



Henry Edwards-Wood
Long Live Southbank
2nd Floor, 57 Poland Street
London W1F 7NW

Jude Kelly
Southbank Centre
Belvedere Road
London SE1 8XX

25th July 2013

Dear Jude,

Thank you for your letter of 19th July. I would like to take the opportunity to address and clarify each of the items you have raised.

1. "Previous position"

There is no 'previous position'. The position to which over 26,000 people have registered as members, over 59,000 have signed a petition and over 12,000 individually objected to Festival Wing plans – is for the preservation of the undercroft in its current form – and we have a duty of responsibility to honour our first principle. You are very much aware of this and it is unclear why you are suggesting that we have moved from anything but our first principle, and we ask you to recognise there has been no change in our position.

2. Workshop consultation

This event is being billed by you as a 'Community Meeting' for 150-250 people.

Despite being very clear about why we would need to be part of the process of any said workshop, you have repeatedly chosen to ignore our request and we have seen nothing of the proposed content, scheme options or the key aims, and cannot commit to something we have not been furnished any information on.

Despite no consultation with us regarding progress or the intended process following our meeting of July 4th, on July 11th you publically announced and invited the South Bank Forum audience to a 'community meeting' and emailed us on the 15th July at 14:36 asking us to confirm attendance by 16:00 stating; "In order to get the invitation out, and give

people enough notice for the weekends of 27-28 July or 3-4 August, we really must send it out by close of play today. We can add more people as we go along, of course – I think numbers invited will be around 250 people”.

This is not a reasonable request.

3. “already agreed” to participate in workshop

The numbered items you have quoted in my letter dated 28th June was in reference to discussion at the meeting of the 4th July only, and not in way relating to the workshop – as the workshop had not been suggested anytime before the 4th July.

4. Meeting Minutes

Your letter contains quotes from the minutes of the meeting. As you are well aware you initiated the discussion stating you felt there would be benefit to off-record dialogue. You raised the idea of a workshop for the first time as part of the off record discussion.

We have made no formal agreement to participate in a workshop while not in receipt of any information as to what said workshop would be.

5. Alternative proposal with Winstan Whitter

As you are aware, Winstan was asked to present his alternative design on the 13th May despite the Southbank Centre having already submitted the planning application to Lambeth Council the previous week. No Southbank Centre representative present at the meeting relayed the information that the plans had been submitted, and Winstan himself was unaware of this vital piece of information until a member of the LLSB committee asked for an answer on whether the alternative designs presented by him were even possible given that the application was now live on Lambeth’s website. Mike McCart had to be pushed for an answer and it was clear these alternate designs did not even have a remote possibility of being implemented.

Simon Hughes MP in his summary at the Southbank Forum also stated that the “win, win” would be that the Undercroft was retained while the Festival Wing also got its new spaces.

We have made it clear in our numerous letters to you, Alan Bishop and the Board of Governors, that ‘We are committed to a sincere and mature consultation process’.

Long Live Southbank’s entirely reasonable stance is that, given the enormous amount of objection to and concern about any loss of the undercroft and associated relocation of its uses, the starting point for the Southbank Centre now in its scheme review has to be a proper and rigorous consideration of what schemes can be devised by the architects which retain the undercroft whilst achieving Southbank Centre’s other objectives. This has not been done at all yet and certainly no plans or supporting financial information is in the public domain. We simply do not believe that a solution is not possible and it is confusing to

the public and a waste of everybody's time and resources for the Southbank Centre instead merely to seek hold a workshop into as yet undefined alternative schemes that would still entail the loss of the undercroft when the clear message that the Southbank Centre has surely received over recent months is that its case for infilling the undercroft with commercial uses (so as to raise funds for its wider Festival Wing project) (1) has not been made and (2) is regarded in any event as entailing an unacceptable trade-off.

Rather than a wide-ranging workshop, the first step towards Southbank Centre arriving at a scheme that may achieve consensus is for there finally to be a proper examination of the options for achieving a scheme that retains the undercroft and its uses – whilst achieving Southbank Centre's other objectives.

Kind regards,

Henry

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Henry Edwards-Wood', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Henry Edwards-Wood

On behalf of the Long Live Southbank members and supporters