



TITLE:	Lost Effra
LOCATION:	The catchment of river Effra that runs through South London
ORGANISATIONS INVOLVED:	Wildlife Trust London manages the project. Initial funding provided by Defra and the Carnegie Trust; Ongoing support from Thames Water, the GLA and Lambeth Council; Plus funding from the Mace Foundation; Significant involvement from local communities and stakeholders
TIME FRAME:	2013 - ongoing
TARGET POPULATION:	The local community
DRIVERS:	The presence of the Effra, one of London's lost rivers, in the sewers beneath the area increases its vulnerability to flooding in times of heavy rainfall, as has been seen in the area in recent years. The project involves removing concrete and tarmac and creating new green spaces that manage rainwater more sustainably, thus helping to reduce the area's vulnerability to flooding.
AUTHOR:	Emma Jones, CAG Consultants LLP
CONTACT DETAILS:	ej@cagconsult.co.uk , T: 07967 325782
WATEF MEMBER:	Yes

What were the aims?

- The aim of the project is to make London more resilient to extreme weather whilst supporting London's biodiversity and empowering people to create and maintain their own urban greenspaces. Communities are central to the project and all schemes are developed, delivered and maintained in close partnerships with local people. Through raising awareness of the need for natural flood risk management and giving people the skills and knowledge to create their own sustainable drainage features on a household scale, we can help local communities become more resilient to urban flooding.

What was the process?

- Following detailed scoping a detailed strategy document was produced "A New Way to Manage Water" is available [here](#).
- Worked with communities in Herne Hill and Brixton taking up hard paving and creating new living landscapes e.g. green roofs, rain garden – resulting in areas more resilient to environmental changes
- Practical creation of SuDS with community partners, such as delivering school visits, running guided walks, holding community planting days and writing community based publications. Following projects created:
 - **Cressingham Rain Gardens, SW2.**
 - **Depaving at Rosendale Allotments, SE24.**
 - **Green roof workshops at Sydenham Hill Wood, SE26.**



- **Living with Rainwater, a community guide to creating urban greenspaces for environmental resilience.** The Lost Effra's introductory guide can be accessed at <http://issuu.com/londonwildlifetrust/docs/living-with-rainwater>.

What were the outcomes?

The project has helped to reduce flood risk in the local area, 10 new green spaces have been created and 550 sq m of new urban wildlife habitat. 3,000 people engaged in project area has increased awareness of local flood risk and SUDs. 55 local people have attended SUDs workshops.

LESSONS LEARNED

1. **Importance of community involvement and buy-in for scheme longevity** : engaging and working with local people has resulted in multi-functional greenspaces which create resilience against flooding and which people wish to enjoy, maintain and support – long term commitment.
2. Through listening to local priorities, schemes can be designed to incorporate both sustainable drainage features as well as greenspaces that communities' desire.



Community volunteers at rain garden planting day at Cressingham Gardens (April 2015)

<http://www.wildlondon.org.uk/lost-effra>

Helen Spring, Lost Effra Project Coordinator - hspring@wildlondon.org.uk.



TITLE: Waterless Urinal Failure

LOCATION: UCL, London

ORGANISATIONS INVOLVED: UCL

TIME FRAME: 2014-15

TARGET POPULATION: University building, several hundred men.

DRIVERS – WHY?: Waterless urinals installed in men’s toilets as part of a renovation of all toilets in the building. Driver was to save water to improve the environmental performance of the department and demonstrate the adoption of ecological technologies. The department has consistently placed won or placed highly in the annual ‘Green UCL’ awards for environmental activities and wanted to maintain this position as an institutional leader. The toilet upgrade provided additional toilets for men and women, to meet increasing demand in the building due to growth in student and staff numbers at UCL.

AUTHOR (SUBMITTER): Sarah Bell

CONTACT DETAILS: s.bell@ucl.ac.uk

WATEF MEMBER (YES)

- ***What were the aims***

To improve environmental performance of the department.

To demonstrate innovation in environmental technologies.

To reduce water consumption.

- ***What was the process***

The department green group identified water efficiency as a key target to improve environmental performance. UCL Estates appointed a contractor to undertake a major renovation of the toilets in the building, based on the green group specification. This included the use of waterless urinals in the men’s toilets, located in the basement and on the top floor of the building.

- ***What were the outcomes – indicators of success or failure – what did you learn?***

The outcome was complete failure of the urinals, resulting in a very bad smell in the surrounding area. This led to continuing complaints from users of the toilet and the building, including women who were impacted by the smell even though they didn’t use the toilets. The final outcome was removal of the waterless urinals and replacement with water efficient versions. The inappropriate installation of waterless urinals in a busy toilet in the basement, with poor ventilation, means that it is unlikely that any waterless urinals will be installed at UCL in the foreseeable future.

- ***Motivations to learn***

It is important for management and users who are motivated to improve environmental performance to work closely with technical contractors and experts in technology selection. Waterless urinals are not appropriate in busy toilets with poor ventilation.





TITLE: Worlds which Exclude project;
Dissemination of findings of water uses in Gypsy pitches.

LOCATION: The Site is a temporary accommodation for no more than three caravans in Checkley, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, West Midlands, but the case was supported by Derby Liaison Gypsy Group in Derbyshire.

ORGANISATIONS INVOLVED: International Centre of Guidance Studies & College of Engineering and Technology, University of Derby; Derbyshire Liaison Gypsy Group.

TIME FRAME: 2013-2014

TARGET POPULATION: Domestic/social

DRIVERS – WHY?: During her latest involvement in the international project Wor(l)ds which Exclude (WE), Dr. Eleni Tracada came across some UK planning framework documents from 2007 onwards in which policy makers made an attempt to include a supplementary document with a title Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments (Guidance,) although separated from the main National Planning Policy Framework, in order to help ‘assessments’ of available sites/pitches or evictions from unauthorized sites. Very often planning inspectors had rejected applications for planning applications of Gypsy and Traveller sites by referring to ‘bad’ hygienic conditions and use of water in these sites; the latest involvement with WE project gave researchers from the University of Derby and Siobhan Spencer from Derby Liaison Gypsy Group the opportunity to visit some temporary authorised sites in which the occupants were appealing to eviction and were asking for an extension of their planning applications. The processes to appeal are lengthy and financially non-affordable; the problem of water uses and hygiene has also been flagged up by the Localism Act and local community opposition. Before the latest UK general elections, a proposal to include pitches within the new Garden City plans was proposed by Lord Avebury, but the latest changes to the Planning Framework have now created more issues not only with Green Belt, but also with uses of water in these pitches as well. There should be more work upon new policies and frameworks in order to sort out gaps in official guidance.

There are some cases of policies and frameworks in other countries (such as Italy, for example) in which problems with daily uses of water were obvious in mandatory local legislation. According to these local authorities Gypsy and Roma communities were obliged to use more water in the pitches, because this was proof of cleanness (stigmatizing the groups) and also several schools in addition had to build more showers so that Gypsy and Roma children had to be mandatory washed before class; there was no proof that children had or had used facilities at home (pitches). Also in



social housing accommodation the use of water was constantly monitored. No Council bothered about waste of water, etc. at all. In the WE project recommendations were made towards policy makers to review local and regional legislation. The UK team of researchers interviewed the occupants of the site in Checkley and a film was also produced by Silvia Paggi, anthropologist with the help of Eleni and Siobhan, which can be found at <http://weproject.unice.fr/video/johannas-tribulations-united-kingdom-derbyshire>. In that film, Mrs Johanna Price presents their dedication of saving water in the facilities they use in the site and shows how the families can manage with water and drainage.

AUTHOR (SUBMITTER): Dr Eleni Tracada

CONTACT DETAILS: <mailto:E.Tracada@derby.ac.uk>

WATEF MEMBER (YES)

- ***What were the aims***

This is an ongoing problem for a group of families of Gypsy who are fighting for several years to get planning permission for a site in the outskirts of the village of Checkley, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, West Midlands. In 2014, they were granted a three year extension to their previous temporary permission by proving that they 'were no harm to the local landscape', thus, after having been checked about their cleanliness

- ***What was the process***

During her latest involvement in the international project Wor(l)ds which Exclude (WE), Dr. Eleni Tracada came across some UK planning framework documents from 2007 onwards in which policy makers made an attempt to include a supplementary document with a title Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments (Guidance,) although separated from the main National Planning Policy Framework, in order to help 'assessments' of available sites/pitches or evictions from unauthorized sites. Very often planning inspectors had rejected applications for planning applications of Gypsy and Traveller sites by referring to 'bad' hygienic conditions and use of water in these sites; the latest involvement with WE project gave researchers from the University of Derby and Siobhan Spencer from Derby Liaison Gypsy Group the opportunity to visit some temporary authorised sites in which the occupants were appealing to eviction and were asking for an extension of their planning applications. The processes to appeal are lengthy and financially non-affordable; the problem of water uses and hygiene has also been flagged up by the Localism Act and local community opposition. Before the latest UK general elections, a proposal to include pitches within the new Garden City plans was proposed by Lord Avebury, but the latest changes to the Planning Framework have now created more issues not only with Green Belt, but also with uses of water in these pitches as well. There should be more work upon new policies and frameworks in order to sort out gaps in official guidance.

There are some cases of policies and frameworks in other countries (such as Italy, for example) in which problems with daily uses of water were obvious in mandatory local legislation. According to these local



authorities Gypsy and Roma communities were obliged to use more water in the pitches, because this was proof of cleanness (stigmatizing the groups) and also several schools in addition had to build more showers so that Gypsy and Roma children had to be mandatory washed before class; there was no proof that children had or had used facilities at home (pitches). Also in social housing accommodation the use of water was constantly monitored. No Council bothered about waste of water, etc. at all. In the WE project recommendations were made towards policy makers to review local and regional legislation. The UK team of researchers interviewed the occupants of the site in Checkley and a film was also produced by Silvia Paggi, anthropologist with the help of Eleni and Siobhan, which can be found at <http://weproject.unice.fr/video/johannas-tribulations-united-kingdom-derbyshire>. In that film, Mrs Johanna Price presents their dedication of saving water in the facilities they use in the site and shows how the families can manage with water and drainage.

- ***What were the outcomes – indicators of success or failure – what did you learn?***

We have managed to support Mrs Price with our research and dissemination of it through publications and international conferences and lobbied successfully politicians in the House of Lords.

The site still exists and thrives as family life goes on; it's a good practice example of a really green Eco-pitch for Gypsy families, but we still have to support a more radical change to planning laws, as very little has been done to give more rights for these communities to get permanent pitches also in Green Belt; now the Conservative government does not allow this.

Any community could easily understand the importance of reasonable and necessary uses of water; they should be given the time and the right to explain their needs and their background culture to politicians and planners. Solutions are easier now to be provided, because technologies related to water uses and management have immensely progressed in the last few years.

- ***Motivations to learn***

As a professional educator and researcher and architect, Eleni wanted to learn more about discriminations in planning laws and help communities to get access to real sustainable places to live and work today in the UK and the rest of the European Union



TITLE: Measuring & Reducing water use (Preston, Merstham & Redhill, Surrey)

LOCATION: Redhill, Surrey, RH1 1SS

ORGANISATIONS INVOLVED Sutton and East Surrey Water; Reigate & Banstead Borough Council; Waterwise; Global Action Plan; Environment Agency; Surrey County Council; Raven Housing Trust

TIME FRAME: September 2009-August 2010

TARGET POPULATION: Domestic/social (760 homes)

DRIVERS (WHY?): Initiative and the Tap into Savings project.

The Preston project was the largest project in the country to retrofit water efficiency measures to existing homes. These measures included ecobetas (which allowed a single flush toilet to be converted to a dual flush), low flow showers and spray taps. A rainwater harvesting system was also installed to a block which uses rainwater to flush residents' toilets instead of using water from the mains. The project was supported by a water efficiency awareness programme and a project at a local school. The outcome was a 20% saving in residents' water usage as well as raising residents' awareness and encouraging more sustainable behaviour on water efficiency.

The Tap into Savings project retrofitted over 600 homes in Redhill and Merstham with water efficient devices such as ecobetas, spray taps, and low flow shower heads, and also provided residents free energy saving devices and electricity monitors so they could save water, energy and money.

AUTHOR (SUBMITTER): Barry Jenkinson – Raven Housing Trust

CONTACT DETAILS: barry.jenkinson@ravenht.org.uk Tel: 01737 272493

WATEF MEMBER (NO)

• ***What were the aims***

Preston initiative: Raven has delivered both the Preston Water Efficiency Initiative and the Tap Into Savings project.

- The Preston project was the largest project in the country to retrofit water efficiency measures to existing homes. These measures included ecobetas (which allowed a single flush toilet to be converted to a dual flush), low flow showers and spray taps. A rainwater harvesting system was also installed to a block which uses rainwater to flush residents' toilets instead of using water from the mains. The project was supported by a water efficiency awareness programme and a project at a local school. The outcome was a 20% saving in residents' water usage as well as raising residents' awareness and encouraging more sustainable behaviour on water efficiency.
- The Tap into Savings project retrofitted over 600 homes in Redhill and Merstham with water efficient devices such as Ecobetas, spray taps, and low flow shower heads, and also provided



residents free energy saving devices and electricity monitors so they could save water, energy and money.

- **What was the process?**

Tap into Savings (1 of 3 project areas) Waterwise working in partnership with RSL's to reach 10,000 residents in social housing in three regions of England

BY WORKING WITH the local water company, social housing provider, & other local groups

RETROFITTING The projects will replace or upgrade inefficient water using products and in Raven case also energy efficient products.

ECOTEAMS Global Action Plan will facilitate formation of EcoTeams & support their activities.

ENCOURAGING We will provide information to residents about the kinds of changes they can make to their homes & lifestyles, & generate community interest through teams, retrofits, activities & local media Tap into Savings (1 of 3 project areas)

Waterwise working in partnership with RSL's to reach 10,000 residents in social housing in three regions of England

BY WORKING WITH the local water company, social housing provider, & other local groups

RETROFITTING The projects will replace or upgrade inefficient water using products and in raven case also energy efficient products.

ECOTEAMS Global Action Plan will facilitate formation of EcoTeams & support their activities.

ENCOURAGING We will provide information to residents about the kinds of changes they can make to their homes & lifestyles, & generate community interest through teams, retrofits, activities & local media

- **What were the outcomes – indicators of success or failure – what did you learn?**

The Preston project:

- Retrofit-household saving 51Lpd, 14% reduction
- Refurbishment- household saving 91Lpd, 25% reduction
- Rainwater harvesting-household saving 8Lpd, 5% reduction (from already low baseline)
- Cost benefit analysis and additional detailed findings are included in the full report

- **What were the motivations to learn?**

- To provide lessons learnt and recommendations for future water efficiency delivery in existing housing.



TITLE: Reducing WC flush volumes in schools – are we overestimating the water savings?

LOCATION: UK

ORGANISATIONS INVOLVED: ech2o

TIME FRAME: 2010-2012 for research with updated analysis in 2015

TARGET POPULATION: School toilets 609 school pupils

DRIVERS – WHY?: When toilets are replaced in a school or water efficiency devices such as a save a flush or EcoBeta installed, future savings are calculated on a WC use of three per pupil per day. This is the same figure that is used for office workers and yet schools toilets are very different to office toilets. And yet anecdotal evidence from pupils was that they hated using the toilets at school and therefore used them as little as possible. We wanted to find out empirically how that distaste of the WC environment impacted on the actual usage.

AUTHOR (SUBMITTER): Cath Hassell

CONTACT DETAILS: cath.hassell@ech2o.co.uk

WATEF MEMBER (YES)

- **What were the aims**

To discover the amount of times pupils use the toilets or urinals while at school

When calculating water savings from efficiency upgrades in schools it is the industry norm to assume that pupils use the WC an average 3 times a day.

This is the same figure that is used for office workers and yet schools toilets are very different to office toilets.

- **What was the process**

As part of a wider ranging questionnaire about personal water use school pupils in both primary and secondary schools were asked how many times they used the toilets or urinals at school.

The form was anonymous and pupils were not asked to share the results with the rest of the class

- **What were the outcomes – indicators of success or failure – what did you learn?**

The average number of times pupils use the toilets or urinals at school is 1.3 times a day.

The average number of times primary school pupils use the toilets or urinals at school is 1.6 times a day

Of the 152 secondary school pupils we asked, 65% of them do not use the toilets at all at school



Girls at secondary schools use the toilets just 0.5 times a day on average therefore savings from upgrading WCs or retrofitting flush reduction measures in secondary schools are overcalculated by a factor of six.

- **Motivations to learn**

When advising schools on whether to fit water efficiency measures in WC cisterns or to upgrade taps, the cost of the measure is offset against the water savings that will result. It is therefore imperative that savings are calculated using robust data with regard to the amount of time pupils use the toilet.

Report can be downloaded [here](#)