

## THE MEGA-EVENT AS A STRATEGY IN SPATIAL PLANNING: STARTING FROM THE OLYMPIC CITY OF BARCELONA

*Lei Qu\* & Marjolein Spaans\*\**

\* Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Architecture, Department of Urbanism, PO Box 5043, 2600 GA Delft, the Netherlands, Email: l.qu@tudelft.nl

\*\* Delft University of Technology, OTB Research Institute for Housing, Urban and Mobility Studies, PO Box 5030, 2600 GA Delft, the Netherlands, Email: m.spaans@tudelft.nl

**ABSTRACT:** This paper analyses how the Olympic Games have been integrated into the spatial planning process to reach social, spatial and environmental objectives since the 1992 Barcelona Olympic Games. It will focus on the motives for hosting the Games, on the urban development strategies to implement the formulated motives and the effects which are expected from these strategies. Based on the empirical case of Barcelona, the paper elaborates on the changing approach of spatial planning and urban governance in the integration of short-term spatial interventions and long-term urban development perspectives, from resolving problems of the past to getting ready for the future. The city of Barcelona wanted to influence its destiny by using its local potential and change its urban configuration. The socio-economic and urban effects of the 1992 Barcelona Olympic Games are evaluated, in order to define the extent to which the original objectives have been realised by using the mega-event strategy.

**KEYWORDS:** Mega-event, strategic spatial planning, urban governance, urban regeneration, sustainability.

### 1 INTRODUCTION: THE MEGA-EVENT STRATEGY AND STRATEGIC SPATIAL PLANNING

Host cities increasingly use a mega-event as a tool in strategic spatial planning. This paper addresses the relationship of these two concepts on the basis of the case study of Barcelona. We will first introduce the concepts of the mega-event and strategic spatial planning, as well as the relationship between them. The mega-event strategy has been considered as a new tool of area development and urban governance. We will illustrate this using the case of Barcelona, which was the first Olympic city to implement this strategy. In the conclusion of the third section we will extend the argument to future Olympic cities, which should learn and benefit from the strategies used by previous host cities. This paper will also approach the short-term Olympic event from a sustainable perspective. Increasingly the comprehensive concept of social, economic and environmental sustainability has received attention in the planning of Olympic events.

#### 1.1 The mega-event strategy

Mega-events – such as the Olympics or a World Expo – are short-term and high-profile international events which have a long-term impact on host cities. Looking beyond the event itself, the mega-event strategy is basically one using the mega-event as an engine for urban development. Therefore it can be considered as a tool of urban governance. Usually host cities of such mega-events have to accommodate a large urban programme. For example, Olympic Games host cities have to provide sports facilities, an Olympic village, a Media Park, hotel accommodation and supporting infrastructure. The scale of these projects is very large and they have a huge social, economical and environmental impact on the host cities or even entire regions. Recognising this, cities started to make enormous efforts on trying to fit event-related projects within the long-term perspective of strategic spatial planning, including the post-Olympic use of projects.

When re-launched in the late 19th century, the Olympic Games did not have much influence on urban development. Traditionally the short-term Olympic event was not approached from the urban development perspective. Usually in a very short time period large investments were made in additional sports facilities and (temporary) housing for athletes. However, in recent decades, the Olympic Games have gradually emerged as a significant catalyst for urban transformation, starting from the preparation period of the

---

Barcelona 1992 Games. Compared with former Olympic cities, the Olympic projects in Barcelona exceeded the scale of building new sports facilities, and represented a new planning approach of urban regeneration. This was achieved by transforming, brownfields, amongst others, into new urban areas with service, culture, leisure and residential functions. The successfully improved spatial quality of public open spaces played a meaningful role in generating a new identity and increasing the socio-cultural integration in the city. This approach was integrated into the strategic planning for the city as a whole (Fig. 1).

In the era of globalisation, the potential of the Olympic Games has been considered from the policy point of view. It can be viewed as means of creating landmarks to attract global investment, facilitating fast-track development and promoting a new urban image through place marketing. Facilitating such a high-profile event can serve as a stimulus in local development in the context of limited federal aid and increasing global economic competition (Andranovich et al., 2001). Moreover, the environmental perspective has recently become a key issue for hosting the Games as a result of the environmental commitment added to the IOC Charter. This was reflected in the Sydney 2000 and Beijing 2008 Olympic Games which both made Green Olympics a core theme. They transformed polluted land and removed the sources of air and water pollution. This was in line with the long-term sustainable development goals of both cities.

But there are also other objectives which can motivate cities or a city region to make a bid to host the Olympics. In 2007, the Dutch National Olympic Committee (NOC) presented its Olympic Plan 2028, which illustrated the NOC strategy for the development of the Dutch sports infrastructure. In the short term the strategy consisted of stimulating and improving the number and quality of (inter)national sport events and facilities. In the long(er) term, the NOC focused on organising the Olympic Games in the Netherlands in 2028. The aim of organising the Olympics has also been integrated into the visions for the Randstad 2040 by the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (Ministry of VROM, 2008), in order to have the Deltametropolis Randstad grow into a coherent urban system and a sustainable and competitive top region within Europe (Chen et al., 2009).



**Figure 1** Barcelona: the coastal front under construction in 1990 and the Olympic village in late 1991

Source: Busquets, 2005

## 1.2 Strategic spatial planning

Both the mega-event strategy and strategic spatial planning relate to place making concepts prevailing in Europe in the 1990s. Strategic spatial planning then emphasised on promoting strategic places, in order to relieve some of the economic, environmental, social and political pressures in a city (Healey, 1998). In many West European countries, the traditional spatial planning approach, focusing on land use control through a zoning system and regulations, was considered insufficient to implement the city's planning policy. A more development-led approach was subsequently adopted. This was previously a public sector led socio-spatial process, through which a vision, coherent actions and means for implementation were produced (Albrechts, 2006). The ideal of improving the quality of life of a city was asserted through promoting and managing 'place making' with a strong preoccupation for the quality of place. When comparing the two planning approaches, the tensions between the two are the regulation of private land use rights and the promotion of quality of places, with the broader aim of promoting social, economic and environmental objectives (Healey, 1998). The place promotion purpose of strategic spatial planning is becoming much more important nowadays, as stakeholders become aware of the importance of quality of place in the global or regional

---

economic competition.

Strategic spatial planning is not a completely new concept, but already occurred in the middle of the 20th century. It was deserted in the 1980s in many – but not all – European countries, when the emphasis shifted toward large renewal and transformation projects. However, it was reintroduced at the end of 20th century because of European Union initiatives (Salet and Faludi, 2000). Healey (2004: 46) defines strategic spatial planning as “self-conscious collective efforts to re-imagine a city, an urban region or a wider territory and translate the result into priorities for area investment, conservation measures, strategic infrastructure investments and principles of land use regulation”. One of the many reasons for the renewed interest in strategic spatial planning is the promotion of ‘sustainable development’ (Healey, 2004). Sustainable development is usually defined as a pattern of resource use that aims to meet human needs while preserving the environment so that these needs can be met not only in the present, but also for future generations. Usually a distinction is made between economic, social and environmental sustainability.

Facing the opportunities and challenges brought by economic globalisation, episodes in strategic spatial planning are often linked to processes of ‘re-scaling’ identified in the European context within interactions between global forces and local dynamics. Thus several criteria were raised to evaluate concepts of space and place. Examples are the treatment of scale and the treatment of the position of a site in a wider context (Healey, 2004).

Along with these new ideas on strategic spatial planning, mega-events have started to be considered as a tool in area development in recent decades and are increasingly integrated into spatial planning frameworks. For example, nowadays the contribution of the Olympic event to the built environment is already far beyond the Games themselves. The Olympic sporting facilities have gradually emerged as ‘large urban projects’ and are strongly integrated in the new urban planning approach. They have exceeded the scale of new sports facilities alone as they now also include infrastructure provision, urban regeneration and environmental improvement.

The following sections of this paper will explain how this process has emerged by analysing the Olympic city of Barcelona as the first city to start such a process. In order to evaluate the effects of the mega-event strategy in Barcelona, we first developed an evaluation framework that covers most of the items related to motives, urban development strategies and expected results. The items defined in the framework are based on a literature review. There is a wide range of literature on Olympic Games, even if we narrow the scope to motives for the Games and their effects. Broadly, we can distinguish between the motives for organising the Olympics, the chosen strategies to implement the different motives and the expected effects of the different strategies. We thoroughly reviewed a long list of literature on Olympic Games in order to complete our proposed model. All mentioned motives, strategies and effects were clustered according to four perspectives: (1) the economic, (2) social, (3) environmental and spatial, and (4) governance perspectives (Table 1). The fourth perspective is an addition to the usually distinguished perspectives – governance has been defined as the framework of social and economic systems and the legal and political structures through which humanity manages itself. The inter-relationship of these perspectives is essential to obtain robust sustainable development (Furrer, 2002).

## **2 THE OLYMPIC CITY OF BARCELONA**

### **2.1 Strategic spatial planning in Barcelona**

Generally speaking, strategic spatial planning in European countries emerged to clarify overall objectives for the cities, with short-term achievable programmes and a wide range of stakeholders involved, based on public-private partnerships (Marshall, 1996). In Barcelona, in the 1970s and 1980s the ‘natural’ political response to new forms of globalisation occurred. This resulted in a shift from urban management to urban entrepreneurship (Harvey, 1989; Marshall, 1996). Along with the process of economic globalisation, Barcelona was forced, by the ever increasing interurban competition among European countries, to improve their urban image in order to attract a flow of people and capital from, for example, multinational companies and tourists. This was achieved by means of strategic projects, such as the provision of physical infrastructure to facilitate further urban development. The Barcelona city council formulated its vision in

**Table 1 Evaluation framework for Olympic host cities**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City pride and boosterism</li> <li>- Community empowerment</li> <li>- Decreasing criminal rate</li> <li>- Increasing sport participation at community &amp; city levels</li> <li>- Increase community visibility</li> <li>- Mixed social groups</li> <li>- Greener environment</li> <li>- International image building, place promotion &amp; recognition</li> <li>- Better public space</li> <li>- Creating new tourist attraction</li> <li>- Infrastructure improvement</li> <li>- Creating mixed function area including new development</li> <li>- Improving tourism facility</li> <li>- Housing affordability</li> <li>- Property price increase</li> <li>- Metropolitan economic growth</li> <li>- City-wide employment growth</li> <li>- Revenues to the event organisers</li> <li>- Attracting manufacturing facilities &amp; company headquarters</li> <li>- Increase in tourism during &amp; after the event</li> <li>- Local merchants benefiting</li> </ul>	<p>Improving public management, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Special Olympic legislation to increase decision-making efficiency</li> <li>- Public-private partnership in event preparation and organising</li> <li>- Tax incentive to stimulate certain economic sectors</li> <li>- Tax incentives and grants to refurbish properties</li> <li>- Information system with high-tech support</li> <li>- Encourage the inflow of talents from outside</li> <li>- Community participation in small-scale neighbourhood upgrading programme</li> <li>- Education, job training</li> <li>- Upgrading of low-quality area</li> <li>- Using special housing policy to provide different housing types</li> <li>- Neighbourhood facilities for different income groups</li> <li>- Provision of high quality sports facilities</li> <li>- Infrastructure development</li> <li>- Removing pollution sources</li> <li>- Developing fast public transportation system</li> <li>- Introducing mix-function land use</li> <li>- Improving retail and service sector</li> <li>- Creating business network strategy</li> <li>- Real estate development</li> <li>- Focus on tourist planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Enhancing international prestige</li> <li>- Enhancing self-esteem &amp; self confidence</li> <li>- Community empowerment</li> <li>- Providing housing for different income groups</li> <li>- Multi-cultural society &amp; diversity</li> <li>- Improving health</li> <li>- Reducing poverty</li> <li>- Social security</li> <li>- Improving (physical) accessibility</li> <li>- Decreasing environmental pollution</li> <li>- Landscape beautification</li> <li>- Creating new landmark</li> <li>- Creating new urban centrality (reimaging)</li> <li>- Create high-quality public transportation system</li> <li>- Creating high-quality public space system</li> <li>- Tourism growth</li> <li>- Creating employment</li> <li>- Real estate growth (quantity + quality)</li> <li>- Short-term economic growth</li> <li>- Long-term economic growth</li> <li>- Foreign direct investment</li> <li>- Improving city competitiveness</li> </ul>	<p><b>Governance</b></p> <p><b>Social</b></p> <p><b>Spatial &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p><b>Economic</b></p>
<b>Expected effects</b>	<b>Urban development strategies</b>	<b>Motives</b>	

‘Barcelona 2000’ planning exercise of 1988-1992 (Table 2), in order to identify and meet the essential needs of the city and metropolitan region (Marshall, 1994).

From the strategic spatial planning perspective, in Barcelona the Olympics played a role as an essential means of practice. However, this was started without the terminology or methodology of strategic spatial planning in the early stages. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of the approach reveals some of the key characteristics, which are essential to strategic planning. Among these are the very effective economic and political motives, the relationship between short-term programmes and long-term perspectives, the large number of stakeholders involved and the close links between goals and implementation. The Barcelona 1992 Olympics had enormous advantages for politicians who wished to rescue the city with a public project, as all sorts of accumulated services and infrastructure deficits could easily be linked to the overall goals of urban development (Marshall, 1996).

**Table 2 Major objectives and strategic lines of the Barcelona 2000 Strategic Plan**

Main Objective	Consolidate Barcelona as an enterprising European metropolis, with influence over its region and with a modern, socially balanced quality of life
Strategic lines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Make Barcelona one of the key centres of the region</li><li>– Improve the quality of life for people</li><li>– Support for industry and for advanced services to business</li></ul>

Source: Ajuntament De Barcelona, 1990

### 2.2 Motive for hosting the Games

The motivation behind bidding for the 1992 Olympic Games came mainly from the economic urgency which arose from the crisis faced by the city in the early 1980s. The political competition factor was a significant additional incentive for the city council. Significant investments were required during that period due to the demands of a growing population, the high levels of unemployment and the severe deprivation in particular neighbourhoods (Gold and Gold, 2007; Brunet, 1995). These authors argue that the Barcelona Olympic Games were meant to be a protective buffer against the economic crisis that affected Europe. This motive was elaborated into detailed socio-economic and spatial-environmental objectives, such as the upgrading of inner and outer deprived urban districts, the massive extension and improvement of the network of public spaces and facilities, the building of new ring roads and drainage systems, the improvement of the telecommunication infrastructure, and the transformation of the old port. On the one hand, there is the motive of adapting the city to the opportunities brought by economic globalisation; this is reflected in the implementation of strategic plans. On the other hand, there is the motive to solve problems in the city caused by periods of crisis and stagnation; these focus on an economic re-launch of the city.

### 2.3 Urban development strategies

Compared with other former Olympic cities, the most essential of Barcelona's experiences is the emphasis on a long-term vision and strategic planning towards urban revitalisation, rather than specific piecemeal interventions. Many of the plans and projects for the Olympics were designed in the 1960s and the 1970s, and were not the result of new proposals purely developed for the Games. This shows the continuity of the urban strategy of the city. These strategic projects were supported collectively by both the public and the private sector. A flexible planning approach was used in order to stimulate mixed functional land uses and further regeneration of adjoining areas, allowing significant private investments thereby sharing the financial risks between the public and private sectors. From the spatial point of view, the shift from quality to quantity was a strategy to attract private investment, as well as an instrument to generate consensus in a depressed economy. 'Rebranding' Barcelona was considered as an essential form of 'city marketing' (Ward, 1998). The Olympic Games were the perfect opportunity to provide the ideal 'flagship' event to develop a new image for Barcelona and replace the image of the old industrial city (Chalkey and Essex, 1999; Monclús, 2000). In the mid 1980s public subsidies were used to stimulate private investment, which was seen as 'leverage' to reorient the urban policy towards 'entrepreneurial urban development'. A more business-like and less controlled urban management approach and a new method of spatial intervention was introduced to cope with the exceptional circumstances arising from the Olympic Games, including the joint venture between local and central government, which would normally have been impossible to realise. Although the Barcelona experience had most of the essential characteristics of strategic planning – goals and implementation being closely linked – there was still no terminology or methodology during that period (Marshall, 1996). Instruments that represented the conventional planning approach were used in the planning process to guarantee the implementation of the Olympic projects, such as penalties for failure in deadlines (leading up to 1992).

Many of the Olympic investments in Barcelona were genuine gains for the city's population as a whole. For example, the location of the Olympic village utilised abandoned industrial land, as an essential step in the redevelopment of the whole coastline. The same goes for the construction of the Barcelona ring roads,

---

the creation of various new centres and the Olympic zones of Montjuïc, Diagonal and Vall d'Hebron (Brunet, 1995) (Figure 2). In recent years, other waterfront development projects, taken up for internationalisation reasons, were in this same line – an example being the Forum of Cultures 2004. However, some citizens feared that regular schemes or programmes, which were not part of the overall Olympic plans, would obtain less funding. It generated criticism from the social point of view that work to improve outer districts would fall behind, given the council's determined focus on the Olympics (Marshall, 1996).



**Figure 2** The Olympic zones in Barcelona

Source: Busquets, 2005

#### **2.4 Expected effects and evaluation**

Evaluation of the Barcelona Olympic Games should be based on the level of compliance with the main objectives, as well as the real economic, social and environmental benefits. The outcome of the urban transformation was fruitful, including an enlarged airport, a new ring road and 35 kilometres of major highways, new urban centralities, renovated stadia, 4,500 new flats derived from the Olympic village, two communication towers and five kilometres of new beaches (Gold and Gold, 2007). The successful transformation of the city through these projects would normally have taken decades, but was actually implemented in only six years because of the Games.

Changes in the urban configuration of Barcelona due to the 1992 Olympic Games have been enormous, and there have been many economic effects. However, it is not easy to quantify this economic impact, since on the one hand the preparation period was the same as the one in which Spain joined the European Community (1986) and on the other hand one must consider the impact of other projects and investments which were indirectly linked to the event. The Games themselves were financially self-sustained, and there were remarkable figures showing the economic boom of the city. The difference between revenues and expenditures shows a positive account (Brunet, 1995). In December 1993 the city's unemployment figure of 11.9% was somewhat below that of Catalonia (12.2%) and well below that of Spain (16.6%). These figures also show a positive social impact by the urban development during that period, and moreover, Barcelona's city marketing effort was not accompanied by increased social polarisation or geographic social segregation, when compared to other cities (Calavita and Ferrer, 2000).

However, there were also some negative effects like the increase of housing prices. The revival of the real estate market was rapid and fierce in the 1990s, but it is hard to determine whether this was because of the Olympics or the de-regulation of housing policy. Nevertheless, gentrification was a concomitant of the socio-spatial transformation process of the Olympic Games (Mullins, 1991). The process of urban transformation aroused by the Olympic projects, had – similar to other urban regeneration projects – a drastic effect on the poor, through increasing housing prices and decreasing housing accessibility for the local population and thus caused displacement and gentrified centres (Marshall, 1996; Broudehoux, 2007). It symbolises the changes in social classes on the event locations, replacing the existing working-class population and industry-related urban functions with middle-class residents and service-related functions (Olds, 1998; Hiller, 2000). An on-going gentrification process and a 'brandification' of urban space go hand in hand in reinforcing the lack of diversity of many urban areas. For example, due to touristic promotion

---

some urban areas are directly or indirectly linked with tourism, which diminishes the goal of a diversified and integrated city, both in urban and social terms (Munoz, 2006).

Last but not least, the environmental effects of the Barcelona Olympic Games should also be included in the overall evaluation. However, it is a challenge to evaluate the results from a green perspective, since it was not considered as the main goal, compared to the socio-economic objectives. Nevertheless, there are still voices from the environmental perspective. For example, some argue that the project was a wasteful and anti-ecological one, since too much emphasis was given to road and air transport and the urbanisation process was too fast, particularly in some areas that could have been developed better, with more social benefits at a slower pace. However, it expresses a position, which is almost certainly a small minority in the city, and has been given little political voice (Marshall, 1996).

### 3 CRITICAL REFLECTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Mega-events – such as Olympic Games – have increasingly been considered as a deliberate strategy of spatial planning and a new tool in area development and urban governance. This started with the case of Barcelona, when for the first time in history Olympic projects were aiming at the promotion of the strategic development of the city and its region as a whole. This has generated new forms of urban governance that seek the opportunities brought by global forces. Here, the aim is to materialise a vision for the future of the city, with the support of various stakeholders, including economical, social and environmental objectives for sustainable development. Enormous results have been seen in the host cities, especially in the improvement of the physical infrastructure, the quantity and quality of public spaces and the boom of real estate development.

The results of Barcelona case are fruitful. In terms of both the resolution of past problems and preparing for the future, most direct and indirect investments of the Olympic Games were in civil construction projects and infrastructure, with an aimed legacy in urban transformation and economic restructuring, such as new centralities, increased productivity and city competitiveness (Brunet, 1995). Barcelona was transformed from the 1980s city, with large deficits in services and infrastructure and in the midst of a deep economic crisis, to a restructured, dynamic and outward-looking metropolis in the mid-1990s. This is seen as a testimony that some cities can indeed exercise an influence over their own destiny (Marshall, 1996).

We evaluated the items in the evaluation framework in Table 1 for the Barcelona case in order to show whether we can speak of a sustainable approach of the Olympics in which social, economic, spatial and environmental perspectives are balanced as a result of a long-term vision on urban development. In Table 3 we indicate in bold and italics those issues on which the organisation of the Barcelona Olympics focused. Analysis indicates that more emphasis was given to socio-economic and spatial issues, and less to environmental issues, especially when compared with the subsequent Olympics in Sydney and Beijing.

Besides the positive impact of a mega-event on a host city, there are also lessons to be learned from former experiences in further mitigating the negative impact on host cities. Using Olympic cities – in particular the city of Barcelona – as cases, we found that although each case needs to be judged within its own spatial, economic, social and political context, it is recommended to put a plan in place to mitigate the negative effects:

1) Since Barcelona 1992, host cities of Olympic Games have taken the opportunity to solve existing urban problems such as a downgraded inner-city area and insufficient infrastructure. The Olympic Games are now also considered as a means to improve the urban competitiveness of a host city in the global urban system. Olympic projects were used as showcase for the city. However, as a consequence, the limited resources of the public sector were mainly used to subsidise Olympic-related projects, so that the government had to cut back on social welfare spending.

2) Gentrification, as a by-product of large urban projects, happens under the influence of market forces along with the implementation of large-scale Olympic projects. This usually causes social and functional changes in the key-project locations, thereby replacing the existing working-class population and industrial functions with a middle-class population and commercial functions (Hiller, 2000). This relation between mega-event and urban regeneration, as well as the associated gentrification process, may happen particularly in post-industrial cities. Social justice needs to be well considered within the process of realising event-related large projects, so as to avoid the consequence that the private investors share most of the profit of growth, while the local tax-payer bears the loss.

**Table 3 Evaluation results of the Barcelona case**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>City pride and boosterism</i></li> <li>- Community empowerment</li> <li>- Decreasing criminal rate</li> <li>- Increasing sport participation at community &amp; city levels</li> <li>- Increase community visibility</li> <li>- Mixed social groups</li>   <li>- <i>Greener environment</i></li> <li>- <i>International image building, place promotion &amp; recognition</i></li> <li>- <i>Better public space</i></li> <li>- <i>Creating new tourist attraction</i></li> <li>- <i>Infrastructure improvement</i></li> <li>- <i>Creating mixed function area including new development</i></li> <li>- <i>Improving tourism facility</i></li>   <li>- <i>Housing affordability</i></li> <li>- Property price increase</li> <li>- <i>Metropolitan economic growth</i></li> <li>- <i>City-wide employment growth</i></li> <li>- <i>Revenues to the event organisers</i></li> <li>- Attracting manufacture facilities &amp; company headquarters</li> <li>- <i>Increase in tourism during &amp; after the event</i></li> <li>- Local merchants benefiting</li> </ul>	<p>Improving public management, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Special Olympic legislation to increase decision-making efficiency</li> <li>- <b><i>Public-private partnership in event preparation and organising</i></b></li> <li>- Tax incentive to stimulate certain economic sectors</li> <li>- Tax incentives and grants to refurbish properties</li> <li>- Information system with high-tech support</li>   <li>- Encourage the inflow of talents from outside</li> <li>- Community participation in small-scale neighbourhood upgrading programme</li> <li>- Education, job training</li> <li>- <b><i>Upgrading of low-quality area</i></b></li> <li>- Using special housing policy to provide different housing types</li> <li>- Neighbourhood facilities for different income groups</li>   <li>- <b><i>Provision of high quality sports facilities</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>Infrastructure development</i></b></li> <li>- Removing pollution sources</li> <li>- Developing fast public transportation system</li>   <li>- <b><i>Introducing mix-function land use</i></b></li> <li>- Improving retail and service sector</li> <li>- Creating business network strategy</li> <li>- Real estate development</li> <li>- <b><i>Focus on tourist planning</i></b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b><i>Enhancing international prestige</i></b></li> <li>- Enhancing self-esteem &amp; self confidence</li> <li>- Community empowerment</li> <li>- <b><i>Providing housing for different income groups</i></b></li> <li>- Multi-cultural society &amp; diversity</li> <li>- Improving health</li> <li>- Reducing poverty</li> <li>- Social security</li>   <li>- <b><i>Improving (physical) accessibility</i></b></li> <li>- Decreasing environmental pollution</li> <li>- <b><i>Landscape beautification</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>Creating new landmark</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>Creating new urban centrality (reimaging)</i></b></li> <li>- Create high-quality public transportation system</li> <li>- <b><i>Creating high-quality public space system</i></b></li>   <li>- <b><i>Tourism growth</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>Creating employment</i></b></li> <li>- -Real estate growth (quantity + quality)</li> <li>- <b><i>Short-term economic growth</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>Long-term economic growth</i></b></li> <li>- Foreign direct investment</li> <li>- <b><i>Improving city competitiveness</i></b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Governance</b></p> <p><b>Social</b></p> <p><b>Spatial &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p><b>Economic</b></p>
<b>Expected effects</b>	<b>Urban development strategies</b>	<b>Motives</b>	

3) Long-term effects need to be well-evaluated in the host cities, rather than be viewed only in terms of the short period of the mega-event. There are insufficient analytical tools to comprehensively assess the socio-economic and environmental impacts of the mega-event on the host city. This includes the approaches



---

which integrate organising the Olympics and the post-Olympic use of event facilities and urban development in the post-event period. As there are usually conflicts between event requirements and post-event usage of Olympic facilities, strategic appraisal of the initiative in the pre-project stage is necessary. This should include proposals on how to re-integrate the event heritage into urban networks in the future. Generally speaking, for the aims of mega-event strategies and the nature of strategic spatial planning, the distinction between publicly provided social objectives and privately produced economic opportunities has blurred. 'Business' became increasingly the main feature, using promotion strategies and the profit-making sector to increase the share of capital investments from entrepreneurs, tourists or local consumers (Roche, 1994; Waitt, 1999). However, by using scarce public resources in Olympic projects, as subsidies for developers, welfare spending had to be cut to meet the urge for city competitiveness and growth (Baade, 1994; De Lange, 1998; Owen, 2005; Horne and Manzenreiter, 2006). Due to the direct participation of private capital, local authorities sometimes behaved as private real-estate developers (Waitt, 1999). The main economic benefits seem to fall in the hands of the global broadcasting industry, as well as local business owners and real estate speculators, who benefited from newly revitalised areas (Nauright, 2004). However, the costs are generally borne by the disadvantaged who endure inflation, soaring rents, and debts that undermine future welfare investments (Whitson and Macintosh, 1996; Burbank et al., 2001). Therefore social equity should be considered as an important measurement of the social sustainability of the host cities (Broudehoux, 2007), not only for the event related projects, but for the strategic planning of the city and region as a whole.

In general, considering the huge potentials that may be brought to cities, the mega-event strategy – as represented by 'Olympic urbanism' – will continue to be used in the 21st century, as a concept related to planning strategies towards social, economic and ecological sustainability. However, it must be accompanied by more pro-active urban governance approaches.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors wish to acknowledge the financial assistance of Delft University of Technology through the Delft Centre for Sustainable Urban Areas.

#### REFERENCES

- Ajuntament De Barcelona "Pla Estrategic Economie i Social", Barcelona, Ajuntament, 1990.
- Albrechts, L., "Bridge the Gap: From Spatial Planning to Strategic Projects", *European Planning Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 10, pp. 1487-1500.
- Andranovich, G., Burbank, M.J., and Heying, C.H., "Olympic cities: lessons learned from mega-event politics", *Journal of Urban Affairs*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (2001), pp. 113-131.
- Baade, R., "Stadiums, professional sports, and economic development: Assessing the reality", *A Heartland Policy Study*, No. 62 (1994), pp. 1-40.
- Broudehoux, A., "Spectacular Beijing: The Conspicuous Construction of an Olympic Metropolis", *Journal of Urban Affairs*, Vol. 29, No. 4 (2007), pp. 383-399.
- Brunet, F., "An economic analysis of the Barcelona'92 Olympic Games: resources, financing and impact", in "The Keys to Success: the social, sporting, economic and communications impact of Barcelona'92", edited by Miquel de Moragas and Miquel Botella, Barcelona, Servei de Publicacions de la UAB, 1995, pp. 203-237.
- Burbank, M.J., Andranovich, G. and Heying, C.H. "Olympic dreams: The impact of mega-events on local politics", Boulder (Colorado), Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001.
- Busquets, J. "Barcelona – The Urban Evolution of a Compact City", Harvard, 2005.
- Calavita, N. and Ferrer, A., "Behind Barcelona's Success Story: Citizen Movements and Planners' Power", *Journal of Urban History*, Vol. 26, No. 6 (2000), pp.793-807.
- Chen, Y., Qu, L. and Rooij, R. "Realizing Olympic Games in the Netherlands", *The Architecture Annual 2007-2008*, Delft, Delft University of Technology, 2009, pp. 60-65.
- De Lange, "The games cities play", Pretoria, SIGMA Press, 1998.
- Furrer, P., "Sustainable Olympic Games, A dream or a reality?" *Bollettino della Società Geografica Italiana*, Serie XII, Vol. VII, No. 4 (2002).
- Gold, J. and Gold, M., "Olympic Cities: City Agendas, Planning and the World's Games, 1896-2012",

- 
- London, Routledge, 2007.
- Harvey, D., "The urban experience", Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- Healey, P., "Collaborative planning in a stakeholder society", *Town Planning Review*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (1998), pp. 1-21.
- Healey, P., "The treatment of space and place in the new strategic planning in Europe", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 28, No. 1 (2004), pp. 45-67.
- Hiller, H.H., "Mega-events, urban boosterism and growth strategies: An analysis of the objectives and legitimations of the Cape Town 2004 Olympic bid", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (2000), pp. 439-458.
- Horne, J. and Manzenreiter, W., "An introduction to the sociology of sports mega-events", *The Sociological Review*, Vol. 54, No. 2 (2006), pp. 1-24.
- Marshall, T., "Barcelona and the Delta: metropolitan infrastructure planning and socio-ecological projects", *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (1994), pp. 395-414.
- Marshall, T., "Barcelona – fast forward? City entrepreneurialism in the 1980s and 1990s", *European Planning Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (1996), pp. 147-165.
- Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer [Ministry of VROM], "Structuurvisie Randstad 2040; naar een duurzame en concurrerende Europese topregio" [Randstad 2040; toward a sustainable and competitive European top region], The Hague.
- Monclús, F.-J., "Barcelona's planning strategies: from 'Paris of the South' to the 'Capital of West Mediterranean'", *GeoJournal*, Vol. 51, No. 1-2 (2000), pp. 57-63.
- Mullins, P., "Tourism Urbanisation", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* No. 15 (1991), pp. 326-342.
- Munoz, F., "Olympic urbanism and Olympic Villages: planning strategies in Olympic host cities, London 1908-London 2012", *The Sociological Review*, Vol. 54, No. 2 (2006), pp. 175-187.
- Nauright, J. "Global games: culture, political economy and sport in the globalised world of the 21st century", *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 7 (2004), pp. 1325-1336.
- Owen, J.G. "Estimating the Cost and Benefit of Hosting Olympic Games: What Can Beijing Expect from Its 2008 Games?" *The Industrial Geographer*, Vol. 3, No.1 (2005), pp. 1-18.
- Roche, M. "Mega-events and urban policy", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 21 (1994), pp. 1-19.
- Salet, W. and Faludi, A. (eds.), "The Revival of Strategic Spatial Planning", Amsterdam, Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen Verhandelingen, 2000.
- Waite, G., "Playing Games with Sydney: Marketing Sydney for the 2000 Olympics", *Urban Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 7 (1999), pp. 1055-1077.
- Ward, S.V., "Selling Places: The Marketing and Promotion of Towns and Cities 1850-2000", London, E. & F.N. Spon, 1998.
- Whitson, D. and Macintosh, D., "The Global Circus: International Sport, Tourism, and the Marketing of Cities", *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (1996), pp. 278-295.