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1. Non-technical summary

Please provide below a project summary written in non-technical language. The summary may be used by us to publicise your work and should explain the aims and findings of the project. [Max 250 words]

The project examined environmental governance of the Thames between 1960 and 2010. It aimed to provide a historical account of changing modes of public participation and political legitimacy, identifying connections between forms of governance and opportunities for environmental citizenship.

Using documentary evidence and discussions with Thames stakeholders, research focused on two issues. Firstly, what were the democratic and environmental consequences of the shift since the 1960s away from formal representation of interests on public boards for water and port services towards professionalised management with obligations to consult stakeholders? Secondly, what was the significance of governance changes for London’s relationship with other
The researchers found no inherent link between formal representation and effective guardianship of the river environment. Within an expanded regulatory framework, stakeholder engagement allows for broader effective participation in environmental governance than earlier representative ‘closed shops’. Civil society organisations have been crucial to changing expectations for both river environments and active consultation. Nevertheless, a hierarchy of interests remains. The dominant economic functions of the river and riverside continue to shape outcomes; there are still significant gaps between local concerns and planning priorities.

A decline in London’s political status and direct control over river functions has been accompanied by the city's increased access to resources. Despite the Greater London Council's resistance to water reorganisation in 1973, for example, river-basin management allowed key decisions about resource allocation to be made at regional level, in place of long-standing conflicts between local authorities over London’s growing water needs.

2. Project overview

a) Objectives
Please state the aims and objectives of your project as outlined in your proposal to us. [Max 200 words]

1. To provide an account of changing modes of public participation and political legitimacy in the environmental governance of the River Thames since 1960, identifying connections between forms of governance and opportunities for environmental citizenship.

2. To assess the impacts of the shift to river-basin management on the political and economic dominance of London, on opportunities for participation along the river, and on the status of urban governance.

3. To examine the political role of communities in the lower Thames region in the light of the concentration of the port downstream and rising environmental concerns.

4. To provide a historically informed assessment of the implications for environmental citizenship of the current emphasis on stakeholder consultation and of the rising importance of technical expertise as a basis for legitimacy.

5. To clarify, for the public and stakeholders, the changing governance structure and history of interest group involvement in the environmental management of the tidal river and its port since 1960.

b) Project Changes
Please describe any changes made to the original aims and objectives, and confirm that these were agreed with us. Please also detail any changes to the grant holder's institutional affiliation, project staffing or funding. [Max 200 words]

There was no change in the project research, though cost savings resulted in an overall underspend on the budgeted Directly Incurred Costs. Most of this underspend was accounted for by lower travel costs than anticipated. With the exception of that to East Sussex Record Office, which was closed for a move, all of the proposed visits to archives listed in the grant application were undertaken. The archival research trips outside London generated a great deal of material, and the use of the digital camera reduced the length of time needed for documentary recording.
This resulted in lower costs since fewer days were devoted to each archive than had been estimated at the outset. No claims were made against the budget for London research trips to the National Archives, central London Archives and Colindale, while visits to the Bedfordshire & Luton Archives were not funded from the grant. The number of those selected to participate in the two workshops and the conference was lower than the projected maximum and some speakers did not claim for refund of their travel costs, so cost reductions were achieved here.

c) Methodology
Please describe the methodology that you employed in the project. Please also note any ethical issues that arose during the course of the work, the effects of this and any action taken. [Max 500 words]

The project used four complementary methodological approaches:

1. **Identification and mapping of the responsibilities and interests** of the wide range of organisations and institutions concerned with the environmental governance of the Thames in this period, whether as regulators or stakeholders. This was informed by research in archival sources, as well as by searches of official publications, the internet and secondary literature. Also important here were information provided in oral history interviews conducted prior to the project (http://www2.gre.ac.uk/about/schools/gmi/research/case-studies/thames-governance) and contacts developed with environmental groups and governance bodies.

2. **Documentary research using traditional historical approaches** focussed on four themes: ‘Representation’ in the governance of the port and river; London and its ‘ecological hinterland’; Watershed democracy? London and the Thames region; The Thames, stakeholders and democracy.

The main collections consulted related to: central government departments and bodies such as the Nature Conservancy Council (The National Archives); the London County Council and Greater London Council (GLC) (London Metropolitan Archives); the Port of London Authority (PLA) (Museum of London Docklands: MoLD); local government and river authorities across the Thames region/river basin (Berkshire Record Office, Bedfordshire and Luton Archives and Records Service, Essex Record Office, Kent History & Library Centre, Gloucestershire Archives, Surrey History Centre, Oxfordshire History Centre, Wiltshire & Swindon History Centre); campaign groups (e.g. London Rivers Association, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Campaign for Rural Essex at MoLD, RSPB Archive at Sandy, Essex Record Office).

3. **Discussion** with invited representatives of stakeholder campaign groups and governance organisations.

The first of two workshops explored the practical experience of environmental stakeholder groups in seeking to influence decision-making for the River Thames and Thames region. A group of representatives of seven campaigning organisations connected to the Thames, its tributaries or the river basin attended by invitation. The second workshop, operating under the Chatham House Rule, considered the reaction of governance organisations to obligations to engage with campaign groups. Those participating in this half-day ‘conversation’ represented five institutions connected to the river and river basin. A report of each workshop was circulated for comments or correction to participants prior to publication on the Greenwich Maritime Institute Research website.

Half of the fifty individuals who attended the project’s Final Conference, *Running the River: How the Past Informs the Present*, were stakeholders.

4. **Observer participation** in events or briefings hosted by governmental and stakeholder organisations to provide insights into current concerns and approaches. These organisations included the Environment Agency’s Thames River Basin Liaison Panel (which Taylor has attended as an observer during the project), Thames Estuary Partnership, PLA, Marine Management Organisation and Thames Water.

This research is being used in academic articles to make new connections between urban history and environmental history, to further our understanding of the localised implications of the emergence of river-basin management, and to trace shifts in participatory culture in the
environmental management of the Thames and its catchment.

d) Project Findings

Please summarise the findings of the project, referring where appropriate to outputs recorded on the ESRC website. Any future research plans should also be identified. [Max 500 words]

1. Stakeholders, political legitimacy, and democracy (Objectives 1, 4, 5)

- Formal representation of competing interests and the public was a key basis for political legitimacy in the running of water supply, sewerage and ports in London and elsewhere at the start of this period. The late 1960s saw a departure from statutory representation, first in the port, then in water services.

- There was no necessary correlation between representation on Thames governance bodies and effective guardianship of the river environment. The same ‘representative’ regimes oversaw both the post-war degradation of the river and its 1960s and ‘70s clean-up.

- This period witnessed both the rising influence of environmental NGOs and river authorities’ employment of in-house environmental expertise within the expanded regulatory framework that accompanied water privatisation and EU Directives. In this context, the recent focus on stakeholder engagement allows for more effective dialogue with communities and interests than the ‘representative’ closed shops of earlier years.

- The governance reforms of the 1960s to 1980s (including privatisation in 1989) reshaped time-honoured avenues for political action, but did not create 'post political' river basins. Despite the rise of professional expertise, civil society organisations have been crucial to changing popular and official expectations for river environments. This is true of both the era of 'big local government' and of 'the decline of urban governance'. The GLC's embrace of urban conservation promoted by the London Wildlife Trust and others in the 1980s led to revaluation of the riverside as an ecological space. Since then, urban ecology has gained increasing influence in river-related policies.

- There remain significant gaps between local concerns and river-basin planning priorities, despite Water Framework Directive obligations for community engagement (2000). Defra's current 'catchment-based approach' is one attempt to address this difficulty in response to local river action groups emerging in recent years.

- The dominant economic functions of the river and riverside still shape hierarchies between different interests. The rise of the recreational river in London was possible only with the port's move downstream. Riverside property development remains a major source of conflict.

2. London and environmental governance (Objectives 2, 3)

- Long-standing tensions between London and lower river communities intensified in the 1960s and ‘70s. PLA conservancy powers were extended downstream and the new GLC, with responsibility for refuse disposal and sewerage, increased pressure for estuarial land reclamation. GLC claims for democratic representativeness were at odds with its approach to developments beyond its boundaries. Like the PLA’s Maplin seaport, the GLC’s 1970s plans for waste disposal beside the Medway were dropped for financial reasons, not because of the local opposition.

- London-based institutions gained political status from control of environmental functions, but urban institutions could hamper urban expansion. Though the GLC opposed the creation of a regional water authority in 1973, river-basin management increased London’s access to resources across the region. The 'Groundwater Scheme' rolled out by Thames Water Authority in the 1970s fulfilled nineteenth-century aspirations to abstract groundwater from the upper Thames-region for London.
e) Contributions to wider ESRC initiatives (eg Research Programmes or Networks)
If your project was part of a wider ESRC initiative, please describe your contributions to the initiative’s objectives and activities and note any effect on your project resulting from participation. [Max. 200 words]

n/a

3. Early and anticipated impacts

a) Summary of Impacts to date
Please summarise any impacts of the project to date, referring where appropriate to associated outputs recorded on the Research Outcomes System (ROS). This should include both scientific impacts (relevant to the academic community) and economic and societal impacts (relevant to broader society). The impact can be relevant to any organisation, community or individual. [Max. 400 words]

1. Academic impact
Papers presented: Localism: Widening Horizons for Policy and Practice, Univ. of Greenwich (UoG) workshop (09/2011); Urban History Group conference The Living and Liveable City, Oxford (04/2012); Communities, Cohesion and Social Stability conference, Univ. of Bangor (09/2012); Rivers, Cities, Historical Interactions conference, Rachel Carson Center, Munich (02/2013); British Commission for Maritime History Seminar, King’s College London (02/2013); Running the River: How the Past Informs the Present conference, UoG (07/2013).

2. Stakeholder impact
Two key organisations benefited directly:
- Museum of London Docklands. Taylor produced for MoLD administrative histories of some key organisations. Such support for cataloguing promoted access to an archive much used by family and local historians. The team gave a presentation alongside MoLD’s archivist publicising their river-related collections (Archives and Artefacts Study Network conference, 03/2013).

- Environment Agency (EA) staff took a keen interest in the research, attending events in 2012 and 2013. Their River Basin Officer commented: ‘[i]t is a direct link from your work to the EA and River Basin Planning via the Thames … Panel‘ (which Taylor attended as an observer). Taylor also aided the EA’s promotion of their ‘Challenges and Choices’ consultation within academia, and is on a steering group for an EA student workshop (01/2014).

The Project has provided fora for communication between stakeholders:
- Fifty participants (twenty-five from stakeholder organisations) attended the project final conference (07/2013). (http://www2.gre.ac.uk/about/schools/gmi/about/news/gm/running-the-river-how-the-past-informs-the-present-conference-report).

Interaction between stakeholders and the researchers was facilitated by a dedicated email...
address (runningtheriverthames@gre.ac.uk) to disseminate project newsletters and reports (also available online), and through Twitter (@ThamesGov).

3. Wider public impact

This research has met a public demand for information on Thames management:

- The on-line **River Thames Research Guide**, active shortly, is the project's main contribution to Objective 5. This provides information on the river's management (1960-2013), stakeholders and archival, bibliographical and media resources.

- A 'Thames Governance Guide' assisted the think-tank Demos in their 'Making More of the Thames' seminars (Centre for London: 2011). A similar guide was supplied for Thamesbank's Defra meeting with Richard Benyon MP (07/2013).

- Presentations. Royal Museums Greenwich Lecture (06/2012); posters for campaign group (at 'Made in Greenwich', 07/2012); Docklands History Group (11/2012); Public History Seminar, UoG (12/2012); GMI Public Research Seminar (04/2013).

b) Anticipated/Potential Future Impacts

Please outline any anticipated or potential impacts (scientific or economic and societal) that you believe your project might have in future. [Max. 200 words]

**Future dissemination activities:**

- The team will monitor the **River Thames Research Guide** usage and feedback over the next 12 months.


- Greenwich Industrial History Society (Talk: 07/2014).

- Taylor will sit on a steering group for (and present at) an EA student workshop (01/2014).

**Article/Chapter Plans**


2. Taylor, 'Public Corporations to Public Relations? Environmental citizenship and the River Thames, 1900-2013.' (Submission to Urban History: 01/2014).


5. Taylor, 'Water and its Meanings in the Capital in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries'. Chapter in proposed volume edited by Bill Luckin and Peter Thorsheim (2014).


You will be asked to complete an ESRC Impact Report 12 months after the end date of your award. The Impact Report will ask for details of any impacts that have arisen since the completion of the End of Award Report.

4. Declarations

Please ensure that sections A, B and C below are completed and signed by the appropriate individuals. The End of Award Report will not be accepted unless all sections are signed. Please note hard copies are **not** required; electronic signatures are accepted and should be used.
A: To be completed by Grant Holder

Please read the following statements. Tick one statement under ii) and iii), then sign with an electronic signature at the end of the section (this should be an image of your actual signature).

i) The Project

| This Report is an accurate overview of the project, its findings and impacts. All co-investigators named in the proposal to ESRC or appointed subsequently have seen and approved the Report. | ✓ |

ii) Submissions to the Research Outcomes System (ROS)

| Output and impact information has been submitted to the Research Outcomes System. Details of any future outputs and impacts will be submitted as soon as they become available. | ✓ |
| or This grant has not yet produced any outputs or impacts. Details of any future outputs and impacts will be submitted to the Research Outcomes System as soon as they become available. | 

iii) Submission of Data

| Data arising from this grant have been offered for deposit with the UK Data Service. | 
| or Data that were anticipated in the grant proposal have not been produced and the UK Data Service has been notified. | 
| or No datasets were proposed or produced from this grant. | ✓ |

Signature: [Signature Image]
Name: Professor Sarah Palmer Date: 29/10/2013

B: To be completed by Head of Department, School or Faculty

Please read the statement below then sign with an electronic signature to confirm your agreement.

This Report is an accurate overview of the project, its findings and impacts.

Signature: [Signature Image]
Name: Professor Christopher Bellamy Position: Director Greenwich Maritime Institute Date: 29/10/2013