and coach parking facilities e.g. a ‘drop off’ point and facilities for disabled access.

It should also be noted that in relation to current negotiations on legacy facilities, East Thames Housing is heavily involved in housing discussions and advise that the Athletes Village will be converted into 4000 apartments, including 30% affordable/key worker housing. This will be managed by a trust. There will also be a hotel built on the site – but this will be built after the Games – the market here post Olympics will be opened up due to the European transport links stemming from the Games development. East Thames is supportive of the FSC proposition and thinks it is an interesting scheme.

There is to be an academy built in the Park with the S106 monies from the village build. This academy will specialize in sport studies and international business studies. The academy is set to receive 2 million pounds in funding from the DfES and will provide education from nursery through to secondary schooling.

The athlete’s village build is set to be the largest S106 contribution to date. These monies have already been negotiated – and in terms of the master plan for the athletes village – the details of the build and the legacy from the physical build has already been established. Alongside this from the S106 monies a 2800m2 of community space is to be provided and will become a PCT “one stop shop” for local residents.

Alongside the more regular day to day housing association business, East Thames Housing also manages a number of hostels for young people at risk under the banner of the “Foyer Project”. This involves five accommodation centres throughout East London. Each accommodation centre houses around 115-120 young people, from the ages of 16 to 24, who are at risk of becoming homeless. They also run education programmes here – specifically in life skills and empowerment. These
centres run at full capacity. A new centre is about to open in Barking. Alongside this, East Thames Housing is currently working with the NEF (New Economics Foundation) on a feasibility study around community assets arising from the Olympic Park legacy – this report will be completed by mid February 2008.

The Options

The options identified below recognise the necessity for the FSC to engage with London 2012 in the pre-event phase as a precursor to its potential involvement in the post-2012 Olympic Park site. Engagement is a complex affair given the nature of governance of 2012. The key stakeholders required to support any FSC initiative are likely to be:

- Central Government (DCMS and Communities, Local Government);
- LOCOG/ODA;
- Mayor of London/London Development Agency;
- Five Olympic boroughs, especially Newham;
- London Schools
- A corporate sponsor(s) committed to a significant investment to facilitate the creation or conversion of a building on the Olympic park for the FSC as a residential education centre facility.

Permanent post-2012 Structures for the Olympic Park (ODA, September 2007)

- Remediation, demolition and earthworks to prepare the land for construction
- Extensive works to waterways, including the construction of new river walls and flood defence walls
- The construction of new highways and a continuous Loop Road surrounding the Olympic Park, to provide initial construction access, and give vehicles back-of-house venue access in Games mode
- The construction of an underground utilities corridor
- The Olympic and Legacy Transformation Planning Application, which seeks permission for the core construction work and post-Games reconfiguration of infrastructure for legacy use, including:
  - The construction of 5 permanent venues (Olympic Stadium, Aquatics Centre, Velopark, Handball Arena, Eton Manor) and 3 temporary sporting venues (Basketball Arena, Hockey Venue, Fencing Venue)
  - The construction of an International Broadcast Centre / Main Press Centre
- Earthworks and extensive landscaping to create open space areas and achieve an Olympic Park that is accessible, usable and varied in its topography
- Permanent and temporary structures, roads and bridges
- Site-wide utilities infrastructure
- Extensive post-Games legacy regeneration work including: partial deconstruction, demolition, dismantling and construction of venues to form legacy sports, leisure and entertainment venues; earthworks and landscaping to provide permanent public open spaces and outdoor sports and changing facilities; and reconfiguration to form buildings for office and industrial use;
- Transformation of the Olympic Village to create approximately 4,500 homes.

Establishing the Customer Base

The existing core market of the FSC consists of 11-18 year old school children. From this, the market segments that would be the core market for the proposition are as follows:

- Local (i.e. East London) schools
- Wider UK schools
- European and other international school visits

These markets would be segmented/structured around various curricula (environmental studies, science, biology, geography, history of the industrial revolution, architecture, tourism, regeneration etc). There is a wide spread of curriculum based possibility here.

**The UK Market**

According to Mintel, the core market of 11-14 year olds in the UK is in decline.

- There were 3.1 million 11-14-year-olds in the UK in June 2005 – a very slight decrease (0.2%) on the 2001 figure.
- The decrease in numbers of 11-14-year-olds is expected to accelerate over the next few years, falling to 2.9 million by 2009, and 2.7 million by 2013.

(Source: Mintel Report Marketing to Children aged 11-14, June 2006)

This represents a considerable decline in the FSC’s core market potential, particularly in the post Olympic years. However, the London Education Centre at the Olympic Park represents a different offer from the FSC’s other more rural based centres. The uniqueness of the sustainability educational programme will have much broader appeal than to the 11-14 year old school groups that are currently the core beneficiaries of the FSC’s centres. The need for a broad based sustainable environmental education package that appeals to a breadth of users was clear from the interviews conducted. The expansion of the FSC’s core market for the centre would include younger primary school groups, adult learners, special interest groups, community groups, corporate groups exploring socially responsible themes, and others.

**The International Market**

With the establishment of the Olympic Park and corresponding improvements in transport infrastructure, opportunities for a strong European (and other International markets) become viable. These would be school groups from Europe, tours that have an interest in the type of educational packages on offer (sporting groups and clubs, architecture groups and clubs etc). While the London Education Centre would be viable with only local and UK markets, the international interest generated by the Olympic Park would contribute to the establishment of strong pan-European links and visitor numbers.

**The Sydney Model**

To illustrate the mix of potential users of the centre, a comparison with the Sydney based Olympic Park centre is useful. Sydney has an existing 80 bed accommodation facility and operates with a similar core market to the FSC. The facility is run and managed by the YMCA. However, like the FSC model, the centre in Sydney branches out from this core market to include a wider variety of learners. The pricing structure in Sydney also reflects this. The market here has been split between student and non-student groups. Student groups here include: schools, TAFE, and University Groups, while non-student groups include: family, community, sporting and interest groups. The costs for student groups are $37 AUD (approx 17 pounds) per person per night, while non-student groups are $47 AUD (for children – approx 21 pounds) and $68 AUD (for adults – approx 31 pounds). All prices are inclusive of breakfast. The centre has been operating at full capacity, and demand has been high.
Indeed the success of the Educational legacy at the Olympic Park in Sydney is such that further educational facilities are planned with a major expansion including a total of 115,000 m² of floor space, and a further 17,000 m² for student accommodation. This is planned to coincide with the further enhancement of the Park as a major business and educational centre, incorporating a number of Educational institutions, including universities and higher education colleges.

**Marketing the London Education Centre**

Presently the marketing strategy for the FSC is partly structured around the “good will” of individual teachers. To attract a wider market to the London Education Centre it will be necessary to refine the marketing and recruitment model. Developing partnerships with schools at the level of head teacher, boards of governors, or Local Authority education departments would be a desirable addition to the current marketing strategy. Alongside this the high profile nature of the Olympic park, and the interest in Olympism and related studies, the government directives and policy aimed at increasing sports participation, and the environmental and sustainability agenda will all contribute to the marketing appeal of the proposition. If the Sydney case study is indicative of the levels of interest in this type of situated learning experience, it is not unlikely that the demand for both residential and non-residential activities will be extremely high. Indeed in terms of the residential demand – a longer term strategy that includes investigation to additional accommodation facilities above and beyond the 120 beds may be required. This is again in the context of the success of the Sydney model, where an additional build of such facilities are being planned. The relative numbers of Sydney’s market, due to the sheer population size of Australia (approx 20 million) compared with the UK (and including a small but significant number from Europe) would indicate the successful fulfilment of the numbers required to establish the London Education Centre as a growing and viable business.

**Option A: ‘Pavilion Plus’**

Engagement in the pre-event period is critical to the FSC’s long term involvement with the Olympic Park in its legacy phase. Government and LOCOG are committed to the creation of a showcase pavilion to highlight sustainability themes:

---

**One Planet Pavilion:**

This will be a state-of-the-art, environmentally-designed pavilion within the Olympic Park. It will serve as the primary showcase for London 2012 Sustainability Partners and contribute to the visitor experience during the Games. (Source: LOCOG 26 November 2007)

---

The pavilion is associated with ‘the promotion of respect for the environment, through the one planet education programme’ (London 2012 Sustainability Programme, November 2007, p12). This commitment represents an important opportunity for the FSC, with Newham Council and others, to become engaged as a partner in the delivery of the sustainability education programme by demonstrating how an idea for a visitor centre may be transformed into a centre for school students and visitors that benefits from the FSC’s expertise in providing outdoor and on-site education that
addresses each of the five sustainability themes – climate change, waste, biodiversity, inclusion, healthy living.

The ‘Plus’ component of this option relates to the leverage gained by the FSC as a partner in the provision of the Pavilion education/visitor attraction. It is possible that LOCOG and other partners may consider the retention of the Pavilion on a permanent basis, especially if there is evidence of its viability as an education centre. If this is countenanced, it may be possible to secure sponsorship from an Olympic or other sponsoring enterprise to develop a purpose-built residential facility to provide accommodation for visiting school students and other UK and international visitors to the Olympic Park post-2012. It will be possible to establish such a centre as a component of the proposed permanent facilities already earmarked for the site. The viability of a Centre arises from its potential for multiple use as an education and residential centre and in its capacity to attract partners to develop, for example, (environmental) business incubator facilities for small firms; offices for community/voluntary organisations and visitor ‘attractions’ to enhance footfall.

The ‘Plus’ component, however, is only a possibility since, for example, the Olympic Village is identified for future use as a housing development which for financial and social reasons may not be amenable to providing residential accommodation for short-stay school students and other visitors. It is estimated that land values in the Olympic park area will have risen significantly by 2012-14. The ODA is set to be the beneficiary of such a rise, however, it is anticipated that the ODA will be required to secure land prices from developers that reflect this rise and, in turn, ensure that the profit from any sale of land is used to offset any projected deficits that might occur as a result of a shortfall in the private sector’s sponsorship of the Games. Indeed, stringent tests of economic viability will be applied to the five permanent sites and their legacy use as the House of Commons, Culture, Media and Sport Committee indicated in its report (January 2007) ‘London 2012, Olympic and Paralympic Games - funding and legacy’ – a parliamentary report that arose from concerns about the 2012 budget:

‘We believe that the decision to limit to five the number of permanent venues remaining within the Park after the Games was sound. Any pressure from international sporting federations – or indeed from the International Olympic Committee – to build unnecessarily high-specification venues should be strongly resisted. We are reasonably confident that a mixed legacy use should provide a sustainable future for the Aquatics Centre and the Olympic Stadium, although we believe that the latter would be rather more secure if it were also to become the home stadium for a football club, possibly in conjunction with a major rugby club. The smaller permanent venues – for hockey/tennis and for cycling - face a tougher struggle if they are to be commercially successful, although we note the popularity of hockey at community level and the tradition of excellence at cycling in the UK. We are less certain about the future of the indoor sports arena, which may face direct competition with established venues nearby’. (Paragraph 111)

This concern with costs, reflected in the House of Commons Select Committee Report in January 2007, may impede the dedication of parts of the Olympic Park to social, community and educational use though such a conclusion must be tempered by the public commitment of all the 2012 partners to achieve a balance between financial viability and community engagement with the Park in its post-2012 phase. In brief, an FSC bid for a permanent location within the Park must be commercially rigorous while also clearly demonstrating the capacity to enhance community engagement.

The Pavilion Plus option requires:
FSC involvement in the ‘One Planet’ education programme and the Pavilion by demonstrating to the 2012 partners a capacity to provide a high quality workshop and outdoor educational experience for London’s and the UK’s school students and other visitors;

The rapid development of an outline educational programme designed to address the five sustainability themes of London 2012 and relate to the UK Schools and Colleges curriculum;

Engagement with potential commercial partners to secure sponsorship for funding a permanent education facility on the Olympic Park;

Specification of the residential facility required – one, two, four bedroom facilities with dining area and other amenities to house up to 150 students/visitors per night.

Option B: A Voluntary/Public/Private Sector Partnership

Option B is a flexible variant of Option A. Clearly engagement with educational and visitor event provision prior to 2012 remains an important goal for the FSC in this option. However, through negotiations with partners it is possible that a ‘wider’ vision of outdoor educational provision in East London and the Thames Gateway may provide the capacity for the Olympic Park to be one important component of an educational strategy that establishes a London Education Centre with residential facilities off the Olympic Park site but within close proximity to the Park and within reach of several important environmental sites along the Thames Gateway. The Olympic Park would remain a central focus for educational provision but would become part of a wider urban environment programme that considers the whole of the Thames Gateway.

A key partner in developing a London Education Centre off, but close to, the Olympic Park, would be Newham and/or other Olympic boroughs for whom other major project developments (Carpenters Park, Stratford City, Rainham Marshes) are taking place in parallel to the Olympic site development. These developments may provide opportunities for the FSC to join with public and private sector partners to develop a residential facility that provides a base for outdoor educational activities to take place in the Olympic Park and more widely within the Thames Gateway. Newham, for example, is the location of a Regatta Centre (Royal Docks) which already has a 30 bed dormitory facility. Enhancement of such a facility could enable the local authority with partners to develop its sports participation and environmental educational provision through the development of a multi-purpose residential site.

The VPPP option requires:

- Strong support from local authorities;
- A commercial sponsor committed to constructing an Education Centre, possibly as part of a ‘Section 106’ form of development near to the Olympic Park;
- A development plan that demonstrates the economic viability of the London Education Centre, including its flexible use as an educational, business and office facility;
- Use of the Olympic Park post-2012 to examine the ‘best practice’ habitats, buildings and environmental projects, including their wider application in the Thames Gateway and the UK.

Option C: London Education Centre and Outsourced Residential Facilities

Accommodation may be provided from another source – a local hostel or budget hotel. At this time however, there are no local hostels or hotels in the immediate area that could effectively meet these
requirements. Of course, there are a number of hotels (and presumably hostels) that will be established in the area closer to 2012 to accommodate visitors, spectators and the media. It is very difficult to estimate the room rates for these providers in the lead up to the Games, or in the post-Games environment.

Two other possibilities in terms of accommodation provision have also been explored.

- The use of UEL student accommodation outside of the university term time, however this could be of limited use due to the clash of academic dates.

- The use of the London Regatta Centre. The Centre can only accommodate 30 in a combination of dorm rooms (2 rooms with 8 beds), plus a mix of rooms with 4 and 2 beds. There are en suite showers and w.c’s. The group rate is very reasonable – 15 pounds per person per night. Expansion of this facility would require strong support from Newham local authority as the precursor to approaching the Regatta Centre.

Option C would require:

- Strong support from the local authority (Newham) or another partner with appropriate accommodation;
- A commitment from the local authority to expand the use of leisure/recreation and outdoor education facilities provided by the Regatta Centre and its related buildings;
- Acceptance within the FSC of the principle of splitting accommodation and education provision;
- An analysis of the threats posed by the outsourced accommodation provider establishing their own version of related activity.

Option D: The ‘No Change’ Scenario

This option assumes no significant change to the FSC Strategic Plan and no new capital resources to enable FSC engagement with London 2012. The main opportunity presented by London 2012, therefore, arises from the extension of existing activities to engage with the environmental and scientific developments taking place in and around the Olympic Park in East London. Between 2003 and 2007 the FSC has led the London Challenge project engaging with over 400 schools in the London area and providing residential courses, for 34,000 11-14 year old students. To achieve this the FSC has worked with 10 other outdoor education providers.

The Olympic Park provides an important opportunity to develop the values exemplified by the London Challenge initiative in a manner that may attract new funding, increase the participation of schools and contribute to the restoration of science and biology as key subjects in the curriculum. The FSC may be the main organiser of school pupil access to the Olympic site in the pre- and post event phases offering a combination of residential and day school programmes that could, for example, build upon the principles and values underpinning the FSC’s ‘London Outdoor Science’ initiative. This option requires:

- Continuation of the ‘good practice’ values of the London Challenge project as an education initiative in the post-2007 period;
- Central government support and funding;
- Support from London schools;
• Curriculum development that explores the potential of A level conferences; civic and social inclusion programmes; the environmental aspects of vocational programmes such as leisure, tourism and travel;
• Exploration of the potential for outdoor education provision to be a component of programmes for overseas visitors and tourists;
• Expansion of FSC resources to enable the ‘Olympic Park’ programme to commence from, say, 2010 and continue into the post-event legacy phase;
• Concentration on day provision or the renting from a third party (YMCA, University – Epping Forest is a non-residential FSC facility) of ‘off-site’ residential facilities.

9.0 The Business and Financial Case

This section provides guidance on costs by option. The figures summarised below are indicative only. Estimates of build costs post-2012 are extremely difficult to provide, especially in the financial climate of early 2008. It is, however, important to note in the context of this report that:

Land Values in the Olympic Park

• The land value of the Olympic Park has been estimated to provide £1.8 billion in sales post-2012 if the cost of the Games requires the LDA to sell land to meet any deficit that may arise; the £1.8 billion assumes the premium on land prices rises at 16 percent per annum over the next four years;
• If the premium on land prices rose over the next four years at the historic rate (measured over the last 20 years), the sale value would rise to £3 billion;
• Analysts in early 2007 consider that economic conditions may contain land price rises to a level of growth of 6 percent per annum, thus reducing the premium to £800 million;
• In summary, the estimated premium on the potential sale of Park land post-2012 varies between a low of £800 million and a high of £3 billion; the likely preferred option for the LDA is that the Games budget is not exceeded and that the LDA remains the unitary authority that owns the Park.

London Labour Costs

• According to ONS data (2004) London average labour costs (all sectors) are 7.6% higher than the UK average;
• London labour costs were on average £18.36 per hour compared to the average for the UK of £14 per hour (2000).

The available evidence (with reference to the ONS analysis of UK urban/rural economic indicators) suggests that the operational cost (primarily labour costs) of running an Education Centre in the Olympic Park would be between 10 and 15 percent higher in London compared to a rural setting.

Comparison of Costs for the pre-event and non-residential activities.

All models assume a strong pre-event phase that provide non-residential educational opportunities for school students, those involved with professional development and other visitors to the Olympic Park.
The primary costs relate to the provision of non-residential educational opportunities for school students, those involved with professional development and visitors to the Olympic Park. The financial model divides into the pre-event, event and post-event phases with pre- and post-event activities focusing potentially upon daytime and ‘virtual’ learning opportunities. A tutor team and support staff would be required to deliver pre- and post-event activities and, potentially, be engaged during the event to showcase sustainability and environmental themes.

There is evidence of strong support for establishing and expanding professional development programmes for teachers and provision of daytime outdoor education activities for London-based school students at all levels. The Epping Forest Centre currently has 11 FT equivalent staff and recently enhanced facilities. These might provide the resource base for developing the Olympic offering. Assuming no institutional overheads, a financial model would include core costs - course development and provision, staffing and marketing.

The table below simply illustrates the relationship between these core or ‘direct’ costs and the growth in student numbers required to cover these. All costs are assumed to increase by 3% inflation per annum, with staff FTE rising from 2 to 6 by 2012. Student numbers per day per annum for the FSCs ‘Olympic Provision’ (assuming the average price per student for non-residential provision as £10) would have to commence at about 7,000 for 2009, and rise to 16,438 student days per annum by 2012 to cover the core costs. Income is solely via course fees, no provision is made for the sale of publications or other potential income generating activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs (£)</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Devt &amp; Provision</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10300</td>
<td>10609</td>
<td>10927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>50,000 (2 FTE)</td>
<td>77,250 (3 FTE)</td>
<td>106,090 (4 FTE)</td>
<td>163,909 (6 FTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10300</td>
<td>10609</td>
<td>10927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70000</td>
<td>97,850</td>
<td>127,308</td>
<td>185763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (£)</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Nos per day, per annum @ £10 per day (£10 charged in 2009 with 3% inflation each subsequent year) to break even. (Assuming no external subsidies)</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>9,188</td>
<td>11,626</td>
<td>16,438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently, FSC fee income for non-residential provision varies at Epping Forest from between approximately £10 per student per session/day and £200 per session/day. This would require a range of student fees to be set with the average at the indicative start date (2009) possibly exceeding £10 per student session/day; especially if fees were the sole source of income. Equally, the above simple model does not include indirect costs. The addition of direct and indirect costs gives the full economic cost (FEC). A guide to FEC may be derived, for example, from dividing total recurrent or operational expenditure in one year by student numbers to determine the indirect cost per student FTE. For the
FSC, in 2006, this was £102 per student (£10,236,114 expenditure (including governance costs) divided by a student FTE of 100,499). This figure, however, is based on a 50% mix of residential and day visitors – the former usually paying for full board accommodation and full time tuition.

In summary, this adds an Olympic dimension to the FSC’s current educational and financial models with delivery being based upon non-residential provision. It is more than likely that the FSC could achieve sufficient student numbers to be realise a surplus from this activity.

Again, when compared to the student numbers in the Sydney model, the projected target numbers of learners required for the London Education Centre will not be difficult to meet. In 2006-7 20,637 students participated in programmes offered in Sydney, with 18,600 undertaking hands-on environmental education. Given the relative population figures for London and the UK, versus Sydney and Australia, attracting the visitor numbers outlined above is achievable. (Sydney Olympic Park Authority Annual Report 2006-2007)

**Option A: ‘Pavilion Plus’ Financial Model**

Option A shifts the focus from the non residential financial model outlined to the recurrent costs to the capital costs of the new build – the education centre - the construction of which would take place between 2012 and 2014. The pre-event phase could include non-residential provision (as outlined) and preparation and participation in the Pavilion. An indicative or outline specification for the Centre and estimation of costs is provided as Appendix A.

The London Education Centre plan proposes a 3,000 sq metres facility over 3 floors with residential accommodation for up to 150. Based upon 2008 prices the estimated cost of constructing this facility is between £10 and £18 million. This estimate reflects the capital costs of construction in Stratford, East London in 2008. The estimate should be treated with caution since:

- The estimate is based upon an outline rather than detailed specification;
- It is assumed that the LDA will continue to own the land with no costs for land purchase but costs based upon as yet unspecified leasehold arrangements;
- The estimate is based upon current prices and divides into – residential, teaching, services, office/incubator units – the degree of ‘flexible’ use of the centre depends upon many factors including partnership arrangements with other institutions/enterprises (option C)

It is suggested in this model that the recurrent costs of operating the Centre will be the sole responsibility of the FSC. It is estimated that the recurrent costs of running such a Centre in London would be between 15-20 percent higher than a similar provision offered in a rural location. The Pavilion component relates to the pre-event and event stages. The FSC involvement will be determined by a ‘legacy group’ consisting of LOCOG sponsors, voluntary and public and private sector representatives. The Pavilion will showcase environmental and sustainability themes and be based upon interactive media and other presentations. It is estimated that an FSC multimedia presentation and staffing and support services required for the event phase will cost approximately £65,000 at 2008 prices. The Pavilion presence, however, may provide an effective marketing forum for other FSC activities.
**Option B: ‘VPP Partnership’ Financial Model**

The main distinction between Options A and B is that the recurrent costs would be shared by multiple users of the London Education Centre; those institutions who may take incubator or office space. It is likely that the FSC is the lead partner in this flexible use option. Evidence from potential stakeholder partners suggests that such an option is feasible with partners emerging through the process of discussion with LOCOG, LDA and other institutions engaged in legacy consultations.

**Option C: Outsourced Residential Facilities**

The main obstacle to this Option is the lack of identifiable facilities in East London (as at Winter, 2008) and the proposed division of residential and educational experience that runs counter to FSC educational philosophy. It is likely that the development of rentable facilities would require capital investment from a partner institution such as Newham Council or corporate sponsor/partner. The facilities development may be possible if attached to an existing plan for the re-development of existing premises, such as the Regatta Centre at Docklands.

The advantage of this Option to the FSC is that rented accommodation does not carry significant capital and recurrent costs relating to maintenance, depreciation etc. The main component of recurrent cost is the cost per night of accommodation for staff and students. At 2008 prices the cost per night of accommodation varies between £18-25 for hostel accommodation and £40-48 per night for basic hotel accommodation (typically, excluding meals).

**Option D: ‘No Change’ Financial Model**

Option D would not challenge the FSC’s existing financial model and strategic plan. The financial model for this option remains the same for the pre-Olympic phase costings, outlined above.

**FSC Organisational Development**

The Options (particularly Options B and C) outlined above impact upon the FSC’s current strategic, financial and organisational plans. The observations here are based upon stakeholder interviews and an analysis of the impact of Options B and C on the FSC as a charitable organisation. It is recommended that the FSC gives consideration to the following:

- The implications of the shift toward an urban focus for environmental studies – the FSC is widely perceived as a provider of ‘outdoor education’ in the rural setting;
- The development of the FSC ‘brand’ as a national and international charitable organisation – Field Studies does not capture the diversity of themes arising from the sustainability agenda;
- Long term financial and educational success will rely increasingly upon the development of diversity of provision (virtual, urban, rural residential provision) and diversity in relation to student cohorts.

It is recommended that, if successful in engaging with ‘London 2012’ and associated policy agendas the FSC considers the following:
• The establishment of a London base;
• The strategic use of the London base to consolidate and ‘institutionalise’ a network of school, voluntary and other sector partnerships;
• The development of a marketing strategy to ‘re-launch’ the FSC in the urban setting;
• A review of existing Education Centres – including numbers, locations and utilisation/occupancy rates with a view to maximising (development fund) investment in growth areas of FSC business i.e. the possibility of relocation of resources from less viable centres to the London Education Centre;
11.0 SWOT Analysis

Strengths

- The FSC, located in the charitable sector, has an unrivalled track record over many years in providing out-of-classroom educational activities for young people;
- The FSC utilises the environment in which it is located as the subject of study and has developed an educational offering immediately and uniquely relevant to the exploration of several of the themes identified by government, LOCOG and other 2012 stakeholders in promoting a sustainable legacy for 2012;
- The FSC can make a major contribution to pre-2012 education and visitor provision through engagement with, for example, the One Planet education programme and the Pavilion;
- The FSC has an excellent record of working in partnership with the private and public sector.

Weaknesses

- The FSC does not have capital funding for the construction of an education centre in East London;
- The governance structure of London 2012 is complex and decisions concerning legacy will be made early in 2008, possibly before the FSC has a fully developed legacy proposal;
- The FSC requires commercial sponsors to construct a new residential facility rather than donate an existing building;
- Staff, maintenance and other overhead costs are typically higher in East London than other UK locations;
- The FSC has a reputation as a ‘rural’ rather than urban ‘London-based’ organisation
- The FSC already competes with commercial providers of outdoor education and leisure activities, the commercial attraction of leisure as opposed to educational provision, in the context of the post-2012 economic environment, could favour the development of a more commercially oriented visitor attraction for the Olympic park and its environs.

Opportunities

- FSC, as an organisation, provides a viable vehicle for the engagement of young people in achieving the aspirations for the use of the Olympic Park in the period up to the event and beyond;
- The FSC has a strong record of working with partners, including London and UK schools, in providing out-of-classroom education provision that explores environmental themes in urban and rural settings via a cost effective/value for money model;
- The FSC can ‘fill’ the curriculum ‘gap’ arising from the demands placed upon schools and colleges to provide citizenship, social inclusion and other enhancement initiatives;

Threats

- Government and other potential providers have already engaged in exploring opportunities for using on-site temporary facilities to showcase environmental and architectural themes – the
Olympic Park provides a highly competitive context for conceptualising and delivering education-oriented legacy;

- The sustainability of the Olympic park has many dimensions including cost and financial viability - financial viability post-2012 will be a major determinant of approval for post-Games projects located permanently in the Olympic Park;
- There is no specific government/LOCOG vision for young people’s engagement beyond volunteering and cultural and sports participation – with these envisaged as being mainly delivered across the UK;
- The Olympic Park location would require a new or significantly revised mode of partnership and funding model to be viable for the FSC (see the section Stakeholders, Partners and Project Development).
Appendices

Appendix A - Outline Specification

The Field Studies Council seeks to:

‘Develop a regional and national centre of excellence in urban education specialising in education for sustainable
development, enabling young people to become successful learners, confident individuals and responsible
citizens through the development of positive out-of-classroom educational experiences in sites and communities
in East London’

Building Specification

3 Floors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>240</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 x 2 single bed facilities en suite - 3 x 8 sq m.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>600 600 sq m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 x 4 bunk bed facilities en suite - 4 x 10 sq m.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>800 800 sq m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

En suite includes shower, wc, wash basin; no kitchen facilities per floor. 10 of the single rooms with disabled access

Total 1820 1760

Teaching Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>300 300 sq m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 workshops/classrooms – 60 sq m</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200 200 sq m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Resources room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150 150 sq m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 650 650 sq m

Business/incubator Offices/Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>180 180 sq m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 offices for business start ups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60 60 sq m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 offices for FSC use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>120 120 sq m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 360 360 sq m

Support facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>350 350 sq m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>60 60 sq m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self catering/ Coffee Shop</td>
<td>120 120 sq m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception/ Security/ Public entrance</td>
<td>120 120 sq m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry and storage space</td>
<td>200 sq m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car/bus parking – set down point loading and space for 6 cars (up to four disabled spaces) or two buses</td>
<td>650 850 sq m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 650 850 sq m

Total Net Internal Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance assumes a 40% balance addition</th>
<th>2830</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS AREA</td>
<td>1132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 20 single rooms include a management residential suite, since a high proportion of the single facilities are designed for teaching staff. The building will be run by employees of the FSC. FSC is a charity though it is anticipated that the building will be constructed via sponsorship from a corporate donor. Assume at present no costs for land purchase (it is likely to be LDA land long leased to FSC), but include costs for town planning and legal fees (if possible). Estimate in current prices (2008).
Appendix B - Institutions Consulted/Interviewed

We would like to thank all those who gave up their time to be interviewed.

Education Board, LOCOG
Environment Board, LOCOG
Angela Drizi, Head of Learning and Schools Service, Newham.
Dan Hopewell, Director of Learning, Bromley by Bow Centre.
Michael Dowd, Vice Principal Newham Sixth Form College.
Stefan Webb, GLA Policy Officer Thames Gateway.
Carlo Roberts, Schools and Youth Officer, Hackney
Colin Boxhall, Thames East Housing Association
David Powell, DPA and Associates
Gareth Potts, BURA
Ray Wilkinson, External and Strategic Development Services, UEL
Josie Fowler and Sue Ingham (Director) Hammersmith and Fulham Urban Studies centre.
John Lock, UEL Co-ordinator London 2012
Paul Brickell, CEO, Leaside Regeneration
John Widdowsons, Geography teacher and consultant
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Appendix D Visions

The visioning for the build is based on a number of sustainable and educational principles. The building itself is intended to be an object of learning. A “built text” that draws on local, recycled and sustainable materials, that is intended to provoke both an emotional and intellectual response that intrigues the visitors to the building. This provides a springboard for discussions around the physical and built environment, architecture, place, sustainability and art.

- The external form of the building optimizes the external envelope:volume ratio using non-orthogonal geometry.
- Internally layered timber screening divide and frame space and views.
- The business and start-up units and the office element within the centre combine rammed earth and concrete for effective thermal regulation and sound absorption.

Points to consider and education links:

Where has the reclaimed timber come from? One could trace the passage of timber from growth, to use (as a ship, as a building) to final use. This is a trajectory that considers the environment, geography, manufacturing, consumption, architecture and art.
Figure 2 Site Map and topography.

Please note the topography and site map are indicative only.
Gabion “party walls” divide the accommodation providing thermal mass and ventilation pathways, supporting the concrete floor slabs.
Figure 5 The View From the Observatory

The observatory can be seen as a “classroom in the sky” allowing for a unique view of the area. The timber structure resonates with the environment, and frames the views.
Figure 6 The Observatory: A View From the Main Building

This view connects and harmonises these structures. The observatory itself becomes part of the landscape in this view, a structure to look at, and look from.

Figure 7 The Observatory

Please note the topography is fictive, and not indicative of the final site.
The excavated clay entrance not only provides assistance to the thermal regulation of the building, but a unique entrance that again provokes a sense of wonder and contemplation via the juxtapositioning of earth and sky.
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## Section 1 - Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Summary</th>
<th>Current Forecast - Stage A</th>
<th>£ / m²</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Shell &amp; Core Construction</td>
<td>3,140,000</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>Based on GIFA of 4,000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Residential Facilities</td>
<td>1,671,900</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>Fit out cost only (see detail overleaf), £/m² is based on GIFA of 2,045m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Teaching Facilities</td>
<td>631,725</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>Fit out cost only (see detail overleaf), £/m² is based on GIFA of 755m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Business Facilities</td>
<td>264,510</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>Fit out cost only (see detail overleaf), £/m² is based on GIFA of 418m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Support Facilities</td>
<td>1,002,340</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>Fit out cost only (see detail overleaf), £/m² is based on GIFA of 782m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Other / Abnormals/Sustainability</td>
<td>1,155,000</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>Based on GIFA of 4,000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Preliminaries</td>
<td>1,179,821</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Based on GIFA of 4,000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forecast Net Construction Cost (excl. inflation and contingency)</strong></td>
<td>9,045,296</td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>Based on GIFA of 4,000m² (NB: costs includes allowances for loose furniture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>452,265</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Based on GIFA of 4,000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Procurement</td>
<td>452,265</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Based on GIFA of 4,000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Construction</td>
<td>452,265</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Based on GIFA of 4,000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inflation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Inflation</td>
<td>2,730,549</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>Based on GIFA of 4,000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td>13,132,639</td>
<td>3,283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Consultant Fees @ 17%</td>
<td>2,232,549</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>including fee contingency and inflation and legal fees and planning fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Active IT Equipment</td>
<td>738,000</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Includes inflation on this item to 2Q13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gross Project Cost (Excluding VAT)</strong></td>
<td>16,103,188</td>
<td>4,026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VAT @ 17.5%</strong></td>
<td>2,818,058</td>
<td>705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gross Project Cost (Including VAT)</strong></td>
<td>18,921,246</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Section 1 - Executive Summary

## 1.0 Executive Summary

### 1.1 Forecast Summary

The Estimated Total project cost is estimated at £16,233,072 excluding VAT. This has been derived from our data base of similar projects including UEL projects.

### 1.2 Inflation Summary

We have assumed an allowance of 26.25% for inflation from today until the assumed Mid point of construction 2Q13, we used an average rate of 5% pa.

### 1.3 Contingency Summary

The allowance amounts to 15% in total, which we feel is a sensible allowance based on the current information.
Section 1 - Executive Summary

1.0 Executive Summary (cont)

1.4 Risk & Opportunities

Further knowledge of the project brief would assist us in ascertaining the opportunities and risk within this project.

1.5 Outstanding Actions / Information

A full project brief with further knowledge of the site.

1.6 Next Steps

Provide benchmarking information to back up the model as required.
### Section 2 - Cost Model 1

#### BASE DATA
- **Date of Estimate:** 07 February 2008
- **Client:** UEL
- **Project:** FSC Education Centre

#### KEY METRICS - INPUT
- **GIFA:** 4,000 m²
- **Base Date of Data:** 1q2008

#### COST MODEL - OUTPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Nett Costs</th>
<th>Cost / m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shell &amp; Core Construction</td>
<td>3,140,000</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Fit-Out Costs</td>
<td>3,570,475</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other / Abnormals</td>
<td>1,155,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminaries</td>
<td>1,179,821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation to 2Q13</td>
<td>2,730,549</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>1,356,794</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONSTRUCTION COST - TOTAL
- **CONSTRUCTION COST - M2 GIFA:** 3,283

#### SHELL & CORE CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Substructure</td>
<td>4000 m²</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Frame, upper floors &amp; stairs</td>
<td>4000 m²</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>760,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Roof</td>
<td>4000 m²</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 External walls including windows etc</td>
<td>4000 m²</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Internal walls and partitions, including internal doors</td>
<td>4000 m²</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total - Shell & Core Construction:** 785 m², 3,140,000 £

#### BASE FIT-OUT COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Residential Facilities</td>
<td>1565 m²</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>586,875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuite areas to bedrooms, including an allowance for DDA fittings as required</td>
<td>195 m²</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>204,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Electrical</td>
<td>2045 m²</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>858,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>285 m²</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residential Facilities Fit-Out Total:** 1,671,900 £

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Teaching Facilities</td>
<td>300 m²</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop / classroom type areas</td>
<td>200 m²</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library / Resources centre</td>
<td>150 m²</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student common room</td>
<td>755 m²</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>317,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Electrical</td>
<td>105 m²</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7,875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>650 m²</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>61,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching Facilities Fit-Out Total:** 631,725 £

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Business Facilities</td>
<td>360 m²</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office type areas</td>
<td>418 m²</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>175,560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Electrical</td>
<td>58 m²</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>360 m²</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>39,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Business Facilities Fit-Out Total:** 264,510 £
### Section 2 - Cost Model 1

#### BASE FIT-OUT COSTS (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant including white goods, servery and all loose furniture</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>m2</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self catering area / coffee shop area including loose furniture</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>m2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception Area / Waiting Area / Entrance including loose furniture</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>m2</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry and storage space</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>m2</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Electrical</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>m2</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>328,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>m2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Facilities Fit-Out Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,002,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Base Fit-Out Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,570,475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OTHER CONSTRUCTION ITEMS & ABNORMALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car Park area</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>m2</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard &amp; Soft landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Over for sustainability options (see assumptions)</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>m2</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>920,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for utilities (see assumptions)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Other Items &amp; Abnormals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,155,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONTINGENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Construction - on net construction costs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>9,045,296</td>
<td>452,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement - on net construction costs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>9,045,296</td>
<td>452,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Contingency - on net construction costs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>9,045,296</td>
<td>452,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Contingency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,356,794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INFLATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inflation to Mid point of construction 2Q13 @ 5% pa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>2,730,549</td>
<td>2,730,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Inflation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,730,549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3 - Assumptions & Exclusions

3.0 Assumptions & Exclusions

3.1 Assumptions

- The Mechanical and Electrical allowance, although we have assumed a naturally ventilated scheme, we have included all sustainable items that would be expected for this type of facilities, such as ground source heat pumps, solar panels, rainwater harvesting, biomass boilers and the like.
- Exposed sofits to all areas except residential accommodation.
- The allowance for utilities is very basic, we have allowed for a sub-station and all other mains connections can be connected close by.
- Car park for 6 bays only, has been included.
- Landscaping hard and soft is limited to an assumed area of 200m2.
- Finishes, fittings and loose furniture have been based on similar specifications to recent UEL projects.

3.2 Exclusions

- Section 106 (planning gain required works).
- Section 278 (Highways improvement works).
- Demolition works/remediation works i.e. no allowance for major decontamination works.
- Site specific issues – such as archaeology, ecology, ordinance, service diversions and the like.
- Site acquisition costs.

3.3 Information Used

- This model was produced from a document entitled “Outline Specification for FSC Education Centre in the Olympic Park”. The area’s used was from the document entitled “Fieldwork Studies Council”, in addition the accompanying e-mail dated 25/01/08 was also used.
### Section 4 - Spatial / Functional Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Residential Facilities</th>
<th>Teaching Facilities</th>
<th>Business Facilities</th>
<th>Support Facilities</th>
<th>Circulation &amp; Plant</th>
<th>GROSS INTERNAL AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**
The benchmark Life Cycle Cost rate for Higher Education Facilities/Further Education Colleges ranges from £14 to £24/m²/year.

The Life Cycle Cost includes the asset replacement of the buildings envelope, internal finishes, fixtures, fittings & equipment and M&E services.

In addition, elements such as the examples listed below can drive the difference in Life Cycle Cost as shown above between college 1 and college 6.

- Specialist vocational equipment
- ICT & AV Systems
- Engineering facilities & workshops
- Swimming pools
- Synthetic sports pitches
- Renewable energy systems

At a later stage a detailed analysis of the Whole Life Costs should be undertaken to identify the potential ongoing operational cost savings in particular electricity, gas and water. This can include carbon accounting to determine the carbon footprint and costs associated with reducing the carbon emissions.