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START AUDIO

Interviewer: Okay. I'm going to put that near you, because I don't want to hear my voice, it's just-

Kirsty: Great. Thanks.

Interviewer: -your voice we want to hear. So, Kirsty, thank you for your time. Could we start off by you explaining your role in the opening up of the Wetlands, and that journey to date? We initially started that conversation just there.

Kirsty: Yes, so, I work in the Community Investment Team in External Affairs, and my role over the past 10 years has predominantly been in access and recreation, and, suppose, trying to do the conservation access, Recreation Code of Practice, which falls underneath the Water Industry Act, which says that we should be opening our land to the public, where possible, unless otherwise stated. So the standard thing is there's deep water, keep out. So our remit is to try and open these sites with stakeholders. And we've always had fishing and bird watching at Walthamstow, so the site has been open but, predominantly, just those two niche markets.

So, about eight years ago we were approached by London Wildlife Trust opening up the reservoirs, but at that point in time, the Trust weren't in the right place to be opening up a 200 hectare nature reserve. They didn't really have any education facilities. Camley Street, I think, was just starting to open. So we declined their kind offer and thought there was probably other stakeholders out there, like Lee Valley Regional Park Authority who would be more inclined to do it.

So, taking that on slowly but surely, engaging with stakeholders across the Lee Valley we undertook a visioning study for the reservoirs, which I think was something like 2008ish, where Lee Valley played quite a key role, along with the Council, the Environment Agency, Natural England, and ourselves. And that was looking at the sublime to the ridiculous theme parks, you name it, trying to-

Interviewer: The whole gang of-

Kirsty: The whole thing, down to leaving it as it is or even shutting it, just to try and focus down on what we wanted. From that, Lee Valley changed their remit slightly; they were more focused on the leisure than the green infrastructure and they sort of fell off the main stakeholder list.

London Wildlife Trust over the years had started to build their relationship with Thames Water and were very- still very interested in the site, but I think it changed their- the route from just opening it, to being more community, and how they could be involved in the project so they weren't driving it so much.

Then after that there was a bit of a gap and then there was the Upper Lee Landscape Strategy and there was also a community consultation that the London Wildlife Trust undertook, which put them, again, on the map of understanding how people might want to use the site. So all of these sort of things were gradually getting momentum.

Interviewer: Yes.

Kirsty: After the Upper Lee Landscape Strategy, which had lots of different projects in it, London Borough, Waltham Forest and Rose Jaijee who was independent at the time, she jumped on board with the Council and put their arm behind their backs slightly and said, "Come on, let's do it, let's do this project. I think you guys should lead on it". And we're here today with the Council leading on it as delivery partner because we, from the very early days, had already, I wouldn't say publicly committed, but we'd already established £1.5m towards the project.

So we were the first people to say, "Well, if it is going to go ahead, we've got, potentially, a pot of money there and we're willing to put our hands in a pockets and say this". But we knew that that would never be enough for the project, so the idea was that was a leverage, but we can't leverage money as a commercial company.

Interviewer: Of course.

Kirsty: So, we rely on stakeholders to leverage funding.

Interviewer: Yes, of course, that's interesting.

Kirsty: It's how we are now working with all of our community- well, a lot of our community projects is working with third party stakeholders who can make our customers money, or stakeholders money, or whoever's money it is go further to the benefit of the communities, because it seems to be a model that works quite well but takes a lot of time and effort, and stakeholder engagement. And rather than us delivering small projects, which don't really have- well they do have- we still deliver small projects but we don't do the same, it just doesn't have the same community benefit as the big ones.

So, yes, London Wildlife Trust won the contract to be the delivery partner. I think RSPB were the other one-

Interviewer: Oh, okay.

Kirsty: -who tendered. I think London Wildlife Trust was definitely our preferred, just partly because RSPB branding, as well, is so strong that the identity of the Wetlands itself needed to be stand alone and also needed to represent the partners who were on board.

Interviewer: Yes, yes.

Kirsty: And part of the reason LWT got that was they were willing to work with us and be part of the Walthamstow Wetlands partnership. Whereas, it was felt that the RSPB brought too strong a brand-

Interviewer: That's really interesting-

Kirsty: -to the site.

Interviewer: -and, of course, that's why you have Wild Walthamstow, and all the website, and all the social media-

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: -is about Walthamstow Wetlands, not LWT.

Kirsty: Yes, and the idea is we are now going to be trying to create the Walthamstow Wetlands brand itself over the next couple of years for opening, which will, obviously, represent all the stakeholders and all the people who have contributed to the project or lead on the project. But it won't be a Thames Water Walthamstow Wetlands or it won't be a London Borough of Waltham Forest Walthamstow Wetlands. It's the entity in itself and we all sit under it, over it, wherever we sit around it. So, yes, that was quite important.

Interviewer: And that's important in terms of reflecting the range of stakeholders that have had to come together in order to make this possible?

Kirsty: Yes, and also, I think, the RSPB for us was about birds, and they're very focused on their own delivery of what they wanted. I mean, obviously, we were not working with them so we don't know how it would have-

Interviewer: No.

Kirsty: -panned out, it may not have panned out that way. But I think we already had a good stakeholder relationship with LWT to know that we could work with them, especially from Thames' point of view, you've got- we don't want to be- this is going to sound strange, don't want to be ramming corporate messages down customers' throats, as such, but at the same time you want to get the messages out there-

Interviewer: Yes, yes, of course.

Kirsty: -which is important to the company and the business. So it's working with the right stakeholder where you can get the balance, where they can fully understand the operational nature but also our key messages, and integrate them sensitively, yet passionately, on our behalf. So LWT have, obviously, worked with us on lots of sites and have a proven track record that they can-

Interviewer: So you know you can work with them and you know you can get that balance?

Kirsty: We can get that balance and we can have that frank conversation if need be but, at the same time, almost leave them to it.

Interviewer: Yes, yes, which actually frees you up to continue focusing on the strategic side of things-

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: -rather than the micro-managing.

Kirsty: Yes, day to day management which we don't have the time to do.

Interviewer: No, of course. We started to move on to, actually-

Kirsty: Sorry.

Interviewer: -to the next question, actually, which is brilliant, in terms of how Walthamstow Wetlands fits in with the Thames Water CSR agenda. So, I guess, it's a very broad question about, really, what are Thames Water's motivations or objectives? I suppose they could be two different things. If we start with your motivations for wanting to be part of this project and help be a major stakeholder in the project, and then maybe move on to thinking about what would be the long-term objectives of engaging in this way.

Kirsty: Ooh, difficult question. Cheers. Thanks for that.

Interviewer: Here to test you.

Kirsty: Well, I suppose, I mean, the driving factor, historically, has very much been the CAR Code of Practice.

Interviewer: Yes.

Kirsty: So there has been this remit and there has been an Access and Recreation team, historically, throughout Thames, trying to push access on site. So, I mean, that's really the, suppose, legislative driver, to a certain extent, although I would say it's probably quite a weak legislative driver.

Interviewer: Okay.

Kirsty: In the sense that it is mentioned within the Water Industry Act, and I always hark onto it when I have to talk to Directors etc, "It's there, it's there, we're important". But I suppose it's that historic move of companies really taking corporate social responsibility as an important driver for their stakeholder shareholders.

Obviously, we do have shareholders, they want to know that we're spending the money wisely from water and waste water point of view, but also doing the right thing for our environment, for our communities that we work within, and that's been pushed up the agenda of big businesses across London.

So you've got things like London Benchmarking Group, which we put our data into, which allows us to benchmark against other companies in London. And there's just a commitment from our Directors, and our Executive Team as well, that it's an important part of the business. So that's about, I suppose, the personalities that come in and-

Interviewer: Yes, okay.

Kirsty: So we've got a very, very strong Executive Team who are very, very keen on community investment style projects, to the point where they actually sit on a community Charities Committee. So all of our big projects go towards- go to a Charities Committee to be put in front of the Chief Executive along with senior Executives, and they, essentially, make the final decision on-

Interviewer: Okay, so that's quite a hands-on engagement at a very senior level-

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: -on the CSR agenda.

Kirsty: Yes, no, it is and that's quarterly meetings, so-

Interviewer: That's interesting.

Kirsty: -that's- and that's everything from charitable donations of even £2,000, £500, all the way up to £1.5m community investment. And we've started putting a lot more in front of them so, obviously, we have our business planning that we've planned it, but we still put a lot of the bigger projects, although they're planned, back into a sense check with the Executive-

Interviewer: Yes, okay.

Kirsty: -to make sure that the deliverables are there from the business and also the community side of things are ticked off.

Interviewer: And what sort of- we started that- you started talking about- when you were talking about the relationship with LWT, what deliverables are- do Thames Water want to get out of it? What messages do Thames Water want to share?

Kirsty: Well, I think there's just getting people onto our land holding and people understanding that we are a huge land holder across the Thames Valley, that's a really, really basic one, but we are a huge land owner, and we just want people to come in and enjoy the sites. I suppose the themes that we look at are heritage. We've got a huge 400 years, suppose, if you go back to the New River, heritage sitting there from the cholera outbreak all the way through to now delivering extremely clean drinking water at very cheap prices, I suppose. It's really down to those sort of things. Education of customers.

Interviewer: Okay. Can you talk to me more about that, because that's quite interesting, so LWT's major on that-

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: -and there'll be an education centre-

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: -at the Wetlands so-

Kirsty: So the education side of things is getting them young, really. I mean, it works, but I suppose the education side of things, the most basic thing is the water, understanding people's water use and how you fit in to the water cycle, and the human water cycle, and understanding that water just- as a business, for us, doesn't just fall out the sky and arrive at your taps.

Interviewer: Yes, yes.

Kirsty: We actually do something in between it, and then when you flush your toilet, we do something else to make it clean, to put it back into the environment to be used again and not to damage the environment. So, it's about just understanding the core business at those very basic levels that, I think, our community or our customer consultation, and when you work with school, people just really haven't got a clue.

Interviewer: No.

Kirsty: They do not think when they turn on their taps-

Interviewer: Oh right.

Kirsty: -what happens, so it's really basic as a, sort of, understanding what Thames Water does apart from put a bill at your door.

Interviewer: Yes, exactly.

Kirsty: Which most people associate Thames Water with. Leaks, putting water at your door. When something goes wrong, blame the water company but, actually, a lot of good is going on in the background and day to day interaction with Thames Water that you probably wouldn't realise you're having. So, yes, it's quite basic, I suppose, but really undervalued-

Interviewer: Yes, okay.

Kirsty: -if... And then, as you're getting into more complex stuff about water efficiency and how you can impact on environmental water usage, obviously, we don't have a lot of water in the south east of England-

Interviewer: No, no.

Kirsty: -but, again, people don't realise that.

Interviewer: No, because we're a wet old country.

Kirsty: Because we're a wet country.

Interviewer: Yes, yes.

Kirsty: So the water efficiency, there's the bin it, don't block it messages. So fats, oils and greases down the toilet, how that actually affects the fact that your roads are getting dug up is probably because your next door neighbour has put fat- you know, it's just trying to build up people's interactions with Thames Water. And then woven into that is the impacts on the environment, which is where London Wildlife Trust-

Interviewer: Yes, okay.

Kirsty: -come in but, I suppose, the Wildlife Trust, from our point of view, are happy to give those messages out.

Interviewer: Yes, because they're compatible.

Kirsty: Because they're compatible and, for us, it's more powerful as well for a third party to be telling our messages and getting those messages out there, than it is necessarily Thames or- we do have four education centres ourselves, our own sewage treatment works where we take kids round to-

Interviewer: Ah, do you?

Kirsty: Yes, so, we've got them. They're all predominantly West London, Hogsmill, which is Surbiton, Didcot, Slough and Maple Cross.

Interviewer: Okay. Actually, I think I know about Slough. Okay.

Kirsty: So, yes, they come and they can see.

Interviewer: And there they can see the very corporate side of things, the very processing plants, how this works-

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: -whereas, seeing it in the environment and seeing it in the natural environment-

Kirsty: Environment.

Interviewer: -is a very different experience for them, isn't it?

Kirsty: It'll be a different experience but, again, part of the activity plan is to weave some of those elements that are- so we've got things like a network challenge that we go out, that's our, what's it called? We actually go out to schools, so that's our Outreach thing, rather than schools coming to us, and that's where it's [unclear 0:18:11] to curriculum: maths, you name it, science, where they have to design and build a water network.

Interviewer: Oh nice, brilliant.

Kirsty: Down to buying pipes, being project managers, they have to design a route, they have to cost it out, they have to go over bridges, go through triple SIs-

Interviewer: Wow.

Kirsty: -you know, lots. We stop them and say, "There's going to be a carnival, how are you going to deal with that?", intervention through it. So we do that, and London Wildlife Trust will be taking that on and adapting it to be a little more local for Woodbury, and for Walthamstow, to make it slightly more local-based. So focused on those sites but still have exactly the same core messaging and same delivery.

So the idea is about sharing resources that we already have between the two of us going forwards, once the Education Manager comes on and adapting things accordingly, but making sure that we get it. And also we've got our target as well for Ofwat, which is our regulator, to reach- to tell you the truth I can't remember how many children we said we'd reach in this period or five year period but, again-

Interviewer: But there is a target there?

Kirsty: -there is a target there, so working with stakeholders to help deliver those key messages is fundamental.

Interviewer: Yes, yes.

Kirsty: And that links to behavioural changes, I suppose, kids switching off their taps when they brush their teeth, having a shower instead of a bath, using less water, so you want to see a behavioural change. How that's measured isn't quite as easy as that-

Interviewer: No, okay.

Kirsty: -but the idea is people will go home and-

Interviewer: Yes, it's through that education-

Kirsty: -through that education-

Interviewer: -through that Outreach there would be behavioural change. Okay.

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: So that's partly- it's interesting, isn't it, like the range of interactions within the CSR agenda are so diverse. So there is the very basic bottom line shareholder issue and then there are, of course, legislative and regulatory issues around CSR. Then there was the very personal, shall we say, sense of stewardship from senior management and members of your team-

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: -and then you have additional NGOs as well that are engaging with you to try and advance that-

Kirsty: And, I suppose, even the next layer along is those small community groups that work directly with us as well that, I suppose, probably are, the loudest voices of all, to tell you the truth.

Interviewer: Yes. How do you think this reflects the water industry more generally? So, when I've been doing my background research, or on-line research, rather, and desk research, I found that back in, I think it was 2004, was the year of the CSR in Europe-

Kirsty: Could be.

Interviewer: -and the water industry wrote a report about: this is where the water industry is in terms of CSR and we're leading because of the following X, Y, Z. And all the major water companies were there, including Thames Water, in that, and yet, of course, it hasn't really been- I suppose it's not been European focused to the same degree since. And so I approached them and said, "Has there been a follow-up report?" You know, "You wrote this great report in 2004, but I haven't seen one since, where are we with this? What does the industry think about this?". And I haven't had a reply, so I just wondered what you think, where Thames Water think, about CSR in terms of the wider water industry?

Kirsty: I don't know if I can answer from CSR, I can answer from a conservation access recreation point of view. So we still meet up on a yearly basis to share- so we have a conservation access recreation conference once a year, and Education also meet up in their own smaller teams, couple of times a year to share best practice, have a look at key issues that are coming up. So from, I suppose, more at a roots level.

Interviewer: Yes, yes, so there's an officer level that meeting up is happening.

Kirsty: That meeting up is happening and has been happening for a long time. The focus is more now strategic, sort of, pushing how you get through business plans, trying to share, but that may change because competition is coming in.

Interviewer: Yes, okay.

Kirsty: So I think CSR's going to be playing a lot bigger part in... Obviously, people are going to choose because of price, first and foremost, but I think there is going to be a change in the nice stuff you do. The stuff you do for your community is going to become far more prominent as customers can choose whether or not they get their water from Severn Trent or Anglian or Thames Water. Although the water is [cold sale 0:23:33] coming from the sink, the company, you can pay somebody else to do it.

Interviewer: Yes, of course.

Kirsty: So that's going to be an interesting one and I don't think we have any answers yet to how that's going to change the CSR agenda, and access and recreation agenda, and how the companies are going to-

Interviewer: Respond.

Kirsty: -respond to that. My gut feeling is they're going to use us a lot more as a marketing tool.

Interviewer: Yes. So that's interesting that you even say that, that, for you, very explicitly then, you are not a marketing tool or up until now you've been not an add-on, a way of promotion, you've been integral to the business?

Kirsty: Well I think that's partly because of the way the water industry is set up. You have your regions, you serve your customers within the region, therefore, they're your customers whether they like it or not. So, I mean, really if you want to do nice things, you do nice things. If you don't want to do nice things, then that's a choice that the business has made. Luckily, I think we have made good choices and we've moved forwards before even competition comes, so we made these commitments to Walthamstow before. We always knew it was coming somewhere but it was never based on competition: we need to get out there and do it. But I think in the next few years as competition comes in, I think it will be quite important.

Interviewer: And is there something specific? Is there something unique about the water and the water industry in terms of this agenda? Is there something very particular about it? I mean, the other utilities don’t seem to be quite so prominent in some respects.

Kirsty: I think one thing that makes water companies unique is the fact that we hold large land holdings. The other utilities don't hold large land holdings. So we already have big, big land holdings with sailing, with fishing. If you take Yorkshire Water, they own half the Uplands, so there's rights of ways and public access already there. Other utility companies, they have their small sub-station, that's it, they don't own swathes of the countryside or land holdings. And what makes it unique for Thames is we've got London, huge population, fairly deprived in green space-

Interviewer: Yes, course.

Kirsty: -with a very, very unique multi-cultural... I mean, obviously the other water companies, there's Manchester and stuff, but nothing really compares with London and the Thames Valley.

Interviewer: In terms of the scale, or complexity, or issues of deprivation or-

Kirsty: Yes, so having a 200 hectare green- well, I mean, it's not even 200 hectare, if you take all of our reservoirs along the Lee Valley and our land holding along there-

Interviewer: Yes, it's-

Kirsty: -well I wouldn't even like to guess what that is, what, 600 hectares something like that, maybe? But even a 200 hectare site to be opened up in a highly populated area is just unique in itself.

Interviewer: Yes. I think that's interesting this- I think you're obviously quite right in terms of this issue of land holding and the way that we already, as citizens, engage with you in a much deeper way, perhaps, than we do with other utilities, because we are walking on your land, or we are fishing on your land, or we are birding in your land. So we're already, in some way, negotiating relationships with you, in some ways.

Kirsty: And it's that fine balance, I think, between- and it's maybe my approach rather than the company's is allowing people to come on and enjoy as long as they know it's Thames Water, then actually, a good message for them is: we've had a lovely day out at Thames Water. It's not- obviously, there's all the education side of things and that's secondary, just even the basic relationship of: I know it's a Thames Water site and we've had a nice day.

Interviewer: Yes, so it is finding- it is using the landscape and nature to establish new relationships with people.

Kirsty: Yes, and if people go away with a nice feeling of it-

Interviewer: Exactly.

Kirsty: -that's one step into the bill landing on the door the next day.

Interviewer: Yes, so rather than just that one fairly negative association-

Kirsty: Association.

Interviewer: -they've got this much more positive-

Kirsty: Positive. Yes.

Interviewer: So it's really interesting. So we've spoken about CSR, we've spoken about it more broadly in terms of the water industry generally. Do you think the land being privately owned affects the way the communities are going to engage with it and already have, historically, engaged with your other sites?

Kirsty: I suppose, with it being privately owned, we make the decisions on when people come on and when people can't come on, so I mean there is a conflict there. There's a lot of sites where people would like to get on and the facilities aren't there, or the operational risk is too high, or the security risk is quite high because, obviously, security is now playing a huge, huge issue. And that isn't governed by us, that's governed by DEFRA.

Interviewer: Right. Okay.

Kirsty: So, although we've got a security team here, a lot of their sites might be: it's just a no, and I'm not going to tell you-

Interviewer: No, and that's determined by DEFRA?

Kirsty: That's determined by DEFRA and that's quite a difficult discussion to have quite a lot, because even I'm not privy to the reasons why.

Interviewer: No, of course, yes.

Kirsty: So it's a blanket, 'No', which isn't particularly good when you're going to consult with your stakeholder group saying, "We want to get on this site", and you're going, "No, it's security".

Interviewer: And I can't [Crosstalk 0:29:53].

Kirsty: "Well why? Why is it security?". "It just is". "Why are we putting that fencing up?" "Because we just are". So that's, yes, that's-

Interviewer: That's a very different- say to the Commons, so it's not a Commons land and there's obviously a different relationship.

Kirsty: Yes, so that is always an interesting- it doesn't happen all the time, but it is there in the background. I suppose, most of the sites that we've opened up, we open up in partnership with conservation groups, or Councils, or through leases and licenses. We don't tend to have ad hoc just open access, it's very much managed, and it's managed because all of our land has an operational functionality to it, even if it's that bit of waste grassland, it's been bought because of extension works, potentially.

So there's a lot of- there's reasons why we hold big land holdings and might not give it up as well because there might be- we might need it to expand later on in the- down the line, 20 years down the line-

Interviewer: Sure.

Kirsty: -so you don't want a community group on it or-

Interviewer: No, so-

Kirsty: -you don't want to open it to the public. So sometimes you're going to be quite frank with-

Interviewer: Because it is a business.

Kirsty: It's a- yes, exactly.

Interviewer: So that's interesting, that balance then that you're negotiating as a business, and certainly as a team, between public good and a corporate requirement.

Kirsty: Yes, operational needs.

Interviewer: Yes, and that balance is-

Kirsty: Which is most of my role is sitting there going to internal parts of the business. So they're just as much my stakeholders as external stakeholders. To go and talk to Property, Operations, Security, Reservoir Engineering, and understand what they're actual functions and needs are for those sites, so that we can make a decision, as a company, whether things are the right things to do or the wrong things to do.

Interviewer: And that's really interesting, so how would you describe or reflect back on that, that those set of conversations with internal stakeholders in order to bring Walthamstow Wetlands to open to the public?

Kirsty: Ha, ha. Sometimes rocky. I think, again, that's a relationship that's developed over 10 years where we've gone in and been frank and honest with them. Obviously, it's always helpful when your Chief Exec's a supporter of the project, because that tends to leverage things slightly. Talking of that, there he is.

So, yes, that sort of leverage does help, but we try not- I try not to say, "Oh Martin Banks says...". But it is helpful at-

Interviewer: It's the trump card.

Kirsty: It's the trump card, but it's working with them and understanding what they require, where their blockers are and trying to overcome those blockers, but also not putting them in a situation where they're in front of stakeholders having to answer those questions.

Interviewer: Yes, okay.

Kirsty: So a lot of it is in the background, just working with them, talking to them, showing them consultation pictures, drawings, allowing them to be part of the process. So, as much as Walthamstow Wetlands, I'm the front person, every single key decision, so from the HLF bid going in, well stage C designs, HLF bid going in, even the detailed designs are signed off internally, in a fashion, by people like Reservoir Engineering, Operations, Health and Safety, CSR, Electrical Teams, Network Teams. Depending on, obviously, what they are, it's signed off as a concept by the business not just by community investment corporate responsibility. They have to be part of the process and, obviously, then agree to the things that they maybe didn't like and then the things that they've managed to get in through the design process or through the business planning or...

Interviewer: And so that has been a lot of your work in terms of bringing this project to fruition?

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: What would you say had been their major concerns, their reasons for saying, "Oh crikey, no"?

Kirsty: The major concern is it's an operational landscape. Ultimately, we are here to serve North London with clean drinking water. Do you really want 200,000 visitors on site a year, getting in the way, potentially, turning valves? It's easier for the guys to do their job without having people on site. They can just get on, do their jobs and not worry about it, so that's an added complication.

Security, it's a strategic water body for London, without a doubt, so that's one. And I think, really, the turning point, a lot of that has been the fact that LWT will be bringing staff onto site. So that's been our trump card saying, "We're not just opening this up, there's going to be good volunteer force, there's going to be proper staff".

Interviewer: And that has been a persuasive-

Kirsty: Yes, no, that has been a very persuasive element, and then starting to go down the fact that having monthly meetings, trying to integrate the two teams together and understanding... And laying our cards on the table as well, it's an operational site we're going to have to close routes, we're going to have to do things when we want to do them, to a certain extent. So that's been Operations biggest, "Oh god, how are we going to do this?".

And we're still in that process because, obviously, through the design process it's very much the what ifs. Now we're going into construction and there's stuff that we've probably missed, and we've all missed it, and we've all signed off stuff where we've gone, "Ah, the roads are not wide enough", or- now it's like we need to live with it, we need to work round this, we need to change things where we need to do it. And the next key thing will be getting London Wildlife Trust really on board to start establishing those connections with Operations and the wider team.

Interviewer: Yes. So moving from the more front facing- we see you as front of house in terms of the interaction with Thames Water and your team. It's moving away and saying, "Well, hey, on a day to day basis the operational people that you are going to be able to be working with, building those relations".

Kirsty: Yes, and understanding how we can benefit each other, and there are things there like Ground Maintenance. London Wildlife Trust can really work with our Ground Maintenance contractors much better than our Operations team can, because our Operations team just say, "Get on with it". Whereas, LWT will be able to put some input into it and make sure it is done at the right time of year for environment, and there's those sort of influences.

Interviewer: Yes. So there are definite benefits of bringing the two skills and experiences and interests together?

Kirsty: Yes, and also we are open to the public already, it's just 15,000 to 20,000 visitors, rather than-

Interviewer: 200, yes.

Kirsty: -200,000 visitors, but it is, it's a suck 'em and see, and, unfortunately, that is a bit of my catchphrase to Operations. We've done a lot of work, done a business plan, we've done an activity plan, we've done the designs, but part of it is-

Interviewer: It's just-

Kirsty: -we need to run with it, see how it goes and we'll make changes as and when required.

Interviewer: Yes, so it is a bit of a leap of faith for the company and for Thames Water-

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: -sorry, the company and for LWT?

Kirsty: Yes, and I think there is- to be brutally honest, I think there's a bit of- we don't know where London Borough Waltham Forest are going to fit in the future. Obviously, that's quite... Obviously, they're delivering it and will be delivering their objectives, but come HLF funding over, I think a big question is- we're in the process of, hopefully, setting up a trust which they will sit on, but I think between us and LWT, we see ourselves as very much we're the ones left holding the baby once the financial risk- obviously, London Borough Waltham Forest, at the moment, hold the financial risk for this project. So until they don't need to pay anything back to HLF or the project's a success, they do hold the risk, but what happens?

Interviewer: And when does that run to, that risk? Twenty-five, is it?

Kirsty: It's either five or ten years. Probably, 10 years by the time they've done their reporting and stuff.

Interviewer: Yes, okay.

Kirsty: Roundabout 20, 25, something like that.

Interviewer: So this mixture, in terms of the public, this space coming to openness, or increased openness, it's quite an interesting mix of institutional, and state, and private funding that makes it, probably, quite a complex space, one, to manage, but, two, to communicate, I guess, and I wondered how you think that opening up of that space will impact the local area?

Kirsty: I mean, it is a complex thing and I think that's why it's taken so long to get to where we've got to, because we've had to have those discussion, and be very open and frank as separate stakeholders and parties. And I think that's really important that we do have a strong vision as a collective, not as individuals.

So from a community point of view and people coming in, we're still not- yes, we are going to quibble about certain bits and pieces, but the vision and what we want to deliver is that's signed, sealed, delivered, it's- and I think we needed to be in that really strong position for it to work-

Interviewer: Yes, of course.

Kirsty: -before anybody did it. And also what that does is there's going to be- we know that there's going to be complex visitor issues. There's all your faith groups within that area, different cultures. We've got a very, very strong fishing community there who feel like it's theirs already, and I have to say some of them are supportive, some of them aren't, but they're very, very important stakeholder for Thames because they're already on site.

So, yes, I think having that strong vision allows us to have frank discussions with communities as well about what we want to deliver, and how it's going to affect them, and how they can use the site, and also offering them opportunities to be part of how the site's shaped in the future which is, obviously, what LWT are there to do-

Interviewer: Yes. Okay.

Kirsty: -for us.

Interviewer: Yes. And in terms of- if- as part of that vision, do you have a sense of what you want Walthamstow Wetlands to bring to the area? Do you have a sense of- you spoke very clearly, early on, about it having its own identity, and its own brand, and it's just being this very singular thing.

Kirsty: Yes, I mean, I suppose it's different for- I mean ours is about getting our customers onto our site but, again, I suppose we play to the local political agenda as well about being able to link in to deprivation figures or health and- but, again, they're all sort of- I suppose, they all sit in the CR agenda, but are probably driven by the Council, and because we have the Council sitting as key partner, those side of things can be driven by them.

Interviewer: Yes. Okay. So the health agenda, the wellbeing agenda-

Kirsty: Agenda.

Interviewer: -green infrastructure-

Kirsty: Yes, access to-

Interviewer: -access.

Kirsty: All that, that's all- I think we've pulled together all the stakeholders deliberately to cover that and, I mean, that's a joint effort-

Interviewer: Yes, of course.

Kirsty: -which is, in some ways, allowed Thames to look at its operational side and not be side tracked quite so much into the- obviously, we're a supporter of all of them because it fits our CR agenda, but actually having the specialists, or having those people feeding in, allows us to really think about how we can deliver the project on the ground. And, obviously, we feed into those but from a day to day running and getting there, we don't need to think quite so hard about that.

Interviewer: Yes, because your focus has to be on the operational side-

Kirsty: Operational side.

Interviewer: -delivery side, specialists around health and safety.

Kirsty: Yes, all of that, which is a huge amount of work-

Interviewer: Of course.

Kirsty: -so having Natural England sitting round the table, having the Environment Agency sitting round the table, Greater London Authority, all of those people bring in all those other elements and also strengthens the project. And it's not just our perception of the health agenda or the- our perception of green infrastructure or access to nature. We're getting in the experts, essentially, to shape the project, so that's quite important.

Interviewer: Yes, no, I agree. And do you- I mean, you alluded there to you anticipate complex visitor issues, do you see there being any challenges or risks of it being opened up to the public? You've already spoken about security, but is there- are there any concerns that you have?

Kirsty: I think our biggest concern from day to day, just on the ground, is the cycling on site, is something that we- it was a big, big, "No", to start off with, I suppose, from us and we eventually backed down and said, "Yes", through the spinal route.

Interviewer: Through the green way.

Kirsty: Yes, but it's understanding how that's going to work and how- and also LWT have certain concerns on that but, again, that's a suck it and see.

Interviewer: Yes, and why is that? Is that safety?

Kirsty: Safety, liability, ultimately, although you've got LWT and the Council, it's still a Thames Water site.

Interviewer: Okay, and we come back to ownership.

Kirsty: Yes, so whatever happens on that site, Thames Water will always have its- it can have the biggest brand in Walthamstow Wetlands identity in the world, but if a kid drowns, it's a Thames Water site.

Interviewer: Yes, of course, okay.

Kirsty: So, yes, that's something that's at the back of everybody's mind.

Interviewer: Yes, of course.

Kirsty: So, yes, the cycling was always a bit of a sticking point, but that's because we don't allow cycling on any of our sites, as such. And what else from our..? I mean it's, yes, the user, it's how fisherman interaction and fly fishing, back casting, it's a standard multi-use site and how that's physically going to be managed alongside the fact that it's a RAMS or Triple SI, ISPA. And again, from a liability point of view, this project, if we start causing disturbance, we're the site owner.

Interviewer: Yes, okay, which makes you accountable first-

Kirsty: We're accountable.

Interviewer: -both financially but also in terms of any mitigation.

Kirsty: Yes, so everything falls back to-

Interviewer: Yes, eventually will come back.

Kirsty: -owner, land owner.

Interviewer: And because I noticed, actually, in the application, Rose's application for planning permission, that there had been an initial objection by Natural England concerned about the impact on nesting, winter nesting birds, and that had been a major concern. They were worried about that there wasn't enough visitor management information, is that right?

Kirsty: Yes, there was stuff around gateways and being able to shut the site and whether the gates were sufficient to deter people because, essentially, the site will have seasonal paths.

Interviewer: Yes, exactly.

Kirsty: So it'll allow us to manage visitors, or LWT to manage visitors, different parts of the site at different times. I think there's, probably, still work to be done, really, to get that right but, again, I think part of that will be once LWT get on site and the designs are- we're at the stage now where the designs are the designs, but I think reality says that going forwards it's something we have to monitor.

And, again, Natural England have sat on the Steering Group and, I suppose, that's caused a slight rift in the sense of, although they've advised and as a Steering Group we've had to make hard decisions on budget cuts and all of that sort of stuff, but when it falls into planning permission in the legislature side of things, it's not necessarily the same people. So although you can influence and you can direct and they can help shape-

Interviewer: Yes, you're not dealing with the same people-

Kirsty: You're not-

Interviewer: -in that stakeholder group, okay.

Kirsty: Yes, so sometimes objections come up that may be not quite expecting.

Interviewer: No, yes, okay. Yes, and that, I guess, is, again, comes down to the complexity of this site and that's why, I guess, the partnership of quite interesting stakeholders was needed?

Kirsty: Yes, because we needed Natural England on there to help us shape it because it is such an important site, and Thames would never have taken this on without having Natural England sitting beside them all the way, and the Environment Agency sitting beside them all the way to help shape that at the early stages.

Interviewer: It's been quite a journey, hasn't it?

Kirsty: It has been a major journey.

Interviewer: Yes, so, we've spoken- I guess, I'm aware of time. Yes, I think I'm quite interested in terms of responsibilities that you think that the opening up of it creates for the public. Do you feel there is any sense of responsibilities for the people that then come onto the site? Will there be a Code of Conduct? Will there be indications of how you should behave?

Kirsty: Yes, very clear. I mean, as an operational point of view that's been one of our things that we've really had to look at: what are the dos and don'ts on site? But working with LWT it makes it a lot easier because they understand the operational requirements. So there's things like no dogs on site. For a start it's a nature reserve but it's also drinking water, so the concept of dog poo and drinking water doesn't publicly go down particularly well, and the Drinking Water Inspectorate wouldn't like it. However, geese, totally different.

Interviewer: Geese are all right.

Kirsty: Well, yes, but that public perception so it's- obviously, there was quite a lot of discussions about: well, couldn't we allow dogs to walk through this bit? So we've had to have that.

Age limits on site, which I would say still haven't fully been established. Essentially, we're saying, or our Health and Safety are saying no unaccompanied children under the age of 16. For some reason the age of eight keeps on coming up, but I wouldn't want my ten-year-old stepson wandering around on an operational site by himself, or even by lakes and stuff. So I'm like, "16 is a sensible age". It gives you- but, I mean, these are not- they're by-laws but they're not by-laws, officially, but it's that- the idea of being it gives London Wildlife Trust, and our staff, a remit to be able to monitor behaviours and deal with behaviours.

So, again, the age limit sort of thing, and my view of how it works is if you've got a group of- couple of 15-year-olds who are really interested in nature conservation and that's- and they are acting responsible, then that isn't actually an issue.

Interviewer: No.

Kirsty: But if you've got a group of three or four young lads coming on site thinking they can disturb the wildlife and drink, then it means that the staff have something to say, "You're not meant to be on site, get off". If you have age of eight what are they going to turn round and tell you?

Interviewer: Exactly.

Kirsty: So it's a common sense...

Interviewer: Yes, and how will that be policed, do you think?

Kirsty: So the idea is, really, through the volunteers at London Wildlife Trust. I mean, we'll have our fisheries wardens who will still be on site, who will be- they'll be employed by Thames Water but they'll slot together, but the idea being that London Wildlife Trust will be bringing volunteers. And those up front volunteers, certainly in the early years, to help reinforce those things, so no swimming. And, I suppose, that's where Rachel's work as well in that early stage is understanding that it's an operational site, the water's cold, as much as you'd love to swim, you can't, because you're going to get sucked-

Interviewer: It's dangerous.

Kirsty: It's dangerous, you're going to get sucked in to pumps. Those sort of things, so really we're part of- this is about the volunteers that LWT bring and also the staffing structure that is going to be in place.

Interviewer: And so will there be- I know it's detail, but you're anticipating signs on entrances that say-

Kirsty: Yes, they'll be signs on-

Interviewer: -the following-

Kirsty: -entrances which will have some key. So no dogs, cycling, keep to the path, designated cycle routes, no unaccompanied children. So the basic no drinking, no picnicking, no camp fires, no alcohol, that sort of thing. So that's in the process of being done as a standardised thing, on everything, as a clear set of don't dos, but the consultants are trying to work on how you turn that slightly more positive.

Interviewer: Yes, okay. Okay, yes.

Kirsty: Which is always the challenge, but it still needs to be clear that there are certain things you are not allowed to do on this site, along with a curator who's starting to build up the stories. So we now have a-

Interviewer: Yes, is that Stephen?

Kirsty: Stephen, yes, and he's really fantastic. He's-

Interviewer: And is it Stephen [Swabi 0:54:43]?

Kirsty: Swabi, yes. Well from Thames' point of view seems to get where we're coming from, which is all- the proof will be in the pudding, won't it, when we actually see what we get. But he seems to understand our issues and the messages that we want to get out there and some of the constraints that we're working to, which is really important because you will- this is going to sound really bad, you've essentially got landscape architects who are very airy, fairy and very driven by the 25 year plan and there's me going, "The 25 year is a 25 year aspirational plan. The word there being 'aspirational'".

The reality of getting 33 hectares of rebedding an operational site are still very narrow, therefore, we are not actually committed to the 25 year plan, it's a way of creating a vision of what it could be, extra entrances and access points. It's like there's reasons why they're not there at the moment, not just the money. And Stephen has been able to balance that and go, "Yes, no, good point. Yes, we're not going to promise stuff that we can't necessarily deliver as a partnership".

Interviewer: And, of course, that's essential in his role as a curator because he's communicating a lot with messages.

Kirsty: Yes, so that's quite-

Interviewer: And, so, have you- working with him, because he's not long been on board, has he?

Kirsty: He's been on board for about six months, but it's been that pulling together all of that information that's already out there.

Interviewer: Yes, okay. And, so, you've been working with him quite closely in terms of-

Kirsty: Yes, I think we've met a couple of times and had big brain dumps.

Interviewer: Yes, okay, brilliant.

Kirsty: And he's now got a headline story board, draft document, starting to- with lots of gaps in it.

Interviewer: Yes, nice, okay. Right. Okay. So we've talked about tensions, conflicts, activities that have been encouraged, activities that won't be- are discouraged, and some of that is around seasonality, and we've spoken about the gates and that sort of thing. So I've dealt with that side of things. I wondered if you felt that, actually, the opening up of the area affects the identity of the area? I mean, it's such a major site, it's such a huge site in a site that is, for the reasons we've described, poor on green infrastructure, so opening up and making available huge amounts of green, blue infrastructure, does that affect the identity of..?

Kirsty: I think it will but I think, again, it's really a Council- so it's linking in to the big developments, the Black Horse Road development, the new housing that's coming on and, ultimately, that's going to play a huge selling point in- so a bit like Woodberry Down and the Manor House, it's a plus point to bring in different clientele, different people, but also improve the life of people already living there, so to speak. And there's huge- both at Tottenham Hale land, Black Horse Road, big, big housing developments which are going to jump on the bandwagon and use it.

From our point of view, I suppose, it's a step change to what it's there, but I suppose it's that working in partnership to allow the Council to benefit from our land holding.

Interviewer: Okay.

Kirsty: And Natural England. Obviously, there's lots of agendas in there that you start filtering in. By opening up we're meeting the agenda and, I suppose, that political game of- does have business benefit to us somewhere down the line. Whether it's a regulator or us trying to get plans through the Council-

Interviewer: Yes, of course.

Kirsty: -it's always going to be used as a political tool somewhere down the line.

Interviewer: Yes, it is an asset.

Kirsty: Yes, definitely.

Interviewer: From that perspective, isn't it?

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: And we've spoken about the responsibilities of the public and I wondered- we talked additionally about consultation and the consultation LWT did, as well as having the consultation that London Borough did. Do you feel that that process has informed? Have people that have been involved in that consultation, have they had a chance to inform the shape of it?

Kirsty: Probably could have done more consultation in the sense of we've done what we needed to do, which is quite often the case. I think we've found it quite difficult to maybe- so we've done fisherman stakeholder groups where nobody turns up and then they get on the forum and complain like billy-ho. So, I mean, I haven't been hugely involved in the consultation, sort of-

Interviewer: And is that driven by London Borough Waltham Forest?

Kirsty: It has been- well it's been driven by LWT as a delivery partner-

Interviewer: Ah, okay.

Kirsty: -partly because that's what they're good at and they did the initial one, and then, obviously, as part of the planning process as well, obviously, the consultation that's gone on there. But I mean the consultations have all been fed back through the design process and questions answered where- so I mean we have gone back and discussed with different parties the decisions that we've made as a Steering Group and why we've made it. Sometimes, obviously, in their favour, other times it's not.

So we have made design changes, things like Coppermills Tower and blocking up windows. There was a- I think there's five houses effected, but we've listened to them and we've come up with new schemes and plans and...

I think it wasn't a hugely controversial consultation. I think the fishermen, bird watchers, yes, impact, but a lot of the consultation just brought up was: we didn't know it existed.

Interviewer: Amazing, isn't it?

Kirsty: Or: we didn't know we could get on. So we weren't dealing with complex issues, as such, about designs and usage, and people were giving us ideas on how they might want to use it, but it was nothing that wasn't not expected, if you-

Interviewer: Yes.

Kirsty: We'd already- I don't think anything was really thrown up that we thought: oh right, hadn't thought about that. I mean, there was this view thing, we were looking at multi-cultural faith area that could be used, that got pulled away partly because of it's likely to be in a quiet area and those quiet areas are probably- we don't want people because we can't man it, which is likely to end up with illegal raves on it.

Interviewer: Yes, of course.

Kirsty: So it's those sort of balances, and they're things that we could do in the future as- so it was about getting the fundamentals right now, what we could afford to do right now, but keeping in mind what we could do in the future as those groups come forwards and we build a relationship with them. So I think we see the site as evolving rather than being a static site now.

So, the community consultation captured these groups and, hopefully, working with LWT going forwards and the engagement officer, and then we can do low cost or- it's more about site usage and engagement rather than the physical aspects on site itself.

Interviewer: Yes. So, talk to me about how you think that relationship will grow. What will be the mechanisms in for people? I'm user of the site, I've not been there before, I start going along to it and then I think, "Actually, do you know what? I live just down the road, I'd quite like to be a bit more involved in-

Kirsty: With LWT or-

Interviewer: -that as well".

Kirsty: -that is they're going to be the face of Walthamstow Wetlands, whatever that brand is, we are the delivery partner, they will be recognised as the delivery partner but they will take on the brand of Walthamstow Wetlands and that staffing structure will deliver-

Interviewer: Mechanisms for people to engage.

Kirsty: -that mechanism for people to engage through the activity plan at the moment, but I very much see the activity plan, the business plan, the management and maintenance plan as working documents. So it's about learning from the people that are coming on site, learning from how the site's being run and adapting them accordingly, rather than having static documents sitting there. Obviously, through consultation with the key stakeholders saying, "Well this isn't working so how are we going to address this?", and coming up with new solutions. So LWT won't be on their own.

Interviewer: No, and do you feel that, generally, that is felt across the stakeholder group that we- that everybody understands that this is quite an undertaking and that we have to learn and people- users will feedback to us and we will- it will evolve?

Kirsty: Yes, I think there is an understanding of that. I think at the moment where we are is very much focused on construction.

Interviewer: Just-

Kirsty: Let's just get it done.

Interviewer: -get it done, yes.

Kirsty: And, again, I think it's really going to come down to LWT and Thames Water in the sense of us as landowners and them as delivery partners, and, again, it's trying to work out where London Borough Waltham Forest fit. They're obviously having to report as the holders of the money for HLF, but I think the relationship, the really key relationship is LWT, Thames Water going forwards to make it work and make those decisions that are going to be right. And, obviously, we'll talk to them, there will be that engagement with the Council, but ultimately-

Interviewer: That's the central partnership.

Kirsty: -that's going to be the central partnership once construction is off site and the landscape architects walk away and they've won their awards and whatever they're there to get from it. That's the bit that's going to be the hard work and the dedication and the relationship building and-

Interviewer: And so that's operational, you already said that, that's the people on the ground, but who else? That’s Rachel and-

Kirsty: Well it will be-

Interviewer: Or it's the education officer and-

Kirsty: Again, it's a bit fluid at the moment because, obviously, until that staffing structure really comes in. So, ultimately, it will be the Wetlands Manager who will be responsible, but I think there's going to be lots of interactions. So, ultimately, on site it's going to be the Wetlands Manager and the Operational Manager day to day: what's happening on site? Is there anything we need to know about? Having their gripes, doing whatever they need to do to get things-

Interviewer: Yes, going along.

Kirsty: -going along, but then from our point of view there's going to be the Education Team talking to the Education Team-

Interviewer: Yes, because you've got two established Education-

Kirsty: Two established Education Teams which will need to work together-

Interviewer: Yes, to prevent overlap but also to get-

Kirsty: Well cohesion. I mean, essentially what we're looking for is overlap. We're wanting LWT to be delivering at Walthamstow on our behalf, but we need to make sure that not only are they getting the chance to do all their wildlife stuff, but it's still fitting into our Ofwat targets and those key messages are still- aren't too watered down and the wildlife and pond dipping. You know, so it's about that engagement side of things. I suppose there's the ground maintenance, the statutory reservoir stuff, so there's going- and also the fisheries and the wetlands.

Interviewer: Yes. Okay.

Kirsty: Which, again, is a day to day site management, so that's going to be with the operations staff and-

Interviewer: Is there a Site Manager for the Academy?

Kirsty: Ah, yes, I totally forgot about the Academy. The Academy is run by our team, the Education Team.

Interviewer: It is, is it? Okay.

Kirsty: Yes, so that's run by our Education Team and that will- again, it's, at the moment, there, but, again, that will feed in to the wider LWT remit/how does that all gel? But I think that'll come as the Education Manager comes in and things start to shape.

Interviewer: Yes. Do you think it's worth me speaking to the Education Manager over the course of-

Kirsty: Yes, I mean you can have a-

Interviewer: -the project?

Kirsty: Yes, I mean, I'm just trying to think who would be- I mean, Will Barnard is the- he manages the Fishing Academy because it's quite a specific remit that the Fishing Academy has. It's working with very small groups of kids, essentially, with major difficulties or criminal records. Faith groups as well, we've had a lot of women's faith groups coming in and- little small groups coming in fishing-

Interviewer: How wonderful.

Kirsty: -so it's a very dynamic, bizarre little-

Interviewer: It's almost like niche offer that the Wetlands offers somehow.

Kirsty: Yes, and that will, hopefully, be more integrated but, again, I think we've kept it separate because we are running it at the moment and we see that integrating as London Wildlife Trust come on board, rather than... And, again, our Education Team, apart from- Will's been involved in the project and the design stage, and he did look after the fisheries until it went back into Operations. Our Education Team at the moment, apart from being aware that the project's happening and it's hearing me grumble and gripe on the phone, haven't been hugely engaged in the content-

Interviewer: No, of course.

Kirsty: -yet.

Interviewer: Yes, but they-

Kirsty: But they will.

Interviewer: But they will be. They will be. Well that's great, so it might be worth me having a conversation later on with Will.

Kirsty: Later on with Will or even Paul Hampton who's his manager, who's the overall- or it might even be both of them because Will will be able to tell you the fishing and the intricacies of his little angling Academy, which is very unique. And then Paul, obviously, oversees all the other education...

Interviewer: Right. Okay. That's very- that's really-

Kirsty: But I don't think they quite know what they're in for yet.

Interviewer: I'm sure they’re very excited.

Kirsty: Because I'd covered all of that. The headline stuff can be covered off by me and then, obviously, it's the nitty, gritty detail of how that-

Interviewer: Yes, how well that will run.

Kirsty: How well that will run and is properly integrated into the-

Interviewer: Yes. And, of course, the Education Officer isn't coming on board, really, until towards the end of Rachel's post, so-

Kirsty: Yes, there's a bit of a- I think, in hindsight, we would have liked to get the staff on sooner rather than later, but-

Interviewer: That's interesting. Are there lessons, do you think, from Woodberry? I mean, I know it's not the same scale, you don't have the same staffing.

Kirsty: There's lessons from Walthamstow.

Interviewer: Ah, okay. Already.

Kirsty: I think most of our lessons have probably come from Walthamstow. Things like staffing structure in earlier. I think that's my biggie now that we're there. There's a lot to develop and, actually, there's gaps in the programme. So if your contracts don't quite match up, you've got maintenance periods that aren't being covered by our Ground Maintenance but, also, aren't being covered by volunteer force on the ground.

So in hindsight, actually, would we have been better to not have held back on things or structure things slightly differently? But Woodberry, I have to say, went, touch wood, has been pretty plain sailing. But, again, we haven't got the complications at Woodberry. LWT got the HLF grant, so although we had a Steering Group, and the Manor House Development Trust, and Berkeley Homes who were putting in money to it and helped shape it, really, the day to day management was Thames Water, London Wildlife Trust. So, when it came to those decisions-

Interviewer: Just faster.

Kirsty: Faster, more efficient, even when you were sitting in a Steering Group, there wasn't the same political- lots of people wanting their own little bit of it. They were quite happy that as long as we were delivering the vision, the day to day running wasn't quite so- we just got on and dealt with it.

Interviewer: Do you think that's down to size or do you think that's just down to the other complexities around things like [RAMS or 01:13:02] Triple SI?

Kirsty: I think it's size and I think it's that long-term relationship we have with LWT. They were in our decision-making mode in that project, whereas, they're in a bit of a funny position with this. They're a delivery partner, they're an adviser but, ultimately, we don't really need to listen to them or the stakeholder, the partnership, the- so I think that has over occasionally been felt that they haven't- or they've felt that they haven't been listened to, even though they're acting in- so it's that relationship between you've got a contract so you deliver it and you're to deliver what we want-

Interviewer: Yes, okay.

Kirsty: -whereas, actually- so that complexity is quite an interesting dynamic. Whereas, I just see them as a stakeholder-

Interviewer: Yes, of course.

Kirsty: -I don't see them as a delivery partner because I'm not paying their contract, I'm just working with them to make it work. And, again, Woodberry is just very much working with them to make it work.

Interviewer: Yes, whereas, for them, with other stakeholders, they probably feel that it is more a contractual relationship-

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: -and there's the brief, go away and deliver it.

Kirsty: Deliver it.

Interviewer: Okay, yes. And, again, we come back to that original conversation about how, when you open up these spaces and it's a quite complex institutional funding structure, there are lots of power and political implications of that. And as you rightly said there's different agendas there that are being protected accordingly.

It's great. The lovely thing about having an informal one is that I can just let it roll and lots of things you've covered already which is brilliant. Let's just double check I've covered...

Would you say that there- I guess, I've got some questions here around if you feel that there are stakeholders- which stakeholders you think have been the most powerful in the decision-making process and which stakeholders you feel might have been missing from that conversation that you feel, maybe, in retrospect, could have been included in the process?

Kirsty: I suppose, the stakeholders we've got, I think, were the right ones round the table. I think possibly one that was missing was Lee Valley Regional Park Authority. They made the decision to not-

Interviewer: Not.

Kirsty: -be involved. However, I think they'll probably jump on the bandwagon. So the way that they worked, obviously, Lee Valley landscape partnership that we had was a huge, huge stakeholder group with lots and lots of people. So that still meets once a year as our- so they're our wider stakeholder group that we keep informed rather than-

Interviewer: Once a year.

Kirsty: So that's the wider Council group, Lee Valley Regional Park, everybody and their dog who's interested, essentially. So that's your- they're not the influencing group-

Interviewer: But they are-

Kirsty: -but they are-

Interviewer: -kept informed.

Kirsty: -kept informed and they have played a part somewhere along- and throwing their questions in. So we do keep them up to date.

Interviewer: What's their name again? What's their [unclear 01:16:57]? Lee-

Kirsty: I don't know what we really call them. It's a group that Rose manages. It's the wider Walthamstow-

Interviewer: Wider Walthamstow.

Kirsty: -Wetlands Steering Group.

Interviewer: Okay. So-

Kirsty: So they're the- yes, they'll keep informed the people who have an interest, either a political agenda, or a use, or would be interested to see how it fits within the Lee Valley and wider. I think we got the stakeholder group right, to a certain extent, with the key parties round there. I suppose, one of my things is we've ended up with landscape architects who have tried to drive the project, rather than the Steering Group driving the project. And I think that's still an issue with them somehow being allowed to comment on, and influence, documents coming forwards and influence design, rather than actually the Steering Group influencing design and I think we've possibly gone slightly wrong with that, but that's maybe my personal-

Interviewer: And do you think that's just the nature of those landscape architects or is that they have a background of that sort of thing?

Kirsty: I've never worked with them before. I wouldn't work with them again. I think they have their own agenda and, yes, I think that's been, probably, one of the really difficult things in the project is like, "This is our project". And I've never had a landscape architect come and try and argue regulations with me. So that's been quite-

Interviewer: Yes, an interesting tension point.

Kirsty: Tension point in the sense of if a regulation says this, then that's it, let's move on to the next bit and let's work on stuff that we can work on together, rather than- so, yes, our landscape architects have played, probably, a bigger part in the Steering Group and design. I know that they're paid to design, but trying to influence-

Interviewer: Wider strategies.

Kirsty: -wider strategy and design. Like, again, what came up recently was we have got different access points in the 25 year plan, and from Stephen's last report, the consultants came back with: and do you know we need to make use of the fact that we've got these really exciting new openings potentially coming up. And I was like, "Sorry, but these haven't been agreed by Thames Water". And they go, "Yes, but they're in the 25...". "Yes, they're in there, I'm quite happy that they're in there". I said, "I'll be open and honest that that's a discussion for the future. I'm not worried about... But today the answer is no". So, yes, that creates quite a tension across-

Interviewer: Yes, okay, and is there a push for some of those things from, maybe, community agendas that they're trying to ambassador, be ambassadors for, do you think, or..?

Kirsty: I haven't got the measure of them to tell you the truth. I don't know what their agenda is, possibly more work. I'm going to be really blatantly honest. I think it would make the project much better, exciting, bigger-

Interviewer: Yes. Whistles and such.

Kirsty: Yes. And it links into other strategic areas which would widen the project even more so, but, yes, I haven't worked in a project that's been so driven by the design team.

Interviewer: So you've had to be quite strong in terms of being clear what the remit is and what is doable?

Kirsty: I've had to be, yes, Mrs Bad Person at a lot of meetings and come down very strongly on the operational side, which isn't in my nature, but to the point where I've just had to blatantly put my foot down and throw my toys out the pram to make sure that things are taken into account.

But we still have things like non-native species turning up on site and turning up in planting schemes. So there's all of those little things, and then you get, "Well you signed off the spec". And I was like, "But we are paying you as a landscape architect to get the spec correct. I'm not a landscape architect, I can have a look at it, but also I notice what you've done is you've put them all in Latin, that's really helpful for me, isn't it? I'm not- I'm not a trained ecologist. I'm looking and going, "Oh that's a rose", but I'm not looking at whether it's a dog-rose or...

Interviewer: How frustrating.

Kirsty: So there's those little design elements that are- you think you're not being listened to.

Interviewer: Yes, which is a challenge in itself.

Kirsty: Which is a challenge in itself and then you've got the Council who even have even less of a knowledge, the roses knowledge of these ecological things or- we've had challenges on designs, they wanted to use steel walkways and very unfortunately my senior manager, who's now left, niece got burnt on a slide, got three degree burns on her hands, so we're really anti-steel and we're just like, "We don’t want steel walkways". And we spent three months fighting with the consultants who produced report after report after report to tell us why we had to use steel walkways. And we're like, "Just put wind walkways, that's what other nature reserves do, put plastic composite down".

Interviewer: That's very interesting. I don't understand the motivation for steel anyway because it's incompatible with the-

Kirsty: It's that-

Interviewer: Is it durability or..?

Kirsty: No, it was about the link between the industrial nature of the site-

Interviewer: I see.

Kirsty: -and the- so it was very landscape, very design driven.

Interviewer: Okay, so it's telling a story.

Kirsty: It's telling a story and we're like, "That story, as much as, actually, the historical story is very important to Thames, is really not fundamental to the fact that we don't want slippy steel".

Interviewer: Yes, there is a safety issue here.

Kirsty: There's a safety issue here, we don't- and then it was a bit like, yes, constant banging of heads, and then it was just like, "But we're a client", and then they'd say, "Well you're not the client, London Borough Waltham Forest is the client".

Interviewer: Which is where, again, this-

Kirsty: Clash and-

Interviewer: -complex stakeholder group-

Kirsty: Yes, and-

Interviewer: -composition and where the contract lies and where the power lies.

Kirsty: Power lies. And I think Rose's way of working with contractors is very stakeholder approached, so they're all part- the landscape architects are all part of the team and they're all- and then I've ended up coming down saying, "We're paying their- we're paying it, they do what we ask them to do, fundamentally". I said, "We can listen to them but we don't agree with it, it's within their remit to not do it". Maybe I've got most likely more black and white contract approach. Whereas, she's like, "Well we're paying them because of their expertise". It's like: that expertise might not be right or right for the partnership. So there's been quite a lot of tensions going forward, but-

Interviewer: Yes, and that, I guess, is inevitable with a project of this size, project of this complexity for all the reasons you've outlined.

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: So that's about- so that was a question about people there and then people missing and then how that's played out. Do you think- well, I mean, I guess it's a bit of an obvious question, but is there an aspiration from Thames Water that the opening up of the Wetlands affects people's relationship with water?

Kirsty: Yes, that's fundamental, the requirement of the project is that people will come on site and be engaged by that bit of water that they're seeing and understand why that bit of water's there, not only from the wildlife importance point of view but from the day to day turning on their taps, that has to be integral to-

Interviewer: Yes, so that-

Kirsty: -their experience.

Interviewer: -comes down to Stephen's role as well.

Kirsty: Yes, very much Stephen's role and the volunteers on site, and even down to those key messages of no swimming. "Why is there no swimming?". Being able to answer those questions through LWT.

Interviewer: Yes.

Kirsty: And I think that's going to be quite an organic- although a lot- well, Stephen's bit won't be organic but I think that role of LWT, and the volunteers, and the engagement officer will be quite organic, not- obviously, the education will be there, there'll be structured stuff, but some of it will be...

Interviewer: Yes. And what would you like to see out of that education centre? What would you like the core messages to be coming out of that education centre?

Kirsty: From Thames Water point of view?

Interviewer: Yes.

Kirsty: So that's very much what's- why the site's there in the first place, what the reservoirs are for, and then, I suppose, the overall human water cycle, so the water cycle including the waste water and clean water element of it. So the people have an understanding of rain falling from the sky, coming out their taps, and then there's the water efficiency messages and the bin it, don't block it messages.

But also, going forwards as our key messages change, working with LWT to do whatever's on the agenda at the time.

Interviewer: Yes, yes, okay. Does that in some way link back to- I mean, you've said it's very difficult to understand where the CSR agenda is going, both for the industry in terms of the introduction of competition as 2017, is it?

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: Yes. So, as a site it will have- it will be in a position to respond through your partnership with LWT about the sort of messages that then need to come through?

Kirsty: Yes, definitely, and I think that's going to be an ongoing process. We'll see that process and I think LWT see that process as a long- and, again, that's why the link between Thames and LWT are so crucial to making this work and putting the resources in as making sure that those messages and the longevity of the site is carried on. I mean, we've lost things like London Wetlands Centre. You wouldn't know now, really, apart from I've got a new project there that you will soon, you'll soon know, again. But, yes, I think we have learnt from other sites that we have, a lot smaller. Well, London Wetlands Centre is not small, is it, that's 200-

Interviewer: That's a huge site, yes

Kirsty: -[unclear 01:28:03] but we didn’t have the input, we didn't carry on with the input, therefore, we lost the- you wouldn't know it's a Thames Water site.

Interviewer: I didn't know it was a Thames Water site, yes.

Kirsty: So we're a corporate partner and that's where you'll see us, and if you delve into some interpretation then that's it, but that's on a 999 year lease or something like that, but it's-

Interviewer: Okay. Where is that? You want a very different relationship with- to be expressed to the public about land holding and land ownership and-

Kirsty: Yes, and I think that also comes with the investment that we've put in.

Interviewer: Yes, okay, yes.

Kirsty: £1.5- well, I think it's actually £1.84m plus goodness knows what else-

Interviewer: Yes. And your time.

Kirsty: -and the peripherals of that that we've had to spend on this project, but £1.8m committed to Heritage Lottery Fund. We need something out of it, it's unprecedented. Most of our CI projects on our own land holding have been £30,000. Then we did our 10 for 10 project where- which was our first big community investment project, but even that was, maybe, giving somebody £220,000 to leverage £1m. So I think that’s Woodberry Wetlands we gave £220,000 as, yes, leveraging funding from HLF and other things, but £1.5m from £220,000-

Interviewer: It's a massive step change, isn't it?

Kirsty: It's a huge step change and a huge commitment for the company, so, yes, our Chief Exec will be wanting to see something for his financial contribution to the project.

Interviewer: Yes, and that is around the things you were saying in terms of people's relationship with Thames Water.

Kirsty: Yes, people's relationship but also not- although we know that it's going to be a separate- Walthamstow Wetlands branding is making sure that it's very clear that it's still our site, and the people are coming on and they are learning about water and what we do as a business, has to be integrated within it. It can't be lost.

Interviewer: Yes. Whereas, you were saying in the London Wetland Centre, actually, that message has been lost.

Kirsty: That message has definitely been lost.

Interviewer: Yes. Okay. So that's a very different CI project, isn't it, and you were saying so now the effort will be to push that back to remind people of that ownership and that investment and, therefore, that return.

Kirsty: Yes, so the project we're doing with them will be looking at their theatre area which is very underutilised and that's going to be turned into classrooms-

Interviewer: Oh nice.

Kirsty: -and new toilets and- because they're really running out of spaces for schools. That whole courtyard area is going to be turned into experimental SuDS as well-

Interviewer: Brilliant.

Kirsty: -and then, obviously, again, allowing us to link in with their Education Team to try and influence their Education Team in the use of water. So I can't remember how much- I think we're giving them about £300,000 for that project.

Interviewer: When's that one kicking off?

Kirsty: It's just started, I'm actually meeting them tomorrow.

Interviewer: On your last day.

Kirsty: On my last day. Only because I want to go and have a nice wander round the Wetland Centre.

Interviewer: Hope you have weather like this.

Kirsty: So we did a 10 for 10 project with them a couple of years ago, which was about £200,000, which did their down the plughole exhibition and their pond zone with their interactive game. So this is the next phase, so, again it's working with them. We've got a very good relationship with Wildfowl Wetlands Trust, it's just we've lost the site input and so it's trying to build that back up again in a little bit more...

Interviewer: How do you think the Walthamstow Wetlands as a project, as a water utility led, effectively, and owned project, how do you think that's perceived in the wider water industry?

Kirsty: Industry. I think they're waiting with baited breath to see what it's like because a lot of the- so take Rutland. Rutland was designed with nature conservation, when it was built, with their sailing club. So a lot of reservoir sites already were designed with sailing club or nature club's vision. They already had their- it was designed alongside the Wildlife Trust. Essentially, what we're doing is retro fitting an operational site, a very large, urban site to open to the public with a huge remit. So, again, it's something I've spoken about a lot at conferences-

Interviewer: Have you?

Kirsty: -about the fact of updating them on where we are and we're actually hoping, I think our next time to host is 2017.

Interviewer: Okay. So-

Kirsty: So, my plan, when I come back from maternity, is we'll host October 2017, we'll host the CAR conference at Walthamstow.

Interviewer: Amazing. It would be amazing, wouldn't it-

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: -to showcase it and-

Kirsty: Showcase it and I think the-

Interviewer: -be honest about the challenges and [Crosstalk 01:33:18].

Kirsty: Yes, and I think the investment that we've put in is unprecedented within the- a lot of- the only place where you see investment like that is where a capital delivery project. So they'll be building a reservoir, they'll be building a pipeline route.

Interviewer: Yes, which of course-

Kirsty: -which is what we do as well-

Interviewer: -provides.

Kirsty: So if we were building a new reservoir, we'd be putting in nature reserves and it would all be part of that package, but to have a standalone community investment project is, yes.

Interviewer: And, as you say, to retro fit it is a whole new world of complexity.

Kirsty: Yes, no, definitely-

Interviewer: Than starting from the beginning and collaborating-

Kirsty: And designing it to be a multi-functional user space with a nature reserve over here, and your cycling route over here, and your sailing club over here, and never do they meet because you've designed it that way. We don't have that.

Interviewer: Yes, you don't have that luxury, so they have the luxury of removing some of those health and safety issues by the very function of zoning off, yes.

Kirsty: Yes, the quiet conservation bit to the...

Interviewer: Yes. And, of course, the user expectations are already then managed. Whereas, now you have established users.

Kirsty: And I think the uniqueness for us as well is it's going to be, what, Europe's largest urban nature reserve?

Interviewer: Yes. And so have you had- have you presented and had interest at international conferences around it?

Kirsty: Again, we haven't really pushed the international thing partly because we're so focused on trying to deliver it. I mean, Rachel's obviously starting to get- and I think, again, we're now, with Stephen on board, starting to have a look at what is our core audience. Ultimately, at the moment, although it's going to be Europe's largest urban nature reserve, who are our key stakeholders at the moment and is our target audience local, is it London based, is it- obviously for each partner it's slightly- but, ultimately, it's going to work its way out, rather than stand up and be a-

Interviewer: Immediately be a-

Kirsty: Immediate. An international site, which I don't think any of us can really- although it's a fantastic strapline and it's a really exciting prospect of where the site could be, I think a lot of it is about the local and London agenda.

Interviewer: Yes, okay.

Kirsty: And then how that fits into a more-

Interviewer: Sort of international.

Kirsty: Or Thames Valley/international.

Interviewer: That's brilliant. Do you think there are any disbenefits to the local communities of it opening up? Do you think there'll be any knock-on effects or has anybody highlighted anything that they're concerned about?

Kirsty: I suppose the concerns have been from existing user groups about the impact to their activity, so your fishing, your bird watching. There is a small bunch of houses down Coppermill's Lane who have the most beautiful view over number five where, I mean, to the point where they influence the type of fencing we put up. So, they're not particularly- but I mean I think the beauty of the site is we're not overlooked. We're this big swathe of land in the middle of it, so really we haven't come across people who are screaming and shouting about the disbenefits-

Interviewer: No, okay.

Kirsty: -of it.

Interviewer: So there's been no comment about, I don't know, affecting land prices or..?

Kirsty: I think that's going to-

Interviewer: That's perceived, is it?

Kirsty: That's positive.

Interviewer: Good. Okay.

Kirsty: I'm sure as we open up and the reality hits home, but I mean you've got things like Walthamstow marshes and things like that already open, Leigh Valley sites. I think one of our things is the fact that it's a staffed site has actually taken away a lot of those concerns. So Walthamstow marshes and down Coppermill's Lane there's continuous illegal raves and dumping and- it's not the nicest of- but we can actually say: we're opening it up but we're managing it.

Interviewer: Yes, okay.

Kirsty: And I think that's alleviated...

Interviewer: Concerns around- because I know one of the reservoirs, don't you have sometimes you have problems with some gangs in Tottenham?

Kirsty: Oh we- luckily- well they don't tend to come- the next reservoir up Banbury, we've got a travellers' site adjacent to it so we have problems with them, but that's not within the cartilage of Walthamstow. I mean, I think during the riots we had issues with- but generally the site is fairly secure.

Interviewer: And, so, it is because it's staffed and managed that it takes away some of these conflicts and tensions you're saying?

Kirsty: Yes, and I think if some of the stakeholders had their way and fences came down and it became an open parkland, then we'd be bringing in issues, but the point is we've been very strong and firm about fences still staying up and security still being met at the same level that will allow us to manage expectations, and access, and behaviours, and thresholds.

Interviewer: Yes.

Kirsty: Hopefully.

Interviewer: That's positive. I think they were all my benefits with it opening up. Yes, I suppose that's a really nice one to finish on is, I guess, who you think, who Thames Water thinks will benefit from Walthamstow Wetlands opening up?

Kirsty: I suppose from our point of view it's our customers. If anybody's going to benefit, our customers should benefit from the investment that we've put in, and-

Interviewer: Okay. But by being able to be a user?

Kirsty: User, yes.

Interviewer: Yes, okay.

Kirsty: And get to enjoy the land holding, the wildlife, the activities, the partnerships that we built up through the years. So, I mean, it's as basic as that and our customers are, essentially, the whole of the Thames Valley, at the moment, and, potentially, new customers.

Interviewer: Of course, 27.

Kirsty: 2017, so that, from Thames Water side, that's the-

Interviewer: Yes, so does it have- you have the whole- a customer base that is the whole of the Thames Valley, so does that come back to your original comment about issues around very local community benefits being the responsibility of the Council?

Kirsty: I don't think it's just the responsibility of the Council. I think they've, through the process, driven that agenda but, obviously, we've got community- we've got strategic Councils and Boroughs and trying to- we- our CR strategy trying to build in deprivation- areas of deprivation or where water usage is high. So we'll have areas within- very adjacent to Walthamstow as well that will be quite targeted, but that will come and go, depending on what the agenda is at the time as well. So it's still feeding in to our CR, wider CR objectives, but I think we've allowed the Council to drive that through the design process, because they're best placed to do it.

But once we're up and running on site, then those figures, and all the stuff that Rachel's doing, and the community engagement and the schools and, again, all the work that you're going to be doing as well, will start to feed into our wider CR objectives about- I'm not London benchmarking stuff, I'm not fully aware of all these- there's a big list of questions and all this, but we'll be able to feed in the stats to those things and have a better understanding of the work that we're doing in partnership.

Interviewer: Yes. And, for me, just looking at what the water industry is doing in terms of CSR, there seems to be an incredible focus for, I guess, obvious reasons at the moment, around affordability.

Kirsty: Yes.

Interviewer: And in terms of the population that are immediately around Walthamstow Wetlands, that probably is a key issue for them. So, do you think that this is- do you think that, in some way, the project links one to the other? Do you think there is a sense of expressing a new relationship with those customers?

Kirsty: I think Walthamstow will give us a platform to talk about some of these issues with our customers. There's a lot of stakeholder work on affordability but, obviously, Walthamstow at the moment is very regional, it's a little bit of our customer base. So we've got our own team who look at affordability and feed that in, but we do see Walthamstow and other sites acting as a platform to be able to discuss, consult-

Interviewer: Even host.

Kirsty: Host, yes, the- but until it's up and running, then it's a-

Interviewer: Difficult one to-

Kirsty: And, again, I think we've tried not to make it about the core business stuff, it's about enjoying the site, it's site use rather than the corporate messages rammed down your throat or trying to get loads and loads of information from our customers, because people will just be put off straightaway.

Interviewer: Yes, exactly. Yes, so if they felt all that information was somehow you were trying to- it was an information capture, it's a marketing exercise-

Kirsty: Marketing exercise or a political- we're not doing it for political gain or getting- yes, sucking out information or stuff from our customers, it will- we'll be able to use it as that, no doubt in the future, to a certain extent, but it needs to embed itself, it needs to settle down, it needs to have its own function, and we need to learn from that, and where opportunities come up, then I'm sure we'll grab them and use them, if it's appropriate.

Interviewer: Yes. Have your marketing team been involved in-

Kirsty: Marketing team?

Interviewer: Do you have a-

Kirsty: We don't have a marketing team.

Interviewer: Do you not have a marketing team?

Kirsty: No.

Interviewer: Oh my goodness, okay. So no communications team [Crosstalk 01:44:22].

Kirsty: We've got a Communications Team, but I suppose our team deal with that as well-

Interviewer: As well.

Kirsty: -as a crossover, so- and also, this is going to sound a bit bad, we tend to keep them away, like, the real- I suppose we have got corporate comms and the key messaging team, we tend to pull them in when facts and figures are needed.

Interviewer: Ah, yes, okay. Yes.

Kirsty: Partly because experience has said if you put the corporate comms team into that, they start annoying people and it turns into the corporate message. Where, actually, what you're trying to do is weave that corporate message into something that is not corporate. So we tend to bring them in later on in the process.

Interviewer: So where would you like to bring them on board so when Walthamstow is opened and is- do you want to do a soft launch and then you'll do a full launch, but-

Kirsty: They'll start-

Interviewer: -do we bring them in then or..?

Kirsty: They'll start to come in where there's gaps in information, so we'll bring in certain people from bin it don't block it or the water efficiency team to start filling up the facts and figures, and we'll start to bring in branding from a branding guideline point of view of how we use our logo, where it fits and figures. But, yes, we don't have a big team from that point of view, so the press team are, obviously, heavily involved in-

Interviewer: In promoting.

Kirsty: -in promoting the site, but I think the CR team, community investment team, we take that on as a- we've obviously got Stephen on board, curator on board to intertwine it. So it's really where there's gaps or we're not comfortable with the storyline quite going as we want.

Interviewer: Yes, at that point.

Kirsty: At that point we would bring them in.

Interviewer: For example, your team would communicate the opening? Your team would say to your customers: this is- we're so excited, we're working with- we're doing the [Crosstalk 01:46:28]-

Kirsty: Yes, yes, no-

Interviewer: -you can come along now?

Kirsty: Yes, no, definitely. I mean, I think a lot of that will be, again, down to the delivery partner to- but, yes, the launch itself will be the three stakeholders working out what we're going to do and how it's going to look, and working together as a team to do it but, yes, fundamentally it'll be me.

Interviewer: In 11 months' time.

Kirsty: In 11 months' time, yes.

Interviewer: That's brilliant. They were all my questions.

Kirsty: That's okay.

Interviewer: Is there anything else that you wanted to talk about?

Kirsty: No, I don't think so.

Interviewer: You probably feel-

Kirsty: I think I've told you everything there is to-

Interviewer: Yes. No, [imagine 01:47:08]. Let me...
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