**File: STATSW17.2.16  
Duration: 0:48:19  
Date: 25/03/2016  
Typist: 719**

START AUDIO

Interviewer: If we could start with you introducing yourself, Stephen?

Stephen Wilkinson: My name’s Stephen Wilkinson and I’m the Head of Planning & Strategic Partnerships for Lee Valley Regional Park Authority. That role means that I manage our role as a statutory planning consultee, but also the park authority’s got plans to prepare policies, proposals, for the future development and management of the park.

We’re not the planning authority but that involves a lot of interaction with partnerships and it links in neatly with title of strategic partnerships.

In terms of the focus of your discussion based around Walthamstow Wetlands and Woodberry Reservoirs, Woodberry Reservoirs very little involvement. The site likes outside the regional park.

I’ve known about the Woodberry redevelopment for a number of years but I’ve only visited twice, and the last time I visited actually was with the chief executive and with David Mooney from the London Wildlife Trust.

We just looked at the site, walked around and looked at the investment proposals and the linkage with the Berkeley Homes developments on the northern side.

The purpose of our meeting was to look at the prospects for a cycle route to go from Woodberry to Walthamstow Wetlands, and that’s something which the park authority is much in favour of because it’s about improving access into the regional park because the park has always suffered from a perception of access, perception of proximity, and also the actual physical issues around access, actually getting in.

Moving on to Walthamstow Wetlands, this project was initiated by the regional park authority, a think piece, a briefing note was prepared in 2007 by myself, a colleague who left, Rob Cairns, and we discussed this over a site visit with [Martin Wagner 0:02:15] who was Kirsty, I’ve forgotten her surname, Kirsty’s predecessor on looking at improving access.

The key things around that were it should be about protecting nature but improving access to nature. This is the model.

We anticipated to have probably about 300,000 visitors a year, and the idea was that it would support the regeneration strategies of the surrounding boroughs and rival the Barnes Wetland Centre at North London.

With Thames we initiated some work and employed a company called 5th Studio in 2008. They did a piece or work which was to identify the possibilities of Walthamstow Wetlands and a few, not to be quoted on this, madcap ideas like having a floating hotel on Banbury Reservoir.

But just trying to look at ways and linkages in, it’s all very schematic. I think the whole commission cost no more than about £13,000, £14,000.

I think the environment agency or Natural England also were party to that as well, but it just set the ball rolling. Subsequently in 2010, the North London Strategic Alliance commissioned something called the Upper Lee Valley Landscape Strategy.

This wasn’t really a landscape strategy in its truest sense, it was more like an access strategy and that took the area from the M25 down to Coppermill Lane.

The ideas was that that would replicate the work being done by 5th Studio and the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation on looking at creating a park which has now morphed into the River Park in the South, that’s an ongoing piece of work.

The NLSA was certainly recognise the value of improved parklands, improved access to nature, to support the regeneration strategies of the boroughs: Enfield, Waltham Forest and Haringey.

That work embraced the idea of something called \_\_\_[0:04:32] around the wetlands. It wasn’t called the wetlands then.

Then a series of projects which I think we employed a firm, I’ve forgotten their name now, CB, basically a firm of landscape architects, and their focus from a landscape strategy, there was a stronger focus on this area which became known as Walthamstow Wetlands.

There was a huge great: where should the boundaries be, who should be the lead partner? The park authority for various reasons decided not to be a lead partner in that.

It was concerned, a couple of things, that this was a Thames Water own site. Thames Water made it very clear from the outset that they wanted to always retain the Thames Water badge, and we were concerned I think principally around the revenue implications of a site like this if we were given the management of it.

In a way we were a contributory partner to a series of studies and really from 2010 provided officer time, officer input, where we had landscape architects.

That piece of work honed in on looking at areas like the marine house and what should be the principal focus, and the principal focus was determined, 2010, ’11, around the importance of water to civilisation basically.

Clearly you could see the resonance of that because all civilisations, all cultures understand that, it’s a mainstay in so many cultures. We got that to chime with the diverse communities which could be found in the immediate locality so there would be some ownership there.

Subsequently, the approach shifted, Rose Jaijee came in where she’d been working with the NLSA on various projects, and she moved off to Waltham Forest which really started to run with this in a big way and they recognised this despite 2008 significant cuts to their budgets and everything, they recognise the site’s potential.

Gradually they put together the partnership, and we see from that we can only contribute about £5,000 a year which is just to support Rose’s time.

But Waltham Forest have clearly looked at all areas what they would contribute to this through either I think CIL payments or highway infrastructure and that sort of stuff.

But funnily enough, I think during this process, because they wanted a lead on it, ignore parks like Haringey, so there are question marks around the western side of the wetlands have been left unanswered, and I think there's some catch up being played there.

But the principal focus has always been around access to nature and protection of nature. We should, just as an aside, remember that apparently there are about 10,000 £1 permits issued a year either for access or for fisher, fishermen, isn’t it, although women are participatory.

Interviewer: Fishers.

Stephen Wilkinson: Yes, fishers.

Interviewer: You've spoken about how it’s fit into your role and your history with the site. I wonder if we could think a little bit more about why companies like Thames Water, why your thoughts are that Thames Water have opened up the site. This is quite a risk for them.

Stephen Wilkinson: When you risk, we had lots of discussions in 2008 around safety and it’s interesting, Thames Water seem to have operated a different safety regime on this site as opposed to other reservoirs, either within their wider region or different water companies.

But safety and the operational management of the site was something which was a real concern.

If you're asking me the real risk, why they decided to engage actively, and there's something in here about probably their corporate social responsibility role.

It’s interesting because over the last decade Thames Water has been taken over by an Australian conglomerate who have I understand maybe asset stripping and all- I shouldn't say that really, but they have been consistent.

I think 2011 or 2012 the chief executives came down, the chief executive of Waltham Forest and the chief executive of Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, so they have maintained a commitment to the site.

The extent to which they're shoving in their own capital is a big question mark to me because Thames Water make significant amounts of profit.

They argue that’s always got to be hammered back straight in the water infrastructure with the 30% of pipes leaking in London, or some fantastic statistic like that.

It’s always occurred to me that they've never really stepped up to the mark. Once they floated the idea and said, “This is our land,” and they invited people to come up with access arrangements and proposals, but they stepped back.

Perhaps I’m being just unfair to Thames Water and I’m unclear what direct capital contribution they put in, but compared to I think the effort which Waltham Forest have put in , bear in mind all the pressure is on their budget, I think Thames have been rather lame, not to be quoted on that.

Interviewer: Yes. What do you think how that private ownership might affect communities’ experience of this site?

Stephen Wilkinson: I don't think that’s a massive issue, I think the massive issue is operation... The issue is it’s an operating site, it has a function, it’s not just a series of reservoirs which are declared surplus.

I think that the maintenance of that issue about managing an operational site is a critical issue, and that’s why I think this site will only be open between 10:00 and 4:00 or something because they want to ensure that all public are cleared off and the function isn’t abused.

Interestingly actually, in 2008 we had discussions with Thames Water who indicated that Banbury Reservoir which is a highly embanked reservoir had been declared a risk by the Ministry of Defence, a target basically, because it’s got such a high embankment compared to lots of the others.

Going back to the crux of your question, it’s less an issue about ownership, it’s more about the operational management of a working site.

Interviewer: I wonder if we could expand that out to think about how that sort of model of ownership and that sort of model of partnership, so you've got LWT doing the delivery, Thames Water owning it, you've got this range of different stakeholders coming together to enable this to come to the table.

That’s happening increasingly in and around London, and what your thoughts are around that shifting models of delivery I guess in terms of access to nature.

Stephen Wilkinson: It’s an interesting one because if sites are to be opened up which are privately owned, the bottom line is this is a private company that owns this site, it’s an operational site, they're not going to give carte blanche to a range of other partners and the public just to use it as they see fit.

On a site like this it’s just an inevitable model. A lot of work has been done in looking at not just security guard the capital invest required but also looking at the long term route, and I think the HLF scheme allows for three years’ revenue support for the LWT past 2017.

Then running in parallel to that there must be a pool of funds set up to sustain it beyond 2020.

The critical issue is where that money is going to come from past 2020 because I understand there's still a question mark on that.

You could say that’s a legitimate role for Thames Water to totally step in and sustain it going forward, to say London Wildlife Trust or whoever should do that.

Because each partner has to come with their own expertise. Waltham Forest came with their creative strategy and they brought in Natural England and the environment agency included in that.

Thames Water provided the land, the site, but that was always there, and so that’s an easy win for Thames Water, and it’s how they take that and I suppose sweat themselves and be conscious of that.

Because if they don’t there has to be a question mark over whether we are looking at a sustainable model going forward. [Aside conversation 0:15:10].

Interviewer: Are you seeing a lot more of this going forward, is the park authority having to facilitate or negotiate within these types of complex partnerships? Is that commonplace now?

Stephen Wilkinson: In many respects, the park authority has itself pulled away from new investment and the \_\_\_[ 0:15:50] have taken forward.

The park authority manages its own spaces and has over the last three years poached back £2.2 million worth of sites. We say intend to manage as parklands.

In terms of entering into partnerships with other bodies, we haven't got much experience in terms of joint management of sites or just contributing in this way.

I suppose the best example is, again, the park is very tangential to, is how the Lee River Park in the Lower Lee Valley is going forward, and again that’s been led on the LLVC who will be working with the various public sector bodies but also the creation of that new park will involve sites owned by British Gas and others to create a series of designs called String of Pearls which involves like East India Dock Basin, Bow Creek and Three Mills which are owned by the authority but two or three other sites as well.

The LLVC are now looking at governance arrangements, options for governance arrangements to try and take that forward.

Just thinking about it, the authority works very closely parks in Middlesex Wildlife Trust on sites like Amwell Nature Reserve whereby it’s their site, they manage it but there's a lot of close work around the biodiversity and \_\_\_[0:17:41].

Interviewer: Are you seeing, would you say, particularly over the last 5 to 10 years that the role of CSR is becoming more relevant in your interactions?

Are you seeing private companies coming to the table and say, “We’ve got this space we’d like to evolve with you in order to contribute to our CSR output”?

Stephen Wilkinson: No.

Interviewer: You're not?

Stephen Wilkinson: No, not at all. 40% of the park is run by the authority and the rest is owned by the environment agency, Canals and Rivers Trust, and then there are various private owners who own land, and obviously the utilities do.

But no one comes forward and volunteers space to be managed in that way.

There's more dealing on this as well but no, a view somehow of those private owners that land is just there, it’s a resource, and the only approach we get from private sector is where they can be built on for houses.

That’s when private owners are interested in the authority and the park.

Interviewer: You've hinted that you’ve already in the answer to the introductory question, but in terms of your view of the strategic role of those two wetlands in terms of the Lee Valley, in terms of how they fit into \_\_\_[0:19:33] the conversations that you're having about what you're trying to achieve in the Lee Valley for the long term.

I wondered if you could reflect on that in terms of any particular ways that you see as part of that story.

Stephen Wilkinson: The opening for Walthamstow Wetlands is a win-win for the park authorities, it’s a win-win for the regional parks because it is integrating this area of reservoirs which have largely been closed to real public access into the whole fabric of the regional parks.

So it fits where our whole brief, our whole mission, as it were, which was established 50 years ago, it’s excellent.

Links to the Woodberry Reservoirs which are outside the park are also something we support and that’s why we are certainly behind the regional cycle routes and walking routes to connect people up.

Then it starts expanding, so you look say a station like Finsbury Park which is probably the busiest station outside Central London, outside Clapham Junction.

A big station, lots of people coming from all parts, and if you can establish a cycle route from there into Woodberry, then into Walthamstow Wetlands, then you started integrating to a certain strategic network of cycle routes.

In terms of managing the offer around biodiversity, ecology, Thames Water haven’t got a biodiversity action plan but this allows greater integration, greater involvement when- That’s something we need to flag up actually.

Interviewer: I’d like to expand on something you said at the beginning, because one of the first things you said, and not everybody has said this, is that the original ideas, the germs of the idea were around how it supports the wider regeneration strategy at the end, how it supports the valley.

Could you talk to me about, one, how those sites do that but also after that I’d like to ask you about how waterscapes feature within that regeneration scheme?

Stephen Wilkinson: Okay. How the opening for the reservoirs fits in with the wider regeneration. The reservoirs are there and regeneration strategies exist and everything, but you're redefining that sense of place.

If you live around that site, as I did 30 years ago, you know it’s water and it’s very nice to look over an open landscape or waterscape from a distance, but you haven't got much sense of ownership.

What Walthamstow Wetlands will do will local people a sense of ownership because they can access it and they’ll understand it.

Hopefully that’ll play out in a very positive way in terms of allowing people to engage on serious levels. In my view though, you’d just get yummy mummies coming into the café.

It might be that people actually want to walk around the reservoirs, it might be that people are just happy to stand in the middle of the reservoirs and look out. We can get some completely different perspective of the surrounding areas and what we can offer.

Then [Georgina 0:23:37], it gives you that opportunity to leave your cramped flat or cramped street and just breathe basically, and that’s obviously very good.

The alternative to that engagement could also be about vandalism and destruction and that underpins the rather cautious approach which Thames Water have in terms of enabling public access because largely like the cycle paths through the centre of the site is going to be a dawn to dusk or it might be well within those hours. I think cyclists are going to be discouraged from using that which is a pity because I’m looking for a different route to cycle.

In terms of how the opening of the reservoirs will regenerate the area I think there are lots of levels.

There's also a rather mercenary argument as well that the reservoirs will add value to developments. If value rises, it’s a fact about how that’s been built into the viability assessments \_\_\_[ 0:24:55] planning authorities are on the study.

Are they just treating the Hale Wharf, X number of flats, as the creation of X number of flats, or are they really saying you can charge another 10% because you're overlooking a fantastic suite of reservoirs.

If they are doing that, then obviously there's more scope for tangible community benefits to be reflected through Section 106 contributions or CIL contributions.

But that’s a moot point about how well the local planning authorities are clued up to that because you could be given a fairly bog standard viability assessment which really doesn't reflect the sense of place.

Interviewer: What has come along the line is how these long developments contribute to the gentrification and how they contribute to, well, and existing process and how it in some way accelerates that process, and in fact it won’t be the original population that benefit from the opening of Woodberry Down reservoirs.

It won’t be the original population immediately around the train station that benefits from the reservoirs, it’s the white middle class that are moving in from Hackney, they're taking over from everywhere from Hackney.

Stephen Wilkinson: Yes, your premise is rather upsetting, isn't it, but you're talking about a white middle class moving in from Hackney. Thirty years ago there wasn’t a white middle class, well, there was in parts.

There are a couple of issues here. If you're going to have 300,000, 250,000 visitors, they're not all going to come from the local area.

So you're inheriting that model that people will come from further afield to enjoy the resource you've created. The other issue which no one has an answer to, and everyone of a certain income background has got to be conscious of, is when we say we’re making better places, we can’t just say we’re just making places which are say for the middle class.

When we talk about this is the model of the new high street and we show coffee bars, what’s the bloody point if your average coffee is £3 a cup and you've got people on minimum wage which has now become the maximum wage, or if you're just on benefits?

The question is about the tangible benefits about who benefits really, but that’s tied up with other factors like expenses policies to reduce social housing which will alter the whole social fabric of the surrounding area as well, and where do the poor people go. Why can’t they be the true beneficiaries of an investment of this scale?

That’s what the HLF is set up for, that’s what their model is set up under the community benefits, but is the definition of community you can always fall back on...?

Interviewer: Generations of sociologists have not answered adequately.

Stephen Wilkinson: Exactly. It’s about are we seeing this migration northwards, either white flight or you could say the successful ethnic communities who want to get that place in the suburbs anyway, are we seeking to restrict that movement because of our own prejudices or are we enforcing it through gentrification?

So the morphology of this area will change. Seventeen years ago the area around the reservoirs was far more homogenous, it was blue collar workers which they’d been there since about 1880.

Interviewer: Which is very interesting in light of the fishermen who are a lot by and large not necessarily [Cross talk 0:29:16].

Interviewer: Yes, who have fished in those reservoirs man and boy, and their father taught them to fish in those reservoirs. So their sense of ownership and their fear over that identity changing is explicit.

Stephen Wilkinson: Yes. Critical issues where 40 years where those fishermen living around the area, or now are they travelling in from Chesham?

Interviewer: A lot of them in the immediate area.

Stephen Wilkinson: All right, still?

Interviewer: At least the ones I’ve spoken to, but then again, there's a flaw in the way that we do research about this because often the people that have attachment to it are the people that are most willing to be involved in the research.

As I say, 10,000 permits a year, I can’t speak to 10,000-

Stephen Wilkinson: No.

Interviewer: So there is a real challenge with getting the usual suspects in this research.

The sense of identity, we’re very interested to hear about potentially how that’s going to change. This is a nature reserve, not a park, and I wonder if you feel that that is significant in terms of who visits, who feels comfortable and the identity of the area.

Stephen Wilkinson: In many ways the reservoirs are SSSI. They've always had high ecological values. They're a partly special protection area. In terms of their identity, there's got to be that balance struck which you could say on a different level defines a sense of place if you're a migrant bird, and it has to be respected, and the needs of people who want to get access to have a look at the water for all those other outcomes we mentioned.

I think that’s been something which the partnership has wrestled with and it’s very difficult. At the moment the site is completely fence but it suffers from vandalism because people are kept out.

It’s like how do you support that transition?

Interviewer: Does that fall in the risks of this being opened up, does that fall into the challenges of opening up a site like this?

Stephen Wilkinson: That at the moment is the fundamental challenge about how you can protect its essential importance and character, allow the public in but not destroy its essential features and character.

Interviewer: There's one question I wanted to ask about whether or not there is anything particular tied to the history or the geography of the Lee Valley that comes with opening up these sites and in some ways how it becomes an additional asset within the story of the Lee Valley, that the Lee Valley Lee Valley Regional Park Authority would be interested in?

Stephen Wilkinson: The opening of these reservoirs, I do think it reflects an interest in a new chapter for this part of the regional park, because on one level the reservoirs have always been there, Thames Water had a benign management role acknowledging the fact that former SSSI is part of this park.

But they have been a closed site. The important thing, and it goes back to the whole root of this project, is opening them up for the public which is part of the park authority’s essential remit. It’s about the creation of a park.

Perhaps Abercrombie didn't really realise how all the designations would follow his visionary statement in 1944 and for some reason how successful the area’s become in trying to support nature conservation as well as incident visitor usage venue development.

But you can say it’s partially that rich bolognaise which the regional park represents as a strategic major asset for London and the Home Counties.

Interviewer: Is there specific or interesting or unique about this being a water site in terms of the benefits that it brings?

Stephen Wilkinson: I think there are about 175 hectares of open water on the site from Coppermill Lane up to Banbury Reservoir, all right, Banbury’s excluded.

I think across the park there are probably about 600 hectares of water, I can get a figure for you, which is rare in any area in a regional park that you've got-

Let’s try and work this one out. We’re looking at 600, 700 out of 4,000. That’s about 14%. So 14% of the park area is open water, and within that this probably forms about 3% of the total area of the park. We can always check on those.

But that is a unique asset that you've got, so it’s large areas of water which are in a controlled and relatively safe, compared to...

It’s surrounded, and that’s a good thing, by development, in its main part.

So it’s a question of so close and yet so far, but it’s a question basically about the ‘so far’ less far.

Interviewer: [Aside conversation 0:36:14]. You started off being very expressive in terms of what it is about water that we get as human beings by being near water, by interacting with it.

Do you think these reservoirs give us a chance to-

Stephen Wilkinson: The large areas of open water, large open areas are not the place for an agoraphobic because in the context of, as you stand in the middle of them you can clearly identify you're in a valley but you're in a wide valley floor.

The configuration of the reservoirs also reflects that this was once, 150 years ago, a massive area of marsh. I’ve lost the thingy-

Interviewer: What is it that water brings, is there something unique-

Stephen Wilkinson: Most areas of flat water generally if you stare at them, and the only thing you can hear are the sounds of the geese, you have a great sense of peace and opportunity for reflection.

That’s like an intangible quality which is important to protect. It’s interesting how that can be factored into something where you're expecting 300,000 visitors a year, and whether in those...

I understand that within the complex of reservoirs there’ll be areas where you've got public access. You've got obviously a hub around the marine pumphouse, then you've got areas where there's public access, so there’ll be maybe school parties, families just sitting on the sides.

Then you've got areas with extra biodiversity where public access is restricted, and it’s an issue about whether that sense of place, that sense of openness and, there's a word for this I think, like a sense of loss but it’s like a sense of being lost, it can be protected.

Obviously you're not lost because your landmarks are very clear but it’s a question of being somewhere which is so different compared to its immediate surroundings where there's a quality of benefit there which can be held on to.

Interviewer: Do you think we’ll get a generation with a sustainable relationship with water as a function of having that exposure?

Stephen Wilkinson: Water policies has never been something which this country has had to suffer but by 2018, I don't know how the figure is expressed, but London won’t have sufficient water resources for itself, so water as a valued resource is going to increase.

You might think with all the flooding that’s going on that’s rather a precious argument but in the South East and in London the water is always just highly controlled than the Lee Valley, has been since the 1950s, ‘40s, and it’s a question about-

I’m struggling with this, remind me of the question again.

Interviewer: Do you think more exposure to it, or opportunity to interact with it with all the learning and opportunities in the wetlands, whether or not we might secure a more sustainable relationship with water where maybe if you live in that part of London or just being in London, you won’t have had that exposure or that interaction or that understanding of the value of water as a resource that you’ve been talking about.

Stephen Wilkinson: I suppose it depends how well the exhibition space in the marina house is put together and what key messages that sends out and whether you can actually learn from that and see things happening as you walk around the site.

I suppose it’s a big intangible. In London, because we have such high rainfall, we never really understand its intangible value other than the water you get through the tap or you pour in your bath.

One of the critical things is it will allow people to understand its contribution to biodiversity and just its unique aspect.

It will tap into something deep in the psyche which probably hasn’t really been understood before. Obviously issues around safety management are critical to that, and the most interesting actually there’ll be very few places on the site where people can run their hands through water, which is a very emotive thing, and it’s the only substance of its kind. All substances are unique.

Interviewer: Do you feel that the people either surrounding it or using it should have any sort of sense of responsibility?

Stephen Wilkinson: As I said earlier, the local people coming into the site will probably encourage that sense of ownership, that sense of stewardship for the site.

Hopefully that will work, and that’s a question mark about sustaining the management site post 2020, whether volunteers will be leaping up left, right and centre to actually get involved and say, “We can take this on board, we can work through the volunteer programme offered by London Wildlife Trust.”

It also depends the extent to which London Wildlife Trust has developed expectations with local communities and we’ve sold the dream really of where this site can go and managed expectations around ownership in that broader sense.

That’s critical because lots of communities, they don't have a first language is English, and it’s how interpretation will be developed and whether interpretation boards will reflect that.

I might be Irish \_\_\_[0:43:55] because I do remember David Blunkett as Home Secretary saying we should encourage people into silos of cultural identity, we should insist on people...

But it’s the point in making those relationships. It’s also about saying to people as well, “In your culture water is seen in this way,” like Muslim cultures, they wash before a prayer and everything, and it’s like will the interpretation make those very intrinsic leaps and respect cultural sensitivities.

Interviewer: Do you think there's a risk that there will be people that won’t feel comfortable on that site?

Stephen Wilkinson: Yes, and there will be if you're an agoraphobic, if you’re scared of water, you won’t like it with children running close to the edge of a reservoir which drops steeply down for about two metres and then the water starts.

And there's fear of what’s underneath the water. There's a pipe system which can suck you down, destroy you.

So people will be scared but it’s a question about... I don't think my parents would have liked me, or my mum wouldn’t have liked me going there.

Interviewer: Really?

Stephen Wilkinson: No. I remember years ago we used to have the mills with lodges, and I was told not to go anywhere near the water, and this got back to my mum because one of her brother’s friends in the 1930s was drowned in the mud.

I remember one day the parents of one of my friends, I was there as well, they were played around on the lodge on the water with the big floats of foam.

Those pipes used to draw water into the mill, I was about eight and I was told off about this, seriously told off, my mum in tears.

I personally, if I went there with a six, seven year old child would be worried that they’d just wander off.

You can say society puts you on the edge but if you've got children, it will be a concern.

There was an issue we didn't discuss with Thames Water about their ops, but they didn't put an age under eight around that site and I don't know why that’s -

Interviewer: That is how it is at the moment, \_\_\_[0:46:45], and I think going forward the under eights need to be with an adult and cared for because there is a fear of pipes in the reservoirs, that they will be sucked under, and it goes back to social \_\_\_[0:46:57], getting back up is incredibly hard.

Stephen Wilkinson: Yes.

Interviewer: It’s interesting that this is something the fishermen bring up a lot as well, and their fear where they say they wouldn't bring their children there, and they wouldn't \_\_\_[0:47:15].

Stephen Wilkinson: Yes, and that’s got to be managed so carefully because you just need one accident in the first two weeks and the whole great blown

But you’ll still get people going to the café because you've got great views, haven't you?

Interviewer: Yes, and as you said before that sense of open space when everywhere else in London you're surrounded by buildings, so visitors will really get that sense of oh, there's the horizon.

Stephen Wilkinson: Yes. [Aside conversation 0:47:51]. You can always catch up with a telephone interview.

Interviewer: Yes. Thank you very much for your time.

Stephen Wilkinson: Cheers.

END AUDIO
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