

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/Southwark*

Date: *22 November 2016*

Present: *Dame Margaret Hodge MP*

Claire Hamilton

Councillor David Noakes

Councillor Adele Morris

DAME MARGARET HODGE (MH):

This is your opportunity to tell me what you think I should know. What I should say to you is that my remit is not to say if it is a good idea or a bad idea. My remit is to say, "Was proper due process followed?" and if not, what are the lessons to be learned about that? And then also, "What is the value for money out of this whole concept and project?" So it is really anything, from where you sit and your knowledge of it, that you think would help me and I might ask you some questions as we go along.

DAVID NOAKES (DN):

Adele's probably the best person to lead because she's more --

ADELE MORRIS (AM):

Yeah, I mean, I know that Coin Street residents - and that includes people from the Oxo Tower - many of them -- I can't say all of them because I haven't spoken to all of them so never make the assumption but, certainly, I know a significant number of people in Coin Street, including Oxo Tower, have been unhappy about it --

CLAIRE HAMILTON (CH): All the time?

AM: Yes, from day one, actually.

MH: This is an interesting thing: that when you look at the early consultation exercises, 85 per cent were keen.

AM: Yeah but I think this was --

MH: It was an open consultation. I think they would say it was an open consultation.

DN: Yeah.

AM: I thought that 85 per cent was from a kind of poll that they did; a London-wide poll.

MH: No.

AM: That was from local --

MH: Yes.

AM: -- consultation?

MH: It was a consultation exercise. If you look at it, they had rooms open all over the place so people would have ... so they did most of the consultative responses, if I am honest with you - I haven't got it here; I brought another sheet - were local.

AM: Right.

MH: So there were some people writing from Cornwall and what have you but most were from the local area.

DN: I suppose, to be fair, that may have been that it was at such early stages that people weren't fully -- perhaps didn't really appreciate that public money would be going into it.

MH: Or were aware of how it would impact, how it would all work.

DN: I think most people had a concept, "I think a garden bridge sounds a very nice thing".

MH: When did things go sour?

AM: I suspect that --

MH: When did you start feeling ...?

AM: I think, certainly, once it became -- once it was going to Planning Committee, I think the first -- when it went to the Lambeth Planning Committee for the first time, in the kind of run-up to that process, I think people has started getting very concerned because I think there probably had been further consultations or maybe the press had started writing about it then and information started coming out about exactly what it was going to be
And I think, particularly then, the people who live in those parts very close, it started to dawn on them; the physical impact. So there's a big issue about the loss of the trees and the green space and effective privatisation of that bit. Now, although it's currently public open space, although technically Coin Street, of course, manages it on behalf of Lambeth.

DN: It's seen as public space, isn't it?

AM: Yeah. Exactly. And it's open space. So I think when people started to realise just how much of that was going to be taken up by the landing part. There was going to be a building which was going to be the offices for the trust and there was going to be another bit of it that was going to be a café.
And then in a way, as it progressed, people have got more and more concerned about what's going in there because I'm not sure that it has got any bigger since it first started but it certainly, as detail has come out -- and, of course, they have to put toilets in. They have to put public toilets and then there are some shops underneath so it's all a --

DN: There aren't many public toilets.

AM: No. There was a big to-do about there not being enough toilets.

DN: I think the other concern was --

MH: It didn't go to your boundary?

DN: No, no.

AM: No, it only goes to -- yeah. Sometimes things that are on the boundaries -- well, I think Philip was probably being consulted. The planning officers would have been asked. I don't think we've -- I don't remember that we, as members, were consulted, although I did submit something, at one of the stages of the planning committee.
I did submit an objection on behalf of the residents, which was quite specific, and again, it was quite late on in the day and it was in relation to the fact that they need to use storage in the Oxo Tower. So where they currently have their refuse area, I think there is a plan that the gardens would also now be using that for the servicing and refuse and things like that. So I submitted a specific objection in relation to any movement. But I think --

DN: Also, it's saying that, in terms of it, obviously residents have, for a long time, had concerns - the residents who live along the route - about the sort of dramatic increase, over the last 15 years, of tourism businesses to the South Bank.
And although most people will obviously think that's a good thing but if you're a resident, there are unintended consequences of things like the buskers and the noise that that brings. So I think once people realise that the intention is not a piece of transport infrastructure but effectively a tourist attraction -- another tourist attraction

on the South Bank and I think it's projected something like 8 million visitors a year and they're(?) thinking, "Wow, that's fantastic".

You know, we've already got, like, 5 million-plus going to the Tate Modern. I mean, the last thing we need is more visitors and tourists, from a resident's perspective. It's a lot of -- it's quite a big toll, I think, on them and their residential amenity. So I think that once they realised the implications of that as well ...

AM: And there's already quite a few pinch points on that river walk. Admittedly, not at that point but I think that's -- again, that's one of the things, is that that point isn't a pinch point but it will become more of a pinch point, you know, because you need to land there because it's got the offices and all the sort of buildings associated with it. And then the people queuing or kind of massing around it, blocking a bit -- you know, one of the bits that has, currently, quite free movement across it. So yeah ...

DN: Also, there's a sort of uneasiness about the role of public bodies in all of this. So the role of TfL and the Mayor and things like Lambeth Council and even Coin Street, I think that's criticism that --

MH: Go on.

DN: -- you know, decisions have been made, that don't always seem very transparent or open. So people are unclear as to why decisions have been made and how we got to the stage we did and how public monies were committed.

MH: Is this the tenders for Heatherwick and -- what are you referring to?

DN: Well, yeah, going right from -- well, again, from that little sort of thing. Also the Mayor sort of committing public TfL money into what wasn't meant to be a transport infrastructure, which I think nobody seems to seriously consider is a transport infrastructure.

AM: Then underwriting it as well because it's not just the initial money; it's underwriting.

DN: And then, of course, Lambeth had their discussions.

MH: What was Lambeth?

DN: Well, Lambeth discussions were about -- and I'm not --

MH: They got a 106 or something out of it, didn't they?

AM: Yeah so --

DN: Well, you're going to have to cut the --

AM: Well, no. So in terms of the 106, I've actually been to some -- a couple of meetings as well so it's something that does come up quite often at the South Bank Forum, which Kate Hoey chairs with -- it was with Simon Hughes; obviously it's now with Neil Coyle. So it has come up a few times there and then Kate Hoey held a meeting with Coin Street - some of the trustees from Coin Street - and Ian Tuckett, with residents, where --

MH: Do you think Ian Tuckett went off on his own?

AM: Well, I think the board -- I think the board supposedly agreed to it. And what the residents were saying to the board was, you know, "You didn't talk to us as residents; as your residents. Why haven't you really kind of talked through this?" And, in fact, the residents called for the meeting. They persuaded Kate to call the meeting because at that point, you know, there'd been no real dialogue between the residents and Coin Street.

MH: And board is how many people; the Coin Street board?

AM: The Coin Street board is (Overspeaking). Yeah, yeah.

MH: So they did give the okay?

AM: They did. But, you see --

MH: But so did Lambeth and then changed their minds.

AM: Yeah, yeah, that's right.

DN: (Overspeaking) to do with sort of reducing what was in the £20 million bag --

MH: Yes.

DN: -- and the loan so (Overspeaking) a better deal. Yes.

AM: So one of the questions that came up at this meeting that Kate hosted was the, kind of, the ongoing costs because in the section -- I think it's in the section 106 agreement, they have to pay Coin Street, for some reason, £250,000 a year sounds like the right figure but it might've been more than that, an amount for basically the cleaning, for the extra cleaning that will be required.

And it's a -- so that's section 106 so it's a commitment that they have to meet and people were saying, well, you know, "So before you even do anything, you've got to find the money for that", before you even start with your other running costs, you know, on the bridge itself, your office staff, etc, etc. So how are you going to make your money?

And I think this has become -- again, I think, as time has gone on, this has become more of a concern for the residents; that they will need to do more fundraising activities on the bridge, closing the bridge. And also, as more details have come out, it's not going to be a bridge that's open all the time.

If you're in groups of eight or more, you won't be allowed on. You know, you won't be able to go and have a kind of birthday party, on the bridge, with your friends; whatever. You know, as it -- I think, as time has gone on, I think people have started to

MH: More and more sceptical?

AM: Yeah. You know and what I think some people did think was a lovely idea, "Oh, yes, wouldn't it be lovely to have a garden bridge?" As all the kind of detail has come out, they'll get more and more people --

MH: And what was the turn? What started that turning? Because it is quite extraordinary.

AM: Yeah.

DN: It's like, it's a sort of --

MH: My inbox, now, is pretty negative and when you look at this original survey --

DN: Actually, we've done -- I did a -- we've done a poll that -- it's not sort of all fully pulled together but it's -- and I know 168 doesn't sound like a huge response but for a local council, I sent out an email to about 850 constituents.

MH: Yes.

DN: And within 72 hours, I've had over 168 responses.

MH: Gosh.

DN: Which is about 20 per cent of the people I emailed came back to me within 72 hours. In fact, four more have just come in because I was just having a quick look (Overspeaking). And people feel very strongly and we'd also asked them some questions about what they thought about the value for money aspect. And certainly, a lot of -- I've copied in some of their responses but I haven't been able to collate them all because there's 172, now, responses. But it was to really give some sort sense of what residents feel and if you -- if it's useful -- I don't know if it's really useful or not.

MH: Yes, thank you.

DN: But if it's useful, I can give you a slightly better put together --

MH: Yes, please. Thank you.

DN: Just so you get a sense of --

MH: That would be very helpful, thank you.

DN: -- feeling of what people think. But certainly, people -- although I know the Mayor has his position, I think, of the Mayor now, there is obviously -- probably, money has been committed and if we were not to support the project, going ahead, you know, that public money would be lost, in a sense, so it's better, now, to continue than to sort of stop the project going ahead. But residents don't seem to share that view; they are very much of the view that -- in their view, it's throwing good money after bad. And there are so many questions about things like the maintenance costs and whether those will be contained to the £2 million. And then where the liabilities if, for some reason, the trust is unable to maintain the bridge. You know, at the end of the day, it will either be local councils or the TfL who are having to pick up the price. And also, I think, the other point is that -- not only on the value for money issue but I think people just feel that this is the wrong bridge in the wrong place.

MH: Where should it be?

DN: Well, I don't know whether people -- where people think a garden bridge should be but I think people certainly think that there should be --

MH: "My lot, my bit". I know.

DN: And obviously that's the -- the Mayor has recently supported the link between Canada Water and Canary Wharf. I mean, that clearly is a transport infrastructure; both cyclists and pedestrians can use it. So I think lots of the comments refer to the fact that there are lots of better projects that people should be supporting.

Deleted: Camden

MH: Yes.

DN: And I think there is a real anger, in a sense, that TfL money has gone into this.

MH: That's brilliant. Thank you very much.

DN: I mean to say, that's just a selection and I --

MH: Shall I keep this or do you want to ...?

DN: I mean, you can or I can send you a better version, if you like. It's really just a -- because I wasn't really sure. It is fairly qualitative comment, rather than --

MH: Yes but it gives me a feel.

DN: I think the strength of feeling was what I was very surprised at. These are SE1 residents, in our ward, so they're just (Overspeaking) Cathedrals ward so they cover from the river, all the way down to Elephant and Castle. But the strength of feeling that came in was -- I was -- I've never had such a strong response.

MH: Really?

DN: Yeah. People are really -- I think, in SE1, people are very against the Garden Bridge.

MH: Really?

DN: So although I think there are polls and London, as a whole, support it, that's just -- that's clearly not the case in SE1.

CH: Interesting it's not just people in the South Bank as well because I think sometimes you have people sort of say, "If you lived there, you can understand why people would object. If it's spreading further as well ..."

DN: No. I mean, I don't know whether that's just because of the media --

CH: There's wider concerns.

DN: -- that's got things like the TCOS(?) campaign and things like that but it's --

MH: (Overspeaking) why it turned around?

AM: I think it was the kind of -- as the information started to come out, I think, you know, the thing is (Overspeaking)

MH: And Coin Street, I can't work out why they didn't sort of square off Coin -- you know ...

AM: Yeah. Well, they -- so, I mean, Coin Street had -- you know, they signed up to it pretty early on, it seems.

MH: And then they just had a rebellion?

AM: Well, I don't think quite -- I think Coin Street are still in the mix. Well, I think Ian took it personally, actually. Ian took it personally. He came under a lot of pressure from the residents within Coin Street. Certainly, the meeting that I was at, you know, they were hostile. They were hostile towards the trustees. I think the trustees -- I do know one trustee who has subsequently resigned from Coin Street.

MH: From Coin Street? On the back of the criticism?

AM: Yeah. And I think, you know, I think some of the trustees, as I understand it, felt that they were presented with a, you know ... It's one of those things, isn't it? You know, trustees (Overspeaking)

MH: You're going to get all this money. You can't get (Overspeaking)

AM: Yeah. And also, trustees tend to be -- your paid staff do the work and tend to present you with papers that you then kind of read through and assess and whatever. But it's -
- you know, if something is presented in a particular way (Overspeaking)

Yeah and I think Ian was very supportive of it. I think he thought it would be -- you know, I think he saw it as an income generator because I think they ...

MH: They get £250,000.

AM: I think it was two -- that's what stuck in my mind. They certainly get, you know, a guaranteed amount of money for -- towards their cleaning costs.

MH: Yes.

AM: And I don't know whether there's a subleasing -- because obviously they sublease it from Lambeth and I can't remember what the deal or the details were, about the kind of -- you know, whether the trust would be a sort of lessee or continue to be a sub-lessee of Lambeth. You know, I can't remember what the layers are within all of that.

MH: Yes.

AM: But yeah and I think, yeah, if we were to go back to the, "When did it -- what turned it?" I think it was just as more information --

MH: Came out?

AM: -- came out about the full --

MH: I mean, do you think --

AM: -- implications.

MH: Are you totally now -- from being neutral, are you completely --

AM: I've never been neutral.

MH: You've always been against it?

AM: I've always been against it. I've always thought, "What a stupid idea and a stupid place to do it". From the get-go, for me, it was about the river walk because I know that we have such issues managing people on the river walk which, admittedly, is slightly more difficult on the Southwark side.

But, you know, in front of the Oxo Tower it's not terribly wide and then you've got the little bit in front of the (Overspeaking) which has got a bit wider with the redevelopment but it's still not huge. And then, of course, it really narrows right down. So yeah, I always thought that it was a (Overspeaking)

DN: I'm aware that, I suppose, projects like the London Eye were not -- they were not supported, originally.

MH: That's true

DN: And the Tate Modern. The council was against the Tate Modern, I think, originally.

MH: Were you against the Tate Modern?

DN: No, I wasn't a councillor then but -- well, not for that (Overspeaking) anyway.

MH: No.

AM: They were against the Globe, way back in the --

DN: The Globe, yes.

MH: Were they?

AM: Yeah.

DN: The Globe, yes, it was (Overspeaking)

AM: Yeah, yeah. They didn't want it.

DN: So I suppose that, you know, I'm aware that what doesn't seem popular, originally, can become popular.

MH: Well, I always said -- I had the responsibility for listing buildings and it was always said to me St Pancras was the example.

AM: Yeah.

MH: We all think it's beautiful but there was a point before it got listed where everyone thought it was rubbish. A bit like, I don't much like the big 1960s stuff; you know, the Barbican. I think it's really ugly. But everyone tells me -- you like it?

AM: I can't stand it. I can't see it at all.

MH: In a generation's time, they might think it's beautiful.

DN: No. Look at the South Bank.

MH: That's pretty ugly.

AM: Yeah, that's true.

MH: And the Hayward Gallery, I think is absolutely impossible. I'd pull it down tomorrow. I'm sorry, we are completely off the point.

DN: No, no. I am quite against it, though, very much, because I think -- well, because of -- I think it's wrong that public money has gone into it.

MH: But we have to make London look great.

DN: You do but not there. It's not there that we're short of tourist attractions and people. I mean, you know, there are -- and some of the comments from residents. There are so many places that would benefit from -- you know, if you want to create a tourist attraction, which is effectively what this is, it's where else you could put it. And I think just the impact it's going to have on residents who are already, you know, under severe pressure in that area, I think it's just too great.

AM: And why not green some of the existing bridges? Why not strengthen them and put some greenery on them?

DN: Another person said, "Just think of how much you could -- how much you could green London with £185 million if you just put that money into green projects across the city". What a difference that would make, to tens of thousands -- hundreds of thousands of residents' lives.

This is going to be visited predominantly by tourists, at the end of the day, who are not living in London probably. Yes, we'll probably all go once, if it gets built but, you know -- well, maybe we won't, maybe we will (Overspeaking). £185 million it's a lot of

money, if that was put into our pocket parks and things like that. So I think it's interesting. Some of the resident responders, who are very much greenies and environmentalists and keen on green projects, they've also come out against it. It's fairly ...

MH: They've cut out the cycling as well, haven't they?

DN: Yes. And even, in one of those, I think it said the ramblers were against it as well because they don't see it -- I think the feeling is that people won't even necessarily cross the bridge; they'll just go on the bridge and walk. You know, that's not really a proper route. And it has an impact on them --

AM: And it will impact on the Thames so, naturally, the ramblers are very keen on making the Thames path, right the way along, better.

MH: Yes.

DN: Which took a long -- and there was a long campaign, wasn't there, to get the riverside opened up? So to then clog it up with a -- this sort of structure.

MH: So Southwark. You went on to Lambeth. What made Lambeth change its mind, from your perspective?

AM: I don't know. I didn't get to any of the planning committees, unfortunately. Actually, the planning committee, they didn't. The planning committee have voted through just about everything. I think they were lobbied really hard. The three councillors, Jenny, Ben and Kevin --

MH: Jenny was the one I've seen, isn't she?

AM: Yeah. But the three of them -- although, interestingly, Kevin wrote a very supportive letter right at the beginning.

DN: Yeah. I think he's changed his position.

AM: (Overspeaking) the planning committee. But he's changed his position because I think he's realised --

DN: I think Jenny and Ben were against.

AM: Yeah. Jenny and Ben, I think, were always against it. Kate sat on the fence a bit, at the beginning, I seem to remember. But she's now come out for (Overspeaking)

DN: I think she's always said --

MH: What do you think? Do you think it should get ...?

DN: Well, I know she said -- she said she didn't think it would.

MH: Were you close to the Tate when they did that? Have you both been involved at all in that?

DN: No. It was before my time as councillor.

AM: The extension or the original?

MH: The extension.

DN: Oh, the extension. We were councillors then, yes.

MH: You were councillors?

AM: I'm Mrs Net-curtain-gate. Did you see the whole thing in the Guardian about Nicholas Serota telling the local residents they should get net curtains because they were all upset about being overlooked?

MH: No.

AM: Not that I live in Neo Bankside but --

MH: Is that what he said to people?

AM: Yeah. Because the people in the flats, when the Tate -- when this extension --

MH: To stop it going up?

AM: When the extension opened -- it wasn't when it started going up because they all knew it was going up. It was the day that it opened and they realised that the viewing tower --

MH: Yes, I've been up there.

AM: It was a 360 degree viewing tower so not only can you view the sights of London but straight into their apartments. So they really didn't like it and they felt, you know -- and it's still an ongoing battle, actually, between the residents and the Tate and the planners, you know, trying to come sort of agreement.

DN: But the point you make is interesting there. Because obviously public money went into that extension --

AM: It did.

DN: -- and residents have not -- no one -- I think that the Tate has a good reputation, generally, I think.

MH: Yes.

DN: I think -- or, certainly, it did; I don't need to say any more on this. I don't know, there was never any real opposition to the extension from the residents. I think most people see the Tate as a really positive thing and people like having an art gallery like that, I think.

AM: And that has been the only real issue that's been raised, is this kind of, "Shock, horror. Oh, my goodness, we've got 100 people an hour actually looking into our properties". And even then, it's not everybody in Neo; it's just the ones on that side.

DN: But there was no opposition to the extension.

AM: No, no.

DN: There were no comments about public money going into this.

AM: No, no.

DN: The only thing is, I also caused a story but that was to do with -- the council gave £1 million to the Tate Modern without consulting residents and so I gave a story on that because it felt like that was --

AM: Because (Overspeaking) opposition because we can.

MH: Do you know if the Tate had the money before they started building?

AM: No.

MH: They didn't?

AM: Don't think so.

DN: (Overspeaking) at all, no.

MH: Then they took the risk on it?

DN: I think they'd collected most of the money.

AM: They got -- they got -- yeah, they had -- they had got some of the money.
(Overspeaking)

MH: And this lot are quite short on what they need.

DN: Yes. I don't know how much -- I don't know how much they collected before they started building.

AM: But yeah, they've got -- I think, yeah ...

DN: They're much closer than, I think, the Garden Bridge people are.

AM: Yeah.

MH: Yes.

DN: And I don't think there's any -- the insurance and liability and all that. I mean, I don't know if that issue applies to the Tate Modern.

AM: No. The ongoing risk, no. No.

DN: And the maintenance costs obviously wouldn't be anything like this would be.

AM: And there's no maintenance cost to anybody else, you know. It's all done within Tate and everything that they do on there. And it is free and, you know, obviously the exhibitions (Overspeaking) door charge.

MH: They've started charging.

AM: Have they?

DN: Which one, the science museum?

AM: Terrible. Even school trips?

MH: My daughter took her youngest and -- yes, I don't know what they do with school trips, actually. So she went with her youngest and I don't (Overspeaking)

DN: That's been a great success, though, the free entry.

MH: And it's now being undermined. It already was, in the sense that all these(?) museums and galleries have started to just pile on exhibitions so you had to pay.

AM: I mean, what Tate has done, actually, is that they have increased their -- they've got new bars and restaurants and they've now got a licence to do events. So they'll be doing more events in the Turbine Hall.

MH: The Turbine Hall events. That will be fun.

AM: I know. Actually, not just in the Turbine but in all sorts of different -- I think it was Kraftwerk. Was it Kraftwerk? No, it wasn't Kraftwerk; it was -- anyway, one of those, you know, about 1980s bands.

MH: There is a (Overspeaking) isn't there?

AM: No, Kraftwerk, the band.

MH: Oh, the band.

AM: Somebody, anyway, a few years ago, did a big --

MH: What, came to the Turbine?

AM: -- did a big gig there. Yeah, yeah. So every now and again they do (Overspeaking) they do kind of stuff like that.

MH: Are the acoustics all right for that?

CH: I don't know. A bit echoey, you would have thought.

MH: What else on this, that you can think? I must say, it's been really, really helpful to get an understanding of what your view -- have you got anybody that is keen on it?

DN: There are those who supported it and I put some of their 'for' comments in.

AM: I mean, I, personally, have been very vocally against it.

DN: A very small minority.

AM: So I think most people wouldn't tell me that they supported it because I've been so --

MH: I can see you have put some of the positives in here.

CH: What about the businesses in the area? Because it seems, on the North Bank, that they're a bit more positive because the businesses; they see footfall increasing and that kind of thing. Have you had much in that perspective?

DN: I don't know. We haven't got relations with the Lambeth businesses so there's -- none of it is actually in our ward.

AM: The South Bank Forum -- the South Bank Employers Group were supportive of it.

DN: Were they?

AM: Yeah. I think -- Because Ian Tuckett is also on South Bank Employers, isn't he? I think he's on the board of that and there's a bit of crossover with --

MH: Presumably that's LWT and --

AM: Who, of course, are rebuilding anyway. They've got this --

MH: Are they?

AM: I'm sure there are plans for something to happen with LWT. Some kind of --

MH: Right.

AM: And, actually, I think there was even some deal with them because I think it impacts on them a little bit so I think there were some negotiations. But yes, I think businesses have been more supportive. The businesses in the Oxo Tower, I think, are kind of mixed about it.

MH: The businesses will be attracted by the increased traffic?

AM: Yes. Yes, in theory, but, I mean, it doesn't always ... it doesn't always translate quite so easily.

MH: Are you trying to get Southwark to have a view?

AM: No, we haven't, really.

DN: No, I think Southwark would be reluctant to -- Obviously I think they'd be reluctant to take sides openly, perhaps. I don't know whether any of the senior politicians --

AM: I don't know that there's a-- . I don't think they --

AM: Yeah. Neil Coyle is --

DN: He doesn't really make comments --

MH: On local issues?

AM: On the Garden Bridge, he hasn't.

MH: Did he not?

AM: He hasn't made any --

DN: No. He hasn't made his views public, to my knowledge anyway; I've not seen them.

AM: I mean, everybody knows that his wife, until she had a baby, worked for Dan Pearson.
And whether or not that's why he's not --

MH: He has to be careful?

AM: Yeah. I believe she doesn't work for them anymore.

MH: Yes.

AM: I'm not aware that he's made any comments either way.

DN: Has Peter John made any comment?

AM: I don't think he has, actually. No, I don't think --

DN: Do you know Peter John?

MH: I do, I do.

DN: But I'm not aware of his position.

AM: No. I'm not sure that they've made their views known.

DN: I think they'd be a bit reluctant to say something because otherwise Lambeth might start commenting on some of our developments and I'm not sure that would -- they'd want that, necessarily, so it may be that they feel this isn't for them to say(?). And particularly as I think --

AM: But it does impact on their residents, which is why -- which is how come we are involved, you know, particularly because of that Oxo bit and the impact on them.
Yeah.

AM: So in your responses, people have said, "Just write off the money"?

MH: Have they?

AM: Have they?

MH: Forty million quid?

DN: I know. But they still -- there's this idea that they just think that throwing more money into it ...

MH: Good money after bad?

DN: I think that they're concerned about the maintenance costs and they're concerned about the liability, about whether the bridge will be maintained and that that may eventually fall on to the public.

And also, I think because there are so many other considered negatives from the impacts from the amount of people there, on the views. Other people have talked about the views from Waterloo Bridge and about the fact that it's not a green project and the loss of the trees.

AM: There was also a whole load of stuff right at the beginning, I seem to remember. Fiona Haughey or whatever her name is, who does the archaeology, you know, who's done a lot of work on all the kind of under the river archaeology stuff, Queenhithe Dock and all of that.

Commented [GLA FoI2]: This was corrected after the GLA identified an obvious error in the transcription.

Deleted: Queen Highstock(?)

MH: It is the most lovely walk, there. The only time I've ever done it was during the moon walk. The moon walk used to go --

AM: I've never done that.

MH: At midnight, going down there, it's magic; completely magic.

AM: Yeah. Okay. I must do that one of these years. But yeah, I know there was some stuff about building any new structures in the river, you know, it changes the current slightly. And there was also an issue about the biodiversity as well.

MH: Really?

AM: Yeah. Introducing species on to -- the biodiversity of the river by introducing new species in the middle of it.

MH: Right.

AM: Because of winds and tides and things, I don't really understand.

MH: Right.

AM: But apparently -- all of that was -- I mean, that was quite early on.

MH: (Overspeaking) biodiversity in before, have we?

CH: No. I don't particularly think so.

MH: No.

DN: I think it's seen as quite a poor green project as well. I think that's --

MH: I heard somebody say that it's actually because of the wind, would --

AM: Yes, that's right.

MH: The wind might make it difficult to ... but I'm assuming that they've thought that through. I'm assuming they've thought that through.

DN: Okay. As I say, I can still refine the comments that we received.

MH: Great, thank you.

DN: A lot of them are quite repetitive but I can try to capture some of it.

MH: I think that's very helpful because it gives a context for me.

DN: Yeah. I mean, it could be --

MH: 850 residents. Were you selective there?

DN: No, no, no. That's just the residents I have emails for. They're across the ward so it's not, in any way, selective.

MH: So it's people who will have contacted you at some point or you've been in contact with over the past whatever years?

DN: Yeah.

MH: Yes.

DN: But I've never had a response like this ever.

MH: Never?

DN: No, no.

MH: It is extraordinary. (Overspeaking)

AM: Even the parking one, you didn't get that many.

MH: Twenty per cent in 72 hours?

DN: Yeah. So anyway, my email only went out on Saturday at 1.00 pm.

MH: Gosh.

DN: I said I need the responses by 12.00 pm on Monday. Obviously that's not very many emails for an MP but for a councillor to get that many emails is a lot. That's a big response.

MH: Yes. Yes.

DN: There's definitely a strength of feeling and they're still coming in now, even though my deadline is past. So I'll update the figures. Yeah, no, it's --

MH: Knowing what you do know, do you or do you not support the project, yes or no or unsure?

DN: Yeah. I mean, that's a massive majority (Overspeaking) to get people agreed on something.

CH: It doesn't sound like either of you were around when the Millennium Bridge was happening? Is that right?

DN: I was. I was a councillor but for a different ward...

CH: I was interested to find kind of what the reaction was at that time?

AM: I was working for Bankside Residents' Forum at the time because, of course, it was around about the time the Tate Modern opened as well. I seem to remember -- I don't particularly remember any objections.

CH: Pedestrian bridges, people like.

AM: Yeah. It is quite a simple -- it's quite --

MH: I think the idea of a garden is (Overspeaking) you can see how it can be ...

DN: Yeah.

MH: It's just a weird place and I think some people view it as a fait accompli. And also, the way (Overspeaking) the way they set about it was a bit dodgy. Will Coin Street give in and make an agreement with them, do you think?

AM: I don't know. I mean, I do, if I remember rightly, that Coin Street have sort of amended their stance very slightly. Because I think, in the beginning, they were close to actually signing the deal. And I think that they have kind of pulled back on that.

MH: And Lambeth, likewise?

AM: And Lambeth -- well, I mean, the planning application all went through. Actually, you see --

DN: Westminster approved it first, didn't they?

AM: Yeah.

DN: I think there was a lot of pressure on Lambeth.

AM: Westminster, I think, are fine. I think the pressure is more on Lambeth, somehow, at the moment --

MH: To agree it?

AM: -- than on Westminster.

DN: I think a lot -- well, I think because Westminster approved it (Overspeaking)

AM: But Lib Peck is still in favour, isn't she?

MH: I've tried to get hold of her.

AM: I know thingy Heywood, I know it was one of her -- Rachel Heywood. I think the Garden Bridge was one of the things that she wasn't very happy about. There was somebody -- there was somebody on the planning committee; I can't quite remember who it was. One of the women on the planning committee, who I think couldn't take(?) a decision because she has stated her opposition to it.

MH: Right. On the Lambeth planning committee?

AM: It wasn't Jennie Morris(?). It was -- yeah, one of the (Overspeaking) No, I thought it was one of -- I thought it was one of the Labour -- no, one of the Labour ...

DN: There was more than one though, I think.

AM: Were there?

DN: At least one. (Overspeaking)

AM: I just remember -- I just remember that there was one of the Labour members on the planning committee who I think had spoken out before and so wasn't on the panel for that decision or withdrew from it because of that. But Lib Peck, I thought, was still in favour of it. Jack Hopkins, is he the cabinet member for regeneration?

DN: (Overspeaking)

AM: I think he's still -- I think he's still pro. I think --

DN: (Overspeaking)

AM: They were supposed to -- they were supposed to -- there was a -- that's right, there was supposed to be an IDM of individual cabinet member decisions that he was -- I think it was Jack Hopkins was going to have to take -- and I don't know what happened about that, whether he did take it.

But as far as I'm concerned, he's still pro. And I think, locally, I think it's the three local ward councillors, for Bishop's Ward, who have been outspoken.

MH: Yes. Yes. Do you work closely, across that border, with them or not really?

AM: Funnily enough, I'm going to meet Ben after this. Yeah. Colombo Sports Centre is in Cathedrals and the pitches they manage are in Lambeth so Ben and I kind of co-chair a meeting.

DN: And there's things like the South Bank Partnership --

AM: Yeah. The South Bank Forum.

DN: -- and the South Bank Forum --

MH: And the South Bank Forum attitude?

DN: (Inaudible)

AM: Yeah. Because the majority of the people in the audience are (Overspeaking)

MH: I think they got this sort of initial sort of big tick.

AM: Yeah.

MH: I think you're right; that people thought, "This is a nice idea".

AM: Yeah.

DN: No one was against a bridge as such.

MH: No.

AM: And it's how you ask the questions as well. We get this with developers all the time, "Do you want to continue to live next to this blighted site? Or would you like us to develop it in some way?" "Please develop it". Before we do it --

MH: And then they do a 36 storey --

AM: Yeah. They're in support. But, you know, it's like, "But you said you wanted it developed".

MH: Yes.

AM: Yeah. So I don't know what the questionnaire asked.

MH: Thomas Heatherwick, have you talked to him?

AM: No. No. We've kind of been --

MH: Have you talked to anybody on the garden trust?

AM: No.

DN: I think some of the South Bank Forum --

AM: Bee Emmott came and did a few presentations.

MH: Yes.

DN: It wasn't very convincing.

AM: No.

DN: And also, Lord ...

AM: Yes.

CH: Davies, yes.

DN: He's come to the meetings.

AM: Yes.

DN: He's a bit more robust in defending it. I didn't think -- I wasn't very impressed when she spoke.

AM: No. No and I don't think --

DN: She didn't make a very good case for it as well.

MH: She's ex-Heatherwick.

DN: Is she? I didn't feel like she was used to public scrutiny. She didn't seem to know how to handle anything or come up with the right answer. I thought she'd have been polished on saying the right answers. They get enough criticism. You'd think they'd have worked out their lines by now.

MH: That's all very helpful.

DN: That's all right.

MH: Can I hang on to this?

DN: Yes and if I send a better version --

MH: Okay. That's fine.

CH: If you send it to me, yes.

DN: Are you Claire?

CH: Yes, that's right. Sorry, yes.

DN: I've got your email anyway. Okay.

MH: I haven't forgotten anything, have I?

CH: No. I'm all right.

AM: If you have, just drop us an email.

MH: Brilliant. And if you think of anything, as you -- I'll be at this for another -- there's Christmas as well and I'm going off on a holiday so I'm going to be off it. It will be end of January, I hope.

AM: I don't know whether it will come off at the -- there's often an item at the South Bank Forum.

MH: Yes.

AM: There's often some kind of discussion. Michael Ball is the --

MH: We're not?

CH: I don't think the Forum, specifically, no.

MH: It's in Coin Street. Coin Street is the key people, really.

AM: Yeah. Ian. Talk to --

MH: Yes, I think he's coming in.

AM: Yeah, he will help his -- you know, he's --

MH: I have to understand where they're coming from.

AM: Yeah. Ian, of course, is a -- is a ...

MH: What is he? Is he a resident?

AM: No, Ian Tuckett is -- sorry, do you not know? He is Mr Coin Street. He's been the chief exec since the beginning of time.