



Henry Edwards-Wood
Long Live Southbank
57 Poland Street
London W1F 7NW

Alan Bishop
Southbank Centre
Belvedere Road
London SE1 8XX

8th October 2013

Dear Alan,

Your letter dated 1st October continues to misrepresent the events of the Open Space forum and the views and actions of Long Live Southbank.

Regardless of the comments of any reporter, the prospect of crowdfunding was not proposed by an Undercroft user at the Open Forum. We spoke to the individual who made the proposal and he himself was quick to confirm this.

As far as we are aware, the idea of crowdfunding was first proposed – at a meeting on the 26th of April – by a member of the Central St Martins team employed by the Southbank Centre to facilitate communications between Undercroft users and SBC. At this time, Mike McCart made it clear that he viewed the proposals as unfeasible. Five months later and significantly closer to funding deadlines we do not see how such a proposition can have become more realistic.

Irrespective of when or by whom the idea of crowdfunding was proposed, it remains the position of LLSB that it would be inappropriate to commit to a funding project which is conditional on accepting the concept of a replacement space or which places the burden of funding SBC's development proposals on the users of the Undercroft.

LLSB remains committed to the preservation of the Undercroft. This was the position of the majority of attendees at the Open Space forum and yet preservation isn't mentioned anywhere in your emails summarising the event. This position is backed by overwhelming public support, as evidenced by a petition of over 63,000 signatories against relocation and by more than 65,000 individuals signing up for Long Live Southbank membership. Far from approaching negotiations in bad faith, we continue to welcome the prospect of an opportunity to discuss any alternatives to SBC's current proposals which make preservation a priority.

The issues boil down to these:

1. We need to understand the funding gap that you assert would be plugged by use of the

Undercroft (you say £17m as I understand it).

2. What assumptions is that figure based on?
3. What alternative configurations for the Festival Wing and/or other sources of revenue/capital have been looked at so as to avoid or reduce that cost gap?

Failing transparency on these issues, references to crowdfunding and the necessity of the Hungerford Bridge plans are surely wide of the mark?

Regards,

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

Henry Edwards-Wood

On behalf of the Long Live Southbank members and supporters