Interviewer: Good afternoon. There's been a lot of discussion recently about what lies in store in terms of the preservation of old buildings and monuments. Today we welcome to the studio two conservationists, Bob Smith and Carrie Westwood, who are both involved in looking after places like these. Bob, what do you think is the best way of going about the preservation of our heritage buildings so that they don't suffer unduly from the rising numbers of tourists visiting them?

Bob: Well, one of the ways is to build a visitor centre and there are certainly quite a few of these in the pipeline at the moment. Architects seem to enjoy the challenge they represent. I suppose a good example of the kind of thing I'm talking about is the architectural design for the tourist centre for one of Britain's most prestigious ancient monuments - Stonehenge, which is a collection of very old, prehistoric standing stones. As you can imagine, this particular development didn't have too many problems getting financial backing and it seems to have been well received, but the debate over what exactly these visitor centres should offer people thunders on. And most people start to ask themselves ‘Who is it for? How accessible should it be?’ Will it simply encourage even more visitors?’ and so on.

Interviewer: Carrie?

Carrie: Indeed. Personally, I feel we should do something quite dramatic, like forget the whole thing, and close the existing visitor facilities at this site and monuments like it, and remove references to anything famous on the site, like the standing stones. Then it would be more like a similar monument at Avebury, not far from Stonehenge. There's no huge visitor centre there. People can come and go as they wish. Parking’s free and there are no admission charges either. In other words, they’ve left the place alone for anyone who happens to come along to discover it for the first time, as it were.

Bob: Great plan, Carrie, but totally unrealistic, and Carrie knows that only too well. That's because the tourist industry is an invaluable revenue earner, so there's no way that's ever going to happen in places already inundated with tourists. With sites like these everyone's well aware from very early on that some kind of money-spinning centre is on the cards. The point is that Stonehenge is one of those sites that just has to be visited and there's no way you're going to get rid of tourists. Petra in Jordan is another similar site. The rose-red city is one of the world's most alluring and magical tourist attractions.

Carrie: It certainly is, and so, of course, is Stonehenge. But apart from being a 'must' for travellers, there are so many other similarities between the two sites. One of the most significant, in my opinion, is that they could both be overwhelmed by visitors if we're not careful. There's a visitor centre at Petra, too. The project's been quite controversial but what they've tried to do, or so I'm told, is make it as unobtrusive as possible. Apparently it doesn't dominate the entrance to Petra and it leads the masses of visitors gently in and out of the site without damaging it, which can only be a good thing.

Bob: I agree that not allowing the visitors' facilities to take centre stage is important. But what appeals to me most about that particular centre is that it offers visitors not simply basic facilities, but a more in-depth look at an architectural site. If you ask me, too many tourists arrive at a place of interest, pay their sometimes exorbitant entrance fee, then make a dash for the main attractions. They often miss out on the carefully thought-out displays designed to give them an idea of why the place was built, what role it had in history, what kind of people lived there, that kind of thing.

Carrie: Well, I do hope it succeeds in getting that message across to visitors. But from what I've read, the aim seems to be to maintain the aura of Petra as a lost city, a place to be discovered. I think Stonehenge should be treated like this as well and all the people I’ve talked to certainly feel that sites like these should reveal their secrets slowly, so that you never know what's around the corner. If they achieve that in Petra, despite all the publicity, and ensure that the numerous tourists don't damage it, it'll be a resounding success.
Bob: Absolutely. And building a visitor centre is one way of ensuring that these places do survive intact and are actually protected and in the long run, it's up to us to make sure that this happens.

Interviewer: Bob, Carrie, thanks for sharing your views with us …
Interviewer: Jed Stone’s best known now for his talents as a garden designer – but he and his wife Helena ran a highly successful jewellery business in the nineteen nineties, which brought them fame and high living. Then they lost it all and, some years later, bought a derelict house which they renovated and now together they’ve created a garden. They join me in the studio today. You do seem to do most things in partnership, like the jewellery business, but using Jed’s name. Why’s that? Helena?

Helena: Well, this is a bit of a bone of contention, actually. We have a friend in PR who said, ‘You have a great name, Jed Stone. People would pay a fortune for such a good name’. But, sadly, at the time, it never crossed my mind that I wouldn’t get the credit for what we do, and that does get to me sometimes, but there again, I’m very bad at putting myself forward. People see Jed as a figurehead, which is fine, actually, because I don’t enjoy being recognised or get any thrill out of that, whereas Jed loves it.

Interviewer: Is that right, Jed?

Jed: Obviously, I’d love to say, ‘No, I don’t,’ but yeah, I do. Even as a child, I thought it must be marvellous to walk down a street and have people know who you were. Ironically, that’s the worst of it now. It would be nice just to go and buy a paper without somebody saying something. But I suppose I do like being a public figure. It gives me a sense that I’ve done something people appreciate. It doesn’t stop me doing anything, but it does modify how I do it.

Interviewer: But Helena, you did appear on our television screens briefly as a presenter on ‘The Travel Show’. That must have been a dream job, travelling around the world?

Helena: Actually, I thought I was being heroic taking that job. I’d actually rather have gone down a coal mine. It was ironic really, because Jed adores travelling, whilst I hate it. The timing was critical though; I mean, we were living in this derelict house. We’d knocked huge holes in the walls to make windows and we could hardly afford to get the job finished and I wanted to be there when it was done. So I genuinely didn’t want to do the job they were offering, but I felt I had no choice because, apart from anything else, it would provide us with a reasonable income.

Interviewer: So what about this jewel garden? Did you have a clear idea of what you wanted to do when you bought the house?

Jed: Not at all. In fact, we were provoked into action. I was giving a lecture on gardening and I was including some snaps of our own wilderness to show what certain plants looked like. But these photos hadn’t loaded onto my laptop properly, and you couldn’t see a thing. So I started to make it all up – describing this jewel garden with magical colours – it came straight out of my imagination, it hadn’t been a long-term plan or anything. Anyway, as soon as I’d finished, these journalists came rushing up saying, ‘We must come and take pictures of your jewel garden.’ And I heard myself replying, ‘Fine, but come when the colours are good, don’t come now.’ To cut a long story short, we had to make the jewel garden before they came, and actually, we did ninety per cent of the work that summer. That was our incentive!

Interviewer: And why did you call it a ‘jewel garden’?

Jed: Having read about the disasters with the jewellery business, one would have thought you wouldn’t want the word ‘jewel’ in your house at all.

Helena: Well, I like to work on projects and if you have a project where you’re thinking only of jewel colours then that starts to limit you, and design is all about reduction. Really it was just a good, positive way of tackling what plants we were putting in, and the way we were going to design the garden, wasn’t it, Jed?

Jed: Yeah. But for me it was also partly a metaphor, it’s making something worthwhile out of a failure. We did spend years doing the jewellery and it wasn’t all disastrous; there were good things about it too and we wanted to salvage them and treasure them. It seemed a waste not to take that bit of our lives and to somehow incorporate it into our new design venture – to take the bad experience and use it in a creative way.

Interviewer: Jed and Helena, thank you for telling us about it today.