

This transcript has been disclosed by the GLA in response to a request under the Environmental Information Regulations (EIR).

In accordance with our obligations to liaise with third-parties whose information is subject to an EIR request, the GLA has engaged with the interviewee(s) covered by this transcript.

As part of this process, and following our own review of the transcripts, the GLA identified errors in the transcription of the audio recordings of the interviews. These included

- typographical errors;
- comments being attributed to the wrong person;
- text being omitted in the transcription; and
- instances where the transcriber completely misunderstood what was being said, and writing something wholly incorrect.

Where the GLA has identified genuine errors in the transcription when compared to the audio recording, we have made corrections to these transcripts using “tracked-changes”.

In each case, the corrected text is shown in the margins of the page and is accompanied by a brief explanation for that correction.

The GLA has taken this approach to ensure both the corrections and original text are available, and so we can balance our legal obligations under the EIR with our duty to help ensure accurate information is released in respect of the individuals interviewed as part of the Garden Bridge Review.

In some case, the parties interviewed have asked the GLA to include certain comments regarding their comments to help provide some clarification about what they were intending to convey. Again, these are clearly marked on the transcripts.

Please note however, the transcript may, despite our best endeavours, contain errors due the transcription process itself.

Garden Bridge Review Meeting Transcript

Event: MH/Cllr Jennie Mosley (Lambeth) meeting

Date: 8 November 2016

*Present: Councillor Jennie Mosley
Dame Margaret Hodge MP
Claire Hamilton*

JENNIE MOSLEY (JM): Excellent. Okay so just to sort of give you a brief background, I'm a lifelong resident of Waterloo and obviously resident councillor there. I've worked alongside lots of the organisation that we speak about, particularly Coin Street; I've worked very closely over the last sort of 20 - 30 years. So starting right off, about the Garden Bridge Trust, I think, end to end, there's been history of poor practice and breach of due process that we've been highlighting for about a couple of years now but, regrettably, it's been allowed to get this far, in our opinion. I think the business plan was confirmed by the NAO to have been flawed; the operations management plan is totally unviable and that was reported, by Dan Anderson, for the Fourth Street. I've got copies of this if you need it.

DAME MARGARET HODGE (MH): Have we got that Dan Anderson report?

CLAIRE HAMILTON (CH): Yes, I was reading it over the weekend, actually; I brought you a copy.

MH: Okay.

JM: The procurement cost --

MH: Dan Anderson - just remind me; I get so muddled with the characters - he's the guy from --

JM: Fourth Street.

MH: Yes.

JM: And if you haven't already, it would be worth having a conversation with him, definitely.

MH: Yes, he's on our list, isn't he?

CH: Yes.

JM: Yes. Procurement obviously was flawed, in our -- and that was reported by Project Compass. I don't know whether you've got that report as well?

MH: Yes.

CH: You have a copy of that.

MH: We've got a copy of that as well?

CH: Yes.

MH: Even more paper.

CH: I'm afraid so; I've got a whole folder.

MH: I can't bear it.

JM: Yes, I know, my house is -- resembles, you know, many trees.

The failure of community engagement which I've witnessed first-hand, which has absolutely been null and void. And failure --

MH: None at all. When did Garden Bridge Trust first talk to Coin Street or talk to local people?

JM: They came to one community forum -- no so there's something called the South Bank Forum, which happens once every eight weeks, I think it is, and they've presented there about four or five times. But we've not -- that's not engagement; that's more come along, do a ten-minute presentation, a couple of questions but in terms of actual consultation --

MH: When -- did they do that before 2014? Were they doing that in 2012/13?

JM: No, I think it was --

MH: Forgive me, I can't remember.

JM: -- 2013, it originated.

MH: 2013, Yes.

JM: I think they started doing it around 2014. Obviously I wasn't elected until around May.

MH: Yes.

JM: So it didn't actually come on my radar until probably July/August of that year.

MH: Right.

JM: And then obviously it was in planning at the end of that year.

MH: Yes.

JM: And that's when it all, in my opinion, went a bit belly up.

MH: Yes.

JM: So in terms of community engagement, I'd say that as well, around consultation. There was supposedly a few consultation days held but they were not -- the information wasn't give to the local community in a timely --

MH: What does that mean? Because they say it was?

JM: So what was happening; do you know the area at all?

MH: I do. Well, I walk along the South Bank a lot; I love it.

JM: Right so I live literally --

MH: In Coin Street.

JM: -- in Coin Street.

MH: Are you in the Coin Street Development?

JM: Yes.

MH: Lucky you, it's lovely.

JM: Yes, very, very lucky. And prior to that I lived in the Oxo Tower, which is also with Coin Street Property.

MH: Oh, my God, lovely.

JM: So I've been very, very lucky. But I literally live one street behind where it's proposed.

MH: Right.

JM: And any of the consultation notifications were given four streets away from where the actual thing is so the people that it would directly impact on never received any information from the Garden Bridge about these consultations. People that had gone to them, they were sort of in the back room of a community hall with a note stuck up. It was just really badly done; it was incompetent and it wasn't effective in terms of any engagement with the community.

And then Garden Bridge were forced sort of to come to a public meeting by Kate and Coin Street were there and it got quite heated; people were very angry.

MH: When was that?

JM: This was I'd say about a year ago, I can get you the exact date but, forgive me, I don't have it down.

MH: No, don't worry.

JM: They weren't very happy about the feedback they were getting and they sort of left quite quickly and that's the last we've heard from them, in terms of any kind of engagement. Also, the lack of transparency of contractual arrangements. Using a charitable vehicle to award public infrastructure contract -- it's a bit concerning. And also, Garden Bridge have been very misleading on an ongoing basis and I've got some other bits to add to that.

So the Garden Bridge entered into contracts when the land was not secured and very far from being so and we're still in that position now and this has obviously significantly put taxpayers' money at risk. The lack of visibility of contracts that they have entered into, specifically the break clauses. And again, as I've just mentioned, Garden Bridge's status is a charity; the Charity Commission are looking into launching an investigation and I'm not sure whether you know that but after the NAO stuff, they were contacted as well and they've spoken to Kate and she said that they've got a team on it, that are working to --

MH: Yes they are still doing the investigation.

Just tell me, break clauses; just go back on that. What's in the break clauses that worries you?

JM: We don't know. I think, going back to the beginning, getting contracts for such a huge amount of taxpayers' money when the land is not secure.

MH: Yes.

JM: And we recently had a meeting with Lord Ahmad from the Department of Transport and his concerns were the same.

MH: Yes.

JM: Now, when they went back for the third time to the DOT, cap in hand asking for more money, and they only gave them 9 million this time, that was just to cover the contract so that if it all failed --

MH: That was to cover the break clause?

JM: That was to cover the break clause.

MH: Yes.

JM: And they're still spending a significant amount of money, monthly. I mean, we've had it on good authority they are spending half a million per month. On what, I've no idea. And also, obviously, the break clause is being covered by Department of Transport ensures that they don't have any personal liability and that's obviously of deep concern in terms of value for money and where our taxpayers' money is going.

Yes so as I was saying, so Garden Bridge Trust sets a dangerous precedent, doesn't it, allowing public bodies to effectively offshore major infrastructure projects by leveraging charitable vehicles and to avoid transparency and scrutiny preserved to government bodies. And that's obviously something that is high on our radar.

The role of TfL. Individuals working at TfL and then moving to Arup, when they've been awarded £8.5 million contracts and high-profile people, as you are more than aware.

The Garden Bridge Trust obviously is very unlikely to be able to support the £2-3 million ongoing maintenance costs.

MH: What makes you say that?

JM: Because if it's underwritten by TfL or the Mayor, where is the incentive for Garden Bridge Trust to raise that money? I'm a fundraiser by trade. Twelve days of having fundraising events on the bridge, regularly, is not going to pull in that kind of money, in my opinion. They are finding it hard to bring in the money now, at this stage, so I just think that ongoing (1) the incentive is not there and I don't think they've got the plans to be able to pull that kind of money in. And then obviously, because that is underwritten, then it's again the taxpayers are being affected.

The Garden Bridge Trust have consistently been misleading, externally. It was a Newsnight clip that exposed the fact that the bridge would cost an extra 10 million, delay completion for another year and misrepresented the fact that there was an additional funding gap of 20 million from the 36 million they were publicly saying they needed to raise. And I've got an FOI from Bee Emmott, who works for Garden Bridge Trust, and at the same time that they were publicly saying that they were in a good position, they were speaking to the Department of Transport and saying, as a board, they were looking to wind up if they didn't have this money.

MH: Yes. When was that Newsnight clip? Have you got a date for that?

JM: I'll get a date for you, if you want. I can actually text someone now, if you --

MH: We can probably get that tape. We can probably get that, can't we?

JM: Yes. The journalist is --

MH: Is this the guy at the Architects' Journal?

JM: No, the journalist from Newsnight.

MH: Oh, right.

JM: Her name is Hannah Barnes, which always makes me think of House of Cards.

MH: We probably should ask her, actually, shouldn't we, yes.

CH: Yes.

MH: Okay.

JM: So where am I? So the NAO stated that Garden Bridge Trust reporting to the Department of Transport has completely not been fit for purpose and they're now onto a different regime in terms of government ministers have changed in that way. But for the Garden Bridge Trust to be responsible, accountable but not be accountable for that kind of money is of deep concern; that they have spent that amount of money and we have no idea where it's gone. The fact that they have delayed their -- sorry, annual accounts going in to be audited, as a charity, by six months. And that was at the same time --

MH: When were they supposed to be audited?

JM: So they were meant to go in in July so if I can refer, if that's okay with you --

MH: Yes.

JM: There is this FOI from Vienna, which is around the exact same time, where they reported in the press that everything was hunky dory; they were all on track. And this is where -- it's 12 July where she refers, "Yes, trustees need to demonstrate we are a going concern", there we go.

MH: They got the underwriting after 20 July, of course, didn't they?

JM: Yes but at the time they were saying that the reason the accounts weren't being audited, at that point, was because they were aligning with other charities, which meant that they would have to put them in on 31 December. But from that, it's showing that that's not the reason. It was about the fact that they were looking to wind up and were looking to be insolvent.

MH: Yes, I remember that, yes.

JM: And again, it's about not being transparent at all.

MH: Yes, okay.

JM: Okay. If you want any copies of these, I'm --

MH: We've got that in -- I'm almost through those FOIs. I'm not clear --

CH: I don't think we've got that one because we've got the TfL and GLA ones but we haven't got any Garden Bridge Trust ones so --

JM: Would you like to have these?

CH: Yes, do you want to email it to me or shall I take that copy? What's easiest?

MH: Well, why don't you get all the Garden Bridge Trust ones?

CH: Yes.

MH: Is that the only one? We've got GLA because I've just spent -- I've been going through all the FOIs almost.

JM: I've got quite a few here from Garden Bridge so if you want to take those because I've got them --

MH: Thank you. Are you sure?

JM: Yes, I've got them all at home.

MH: Thank you.

JM: My husband is very good at setting me out.

MH: Good, yes.

JM: Yes, he's very good. Right so back to --

MH: I mean, we know that bit of the story but I haven't got the FOIs (Overspeaking)

JM: You haven't got the FOIs. And other people have tried to get FOIs consistently from TfL, GLA and Lambeth, particularly, and refusing to give over FOIs.

MH: Like what? What sort of information haven't you got?

JM: So, for example, again, in July of this year, there were meetings at City Hall with Sadiq and David Bellamy, Shaun Harris who's the chief exec from Lambeth, Lib Peck, leader of Lambeth and Coin Street. And Lambeth and TfL were trying to push the signing over of the land and basically offering Coin Street anything they wanted. So, for example, they offered them a double -- doubling -- another 75 years on the lease that they already have at peppercorn rent, which would make them have a lease for 150 years. And these are all meant to be material -- huge material changes to the head of terms.

MH: Take me through this because I need to know this. Okay, just go through that slowly.

JM: Shall I go slowly?

MH: Yes, go on.

JM: All right. So the heads of terms need --

MH: With your --

JM: With Coin; it's Coin Street --

MH: With Coin; I understand that. I know about that, yes.

JM: -- Garden Bridge Trust and Lambeth all need to be decided.

MH: Yes.

JM: We felt that Lambeth were pushing these through without much scrutiny so we called it in to the Scrutiny Committee, where lots of information came out that we weren't aware of, and it sort of set a precedent that any material changes to the head of terms because Lambeth were trying to get the officers to do it; giving them the responsibility and we were upset --

MH: You have to agree.

JM: We didn't want officers to have control over this.

MH: Yes.

JM: We wanted it to come back to cabinet. And so it was set that if there were any material changes, it would have to come back to cabinet or full council. So when they are having these secret meetings, as I say, I've got a big connection with Coin Street so a trust that's been built up over many, many years. And so when they have these meetings at City Hall, where Lambeth are offering them a double --

MH: So Lambeth offered --

JM: Seventy-five years extra on the lease that's already there. If they would sign it and sign it quickly. Because this is obviously the one thing that's holding --

MH: This is the lease for what?

JM: The land so the South Landing building --

MH: The land that will be used to construct the bridge or the land that will be used to go to the bridge?

JM: Well, it's both so it will be the place that they have their construction site, which is off the ground.

MH: Yes.

JM: It used to be LW2, I call it --

MH: By the ITV, Yes.

JM: But it's the ITV building, yes. So that is -- that's Lambeth land but it's -- the custodians of that are Coin Street.

MH: Coin Street.

JM: And have a 75-year lease for a peppercorn rent.

MH: So they agreed to double that?

JM: They agreed to double that.

MH: If you allowed the construction of the bridge?

JM: Well, they need to sign it over to the Garden Bridge Trust; so a public piece of land, which is accessible to us at the moment, everybody can use it; it's open space. Once that's signed over to Garden Bridge Trust, it then becomes a private piece of land.

MH: So what's that an advantage to -- am I being daft? What advantage is that to Coin Street?

JM: It isn't. It isn't but they are caught between a rock and a hard place. There was lots of pressure.

Could I turn this off for the moment?

(A short break)

JM: I can leave this with you as well, if you want.

MH: I didn't see the FT yesterday. Did you pick it up?

CH: No.

MH: I saw a letter that Lord Davies --

JM: Lord Davies. And it's really interesting because Connor Sullivan - it might be worth you looking up - he's done two articles so far. This is the latest one and the first one was about trustee liability and it's really interesting so I'd definitely recommend you look at that.

MH: Can we just have a quick look at this?

JM: Yes.

MH: Okay.

JM: Sorry, it's like information overload, isn't it? I'm so sorry.

MH: No. So Ian Tuckett runs your Coin Street Community Builders, which is responsible for maintaining that river strip; the river.

JM: That stretch of land, yes.

MH: Okay. It does say the Garden Bridge Trust needs to raise 56 million towards the 185 million.

JM: Yes.

MH: That's not right. If they're getting 60 million, they need to raise 120 million.

JM: It's 185 million, the project, all in all.

MH: Yes.

JM: So 60 has already been spent.

MH: Sixty million, yes. No, 60 is the public money.

JM: Yes.

CH: There's other bits - other donations - that they've reached.

JM: I've got a list of that.

MH: Okay.

JM: Do you have that? Okay.

CH: I've got one they published, Yes.

JM: And that's really interesting as well because since August, that's not changed; they've not updated that since August this year and we are aware that some of the donors have dropped off of that list. So it will be interesting to actually get an updated version of that.

MH: Yes.

JM: And also, they are pledges; they are not actual cash in the bank.

MH: Yes.

JM: As I know you are aware.

MH: Okay so the position -- I'll get this absolutely right. The position is that you would have to allow Garden Bridge Trust to build a bridge there and that bridge would be on your land, although you -- it would be (Overspeaking)

JM: That's Coin Street, Yes.

MH: Yes, you would be gifting it on 75. What else did they offer you?

JM: It's not me; it's Coin Street.

MH: Yes, what else did they offer Coin Street?

JM: It was -- I think they mentioned something about putting gates on both sides of -- I know, about car control, because they are concerned it's pinch points and the TfL --

MH: Gates on either side of the bridge?

JM: Yes so it would stop -- they are worried about people getting on there late at night; all that kind of stuff.

MH: Yes.

JM: So it was about putting gates there.

MH: And what else were you offered?

JM: -- significantly different to what the planning was, originally.

MH: Yes. Oh, right.

JM: Yes. But that's what I know so far. For me, what's significant is the 75 years just being sort of handed out -- sorry, being handed out as something that Lambeth can just do at the drop of a hat, when it's a massive material change to the heads of terms and it should have come back to cabinet and it hasn't. And it's all very secret, these meetings. There were three meetings, in two weeks, where there was lots of pressure being put on Coin Street to sign over the land. So that's that.

I think for us, as well, the most fundamental question is how could such a significant amount of money be spent and, in the Mayor's own words, for no benefit at all; not a shovel has gone in the ground. And I don't believe that you can put that down to preconstruction costs. We haven't had a breakdown what that looks like but I think it's £22 million has gone on preconstruction costs. Now, the Millennium Bridge cost less

than that to build. Okay, I know that was a decade ago but it's just unbelievable, the amounts of money that is being spent prior to this.

And also, I think the last thing is a bit disappointed that the Mayor has refused to meet us.

MH: Coin Street?

JM: Me, councillor, local representatives.

MH: Councillors.

JM: Local elected representatives. We've been touch with Sadiq several times; no response, not even a "no". He refuses to meet us and my concern about that is that I don't think he's got enough information about what's happening.

MH: He's probably waiting for me to do it.

JM: And I thank you very much and I feel very honoured that I'm the first person here to get all this out. It's two years' worth for someone to please listen to me. So that's sort of where we are. There are certain bits that I just would like to --

MH: I tell you one thing I'd really want to know from you. What was the process that led to Lambeth Council giving this planning permission? I think that sort of would help me.

JM: I've got lots of FOIs about that as well. Yes, we've got very core action group within the local community and I think they are desperately trying to get in touch with you. They are called TCOS - Thames Central Open Spaces - and they've been very proactive.

MH: Yes. We've --

CH: I've written back to them.

MH: Yes, we've written back since.

JM: They have been very proactive in terms of getting FOIs and they just share it with us.

MH: Right, no, that's very good.

JM: Yes so ... sorry, what was --

MH: It had to get planning application from Lambeth.

JM: Yes. So initially, what we found out was the talks with Boris and one of the senior planning officers at Lambeth had been going on since early 2013.

MH: 2013.

JM: And that's what the FOIs showed. So by the time we sort of came on, as councillors, it was already in full swing. And when we did get to planning, I think it --

MH: Because there would have been public consultation around planning.

JM: And there was lot of feedback about those -- at those consultations, however not a lot of it was taken on board. There was a huge outcry, publicly. We were just heard as noise - there is just a bit of noise, locally - and it wasn't. And since then it's gained massive momentum, for want of a better word. I presented a position for cabinet, last year, with 15,000 signatures on it, which were from local people that were unhappy about the bridge. So yes, there was consultation but, to a certain extent, unless you know where to go.

MH: But they should; the officer should.

JM: Yes. I'm talking about local people.

MH: I mean, I've been on a local council. They ought to know and they ought to have told you that they were doing the planning application, as a local councillor.

JM: Yes, we weren't there.

MH: You weren't there, were you?

JM: I don't know whether the timing sort of didn't work, in terms of us having the knowledge. There were changes in those positions at that time.

MH: That's right.

JM: And how acutely aware they were of the plan and stuff but --

MH: Right, by the time you came in, in 2014, they were well down the line.

JM: Yes. And then -- so I think it was September or October of that year when it went to full planning and from a lot of jigs and reels, it ended up with 46 planning conditions set against it; unprecedented. It's never happened before, in Lambeth, that a project that was clearly, even at that point, not fit for purpose. There was no operations plan set in place, that they had these 46 conditions. So we've had to go PAC meetings every sort of three or four months - myself and my other fellow councillor - to discuss, with Garden Bridge, where they've gone down the line with these conditions.

MH: Those conditions.

JM: All, bar one, has been met. There are certain issues I still have about the police; I don't think the police are involved properly, in terms of the reporting of the terrorism situation etc, etc. It was just experts that had been paid a huge amount of money, in

my opinion, from the Garden Bridge Trust but there was no direct link, in terms of having those conversations with the Metropolitan Police. And that's just one example of that.

And also talking about the crushing; possible crushing element. So the original document from TfL put it in a category of -- I think it was a B. And, forgive me, I'm not totally au fait with the details but the B meant it would be uncomfortable, at times, along that stretch into South Bank. That's what was presented at planning. Six months down the line, when it was challenged, "Oh, no, actually, it's a C; it is very uncomfortable". So there was a misrepresentation, in terms of some of the information that had been given over at that time.

MH: So despite your lobbying, they gave it planning permission on the grounds that there were no grounds to refuse it? Or on the grounds they positively wanted it?

JM: They positively wanted it. It was proactively --

MH: By the cabinet and the leadership?

JM: Yes and by officers, definitely, yes.

MH: But presumably supported by members?

JM: Well, Yes. I mean, I think it was 4 to 1. No, it was 4 to 2; it was the Tory councillor and someone called Sally Prentice, who is a Labour member, who voted against the bridge and then obviously the Chair had the casting vote so that's where it was. And it's been proactively pushed by the cabinet, definitely, definitely.

MH: Right.

JM: I'm just going to call up a couple of things. So, I mean, I know you are going to talk to Dan so I don't want to steal his thunder but his report is excellent and just exposes all the gaps within the operations maintenance plan.

MH: Yes, I've read it. I think I read that.

JM: And also how unviable that is, in itself, but also the fact that fundraising element is just null and void. I don't want to sort of bore you into submission.

MH: No, go on. You've got time to say what you want to say.

JM: I think, just sort of going back to the trustee's liability and about it's tearing the backside out of it, that's how I feel is happening at the moment. And that can only affect the public funds and that is a deep concern for me. I don't know whether I'm living in cloud cuckoo land - I don't think I am -- it's when, not if, with this bridge. You know, if you imagined, with all the press that's happened, how is that going to attract

funding from organisations to give over to something that's quite toxic? And at the moment, with a £56 million, it's not going to happen.

From our point of view-- I'm ever the optimist -- that it will fail but it's when it is and how much that will cost us. How far down the line are we going to get to; we've spent every single penny? And the consistency of the bridge going cap in hand to the Department of Transport. Their behaviour showing that they are just totally incompetent. It's one of these public meetings, Margaret; they didn't know about some of the details of their project and I had to tell them. It was so embarrassing; people were laughing in the forum.

MH: Tell me about that?

JM: So it was Bee Emmott. She was there but she was talking about how many trees would be felled and she was saying, "Oh there were 20" and I was like, "It's not; it's 30", you know, and it's this Bee and it's that. It sounds ridiculous but just small details like that, where they were unclear about, you know, stuff that they should know. And that just sort of sums them up, really, in terms of their lack of --

MH: Just tell me something. They put a big case on economic development; helping regeneration and earth building and all that sort of stuff.

JM: Being on the South Bank, it doesn't need regenerating.

MH: No.

JM: I've lived there all of my life.

MH: Yes.

JM: I avoid the South Bank; it's so busy.

MH: I know.

JM: It's so busy. I took my mother-in-law over there the other day and, God love her, she's disabled and in a wheelchair and we're there two minutes and we go, "We have to leave". This is before this supposed transport link, which is not a transport link at all. I mean, it's a tourist attraction, isn't it? It's never in any of the plans from the Mayor - the previous Mayor - that it was going to be such. And they are looking to bring upwards of 5 million people extra to the South Bank each year. I mean, it's madness. And you've got two bridges, either side, that takes you to Covent Garden. And, I'm sorry, I don't mean to sort of laugh but I just feel it's so ridiculous, what's the excuse of why it's there.

MH: Do you deal with the people who are trying to get the development on the north side? Do you have any dealings with them on the Westminster side? King's College and all that bit. They are trying to get regeneration there and they are trying to do the link

through to Covent Garden. That is one of the arguments that from Westminster, I assume; I haven't talked to Westminster yet. Westminster wants to get an easier sort of tourist link in from -- you go and visit the South Bank and then you walk across and you go into Covent Garden and spend your money there. Did you ever talk to the people on the North side?

JM: I went to the planning meeting at Westminster, where, you know, they were more concerned of it than Lambeth, I volunteer --

MH: Were they?

JM: Yes, at the time. And --

MH: Well, they got this commitment on maintenance out of him that there is a planning condition that they had to be underwritten.

JM: That's right, yes. And --

MH: It's just a bit unclear, is the maintenance underwritten by TfL or GLA?

JM: I think it's GLA.

CH: I think it has to be GLA but they'll deploy it through TfL but it's a GLA provided one.

MH: Are you sure? Because it's very unclear in the stuff, to me, that it's -- you can't check that for me?

CH: Yes.

MH: It would be brilliant just to check --

JM: Dan Anderson's report, I think, that will be in. I'm sure I have that.

MH: Because you will get all these sort of statements from TfL saying, "We're not going to pay the maintenance". Then you get the undertaking, which they all say they don't want to use obviously. If you could just check for me, that would be really, really helpful. It's just me probably not getting it right.

CH: Will do.

MH: So Westminster got that undertaking?

JM: Yes, they did. We talk about housing and I know that they're building on that side of the North Bank. But the value of those homes are not, in any way ... unless you've got an inheritance hidden away, somewhere that, you know, ordinary people are going to buy, you know. So it's sort of let's define regeneration, you know.

MH: Yes.

JM: It's ... for me, it's not a reason to have that bridge at that cost. Let's have a footbridge, if that's the reason for it, not a £185 million bridge that's cost the taxpayer 60 million and it was never part of the Transport Plan from the Mayor and it's not needed and it's not wanted, you know, which is very simple.

MH: Would they all come and talk to you? Well, you weren't there locally but if they had come and talked to Coin Street in 2013, they might have got a different ...

JM: I think ... can I take this off record, if that's all right?

(A short break)

JM: I think that might be about it. I feel like I've just gone so I apologise.

MH: No, that's really -- I think we have covered the things -- there is nothing I have failed to cover, is there, that we were going to cover in our lot? I think we're all right.

JM: So it says:

"If the GLA provides a guarantee of operating costs, then the last of these solutions [I'll go back to them] is most likely to -- which puts the Mayor's manifesto commitment of no more money at significant risk."

MH: Yes.

JM: So there are four contradictions about how they could get more money or pay for the maintenance and the last one would be to get GLA. So it is the GLA, not TfL.

MH: Yes.

JM: But that's all in Dan's report so I'll let him do that.

MH: Yes, I've read that report. So just summing it up, okay, your main objection; just tell me your main objections?

JM: I mean, so on one side it's not needed in the areas, in my opinion, as a transport link.

MH: Yes but would it damage the area?

JM: Yes. So the public land that it -- The South Landing building will land on - the overuse of "land", I apologise - is public, open space.

MH: Yes.

JM: It was fought for, for about a decade; I was part of that campaign. The local people fought for it; that you couldn't build on it. It's one of the best parks in front of ITV. Beautiful, tree lined, absolutely stunning. You can sit and have a picnic or just sit and watch and that will all be done. That will be a concrete entrance to the bridge, with shops on it, and we'll just lose that public land and that is a travesty. There was a covenant on it, saying it could never be built on, and this is what Lambeth are doing; they are changing the terms of that lease, to Coin Street, that Garden Bridge can build on it.

But the impact in terms of the additional people that come to the area and what they bring; what that footprint brings. Rubbish, traffic, deliveries for -- it's a busy area anyway but it will just absolutely crucify it, I think. And as I say, as a local resident, happy for change, happy for change. I think some of the stuff along that area has been fantastic but I think, for me, this is a step too far and something that will significantly impact the area in a detrimental way.

MH: Brilliant, thank you.

JM: You're welcome.

MH: The time I love the area best, actually, is you know that breast cancer walk? Do you ever do that?

JM: Yes.

MH: And they walk along the South Bank and you're doing it so you come across Tower Bridge, is one of the bits of the walk, and then you come up the South Bank. I can't remember if you cross again but anyway, at 3 o'clock in the morning or 2 o'clock in the morning, when you finally get there, it is utterly beautiful.

JM: Is it the moonshine walk, is that the one?

MH: I've done that a couple of times. I haven't done it the last couple of years. Actually, I've done it more than a couple of times - probably three or four times - and I just -- because I love it. In fact, the last walk they changed because, for some reason, we couldn't do that walk. There was something going on; we couldn't do it. And it was really boring; I didn't like the walk and it was a long road.

JM: Because it's stunning along there, isn't it?

MH: It's absolutely stunning.

JM: Yes. I mean -- and from an aesthetics point of view -- that bridge will stop those views from Waterloo Bridge into St Paul's.

MH: Yes.

Commented [GLA FoI1]: The GLA has redacted the remaining part of the transcript as the conversation becomes a private conversation. The conversation does not relate in any way to the Garden Bridge or contain anything remotely relating to the scope of the Garden Bridge Review.

It has therefore been removed as being out-of-scope of "a transcript of the conversation in relation to the Garden Bridge Review".

JM: And, you know -- I mean, it's iconic. It's just stunning, isn't it?

MH: Yes.

JM: You know, so -- but that's something different.

MH: Good. Thank you very, very much indeed.

JM: Thanks for your time.