

**Option 1.1 Hold fees at the current baseline level increased annually by Retail Price Index or similar. Do you consider that annual licences fees would best be held at current levels with a modest annual increase?**

IP Address	Response	Comment
	Yes	An increase yes...
	Yes	Held at current levels, with increase in line with inflation.
	No	Held at current levels.
	No	I do not think that current levels are adequate. Looking at boats moored some are in very poor condition and a number look abandoned. Too low a fee I think encourages misuse of the facility.
	Yes	I don't see why this would be a problem.
	Yes	I support this option.
	Yes	I think that mooring fees should be raised such that demand meets supply, whilst living on a boat is seen as a cheap option then people will demand more moorings than are available and potentially moor in areas that are restricted or unsuitable.
	No	Licence fees should be held as-is. Moorings provide a safe space for many people who could otherwise not afford to live in the City. Everyone else is already being priced out, especially millennials like myself. Please do not inflict this on those with boats too.
	No	Licence fees should remain the same.
	Yes	Modest increase.
	No	No fees are very minimal at the moment and would welcome an increase to invest into the riverbank and facilities for its licence holders
	No	No, Fees should cover all council costs related to provision and enforcement of mooring facilities with a sum put aside for capital works to cover infrastructure replacement.
	No	No, fees should not be held at current levels.
	No	No, prices are clearly undercharged for the service level and completely out of the range of charges paid by people living in houses in the area.
	No	No. Because it further encourages mooring on the river rather than elsewhere.
	No	No. Put fees in line with others. More money for maintaining the moorings and visitor moorings.
	No	No. The current level represents a substantial undercharge compared with market rate which means residential boat owners are being subsidised irrespective of their means. The cost of mooring is an expense which should be factored in by anyone owning a boat. For those who are unable to afford the cost, the subsidy should be paid by other means, e.g. housing benefit
	No	The current prices reflect the availability of things such as water and electricity. At all places where we have been charged that £2000 fee we have had access to 240V electricity and a personal water tap. At the moment we are paying exactly £2000 per year and have our own water, electricity, storage and a small private area for plants/garden near a dock. We also have Wifi.
	Yes	Yes - this is the fairest option.
	Yes	Yes, current levels with a modest inflation indexed increase.
	Yes	Yes, I strongly support this option as the fairest for existing long-term boat residents.
	Yes	Yes, this is the best option. You will make mooring in Cambridge impossible for anyone but the rich if you raise mooring fees substantially.

**Option 1.2 Substantially increase baseline fees to bring them in line with current providers providing similar facilities elsewhere in the country. (This would most likely require a doubling of the current charge of £1,000 per year excluding VAT). Would you support this option and if so, do you have any views on what would be an appropriate percentage increase?**

IP Address	Response	Comment
	No	a maximum of a 50% rise but not 100%
	No	Doubling is too high and fast.
	Yes	I agree with this option with the increase to match current providers providing similar facilities elsewhere in the country.
	Yes	I support making mooring fees more market rate based than subsidised
	No	I would NOT support this option. These moorings provide many people somewhere to live, who would otherwise not be able to afford to live in Cambridge. So many people, especially young people, are already being priced out of the city. Please do not do this to those with boats too.
	No	I would only support this option if electricity, water and wifi were made available.
	Yes	I would support this option over others although I don't believe it fair to charge for both mooring fees and council tax.
	No	I'm not sure that the people moored get that much for their money, and probably don't ask much and therefore should not be treated as a cash cow.
	Yes	In line with current providers in other parts of the country
		It is only fair to compare fees charges when similar services are provided: most marinas provide electricity, water from a tap close to where the boat is moored, and elsan facilities close by. If these aren't provided this should be taken into account.
	No	No
	No	No - a single increase of £1,000 could significantly impact the personal finances of those currently living on boats. A smaller increase based on inflation or a stepped increase over a number of years to bring them in line with current providers would be fairer and more appropriate.
	No	No - this would be drastically unfair on those who have made the river their home. There is no need for the council to emulate other 'current providers' - which appears to mean the private sector - in all things. It is possible to do things better, more decently and more fairly: the council must do what is best for the residents of Cambridge, including where this means going against the practices of those whose primary aim is to make a profit.
	No	No, The existing fee is appropriate for the level of services, access and tenure of mooring. ie we are not guaranteed a particular spot.
	No	No additional services or amenities are being suggested so there appears to be no justification for price rises.
	No	No I would strongly oppose this option being imposed on existing licensees as an unfair and disproportionate change in their reasonable expectations of costs.
	No	No increase as completely unfair on those living on boats who signed up for the current fee.
	No	No why would it be ok to increase the fees to such a high level on a totally green way of living and least demand on the city resources
	No	No, boaters won't be able to budget for substantial increase or make alternative arrangements.
	No	No, boats also pay river tax and other fees this is a massive unfair hike
	No	No, it would out price many boaters and those who pay more elsewhere get security, services and facilities not asked for or requested by the boaters from the Council.
	No	No, the blanket approach does not work here. There are specific conditions in Cambridge.
	No	No, the people living on the Cam are already counting every penny... the mooring fees are reasonable for the services provided. If you want to increase them, I would suggest that additional services need to be provided (electricity, water etc.)
	No	No, there is absolutely no reason why there should be any increase especially as no services are currently provided anyway
	No	No, this is a huge sudden expense to put upon current mooring holders, which may be unaffordable for many people. To double the cost of anything is too high an increase.
	No	No. Cambridge is special because it is possible for average people to live on the river. By increasing the fees, they will be priced off the river. Maybe, other greedy 'providers' could see us, in Cambridge, as the benchmark? Not the other way around.
	No	No. Current facilities do not demand an increase in fee and are currently inadequate. The one service point at Jesus Green having nothing but problems this year.
	No	Nobody but the super rich would be able to afford this and they would not live onboard. They would use the mooring for leisure use or rent it out in low season to pay for the mooring. Moorings should be available to those on the lowest incomes and be proportional according to income.
	Yes	Seems sensible
	Yes	Sensible but phase the increase over several years
	No	The problem is not income, although boat owners do get a good deal. If the fee was raised it would cost more to collect, and if poorer owners left they would be replaced by richer ones. This would not solve the problem of overcrowding
	No	This would effectively be social cleansing. Bad idea.
	Yes	Yes- if it reflects true costs.
	Yes	Yes would support this and those that cannot afford the fees and are in receipt of benefits should be assisted by the Council
	Yes	Yes, fees should be in line with similar facilities elsewhere.
	Yes	Yes. But it should be brought in gradually, not immediately, so that people have fair warning to plan ahead.
	Yes	Yes. Doubling if this is in line with others.
	Yes	Yes. Increase to current market rates. See comments under 1.1 above

**Option 1.3 Do you have any alternative methods for determining fees and charges including how and when changes should be introduced?**

IP Address	Response	Comment
		An increased fee would be acceptable if the facilities available increased.
		Council needs to live within its means - don't pass on costs to others for poor management.
		fees to remain the same with an increase related to inflation
		I do think that in fairness some consideration of size of vessel is important. Certainly any vessel over 60feet or wide beam should attract a higher charge. Residential narrowboats will nearly always be between 57 and 60 foot

		I dont believe there is any reason for any change at all
		I think it would be a good idea to have some sort of auctioning for licences for those going to the highest bidders with an increased duration if maybe 3-5 years. If this is not possible for those currently holding licences maybe any new licences going forward could be auctioned and given some premium spots at maybe Jesus Green etc and those that cannot afford it move to less desirable spots, mirroring buying/renting properties in the City.
		If a significantly higher baseline fee is implemented immediately, could it perhaps only apply to new applications for moorings to protect current boat residents and to enable those moving to the river to understand the full cost.
		In line with inflation
		It seems reasonable to charge a higher than current rate for NEW registrations as long as these higher charges, too, are only modestly increased annually while the licence is maintained.
		Leave things as they are.
		Leaving them as they are is the only acceptable way I can see is fair
		Many boats pay nothing; collection should bet more rigorous
		Means tested would be a fair way, along with pricing increases for widebeam, as they take up more space and encroachment into the recreational zone of the river.
		Mooring fees should between 2-5% of total annual household income to ensure it is fair to those on low incomes, with discounts for those with children onboard
		No. The system that currently exists works. Leave it alone.
		No. apart from above, increases applied gradually.
		None
		Size is a good way to determine price but it if all you're offering is a length of footage and nothing else the price has to reflect that it's a wild mooring.
		The fees should be such that they reflect the costs to the council of proving facilities available/
		The only way a fee increase could be considered would be to increase facilities such as an additional service point, electric hook ups and rubbish collection from the boats.
		Yes there should be a full open meeting with all concerned and the fees should reflect the low impact on the environment

**Option 3.2 Additional charges for wide beam vessels not to be applied at this stage. Do you support this proposal?**

IP Address	Response	Comment
	No	From the point of view of maintaining the navigation, the wider beam vessels are more tricky to get around. I don't think it should be something stupid like double the fee but perhaps there is room for some adjustment for wider beam vessels?
	No	I do not support this proposal. Widebeams make the river even narrower than usual. I would think basing the charge on boat area rather than length may work.
	No	I do not support this: wide boats intrude excessively into what is generally a very narrow river. Wide boats should not be allowed to moor in the narrow parts of the river, particularly anywhere along Riverside..
	No	I dont see why wider boats should be charged more as they dont occupy any more river bank
	No	I don't support this, other marinas do charge additional monies for additional width, and I can't see why this would be any different. If the concerns about additional river users are genuine then there is space for additional river users in that space.
	Yes	I would charge by beam right away due to the narrowness of the Cam.
		I would like to see wide beam vessels banned from anywhere where they present a hazard to navigation, particularly along the Riverside wall.
	No	No as this does not affect anyone if the boat is a little wider
	Yes	No extra charge should be made. See above answer.
	No	No if any changes should be made then a blanket overhaul on all vessels should be considered. Many of the widebeam will reside elsewhere through financial choice. Narrowboat owners have less choice and their vessel is more often a necessary home and not a life style choice. Implement increased charges for widebeam and leave narrowboats at same price. this would reduce residential requirements over night and provide more moorings for traditional vessels.
	No	No- see above fees should relate to overall size of boat.
	No	No Widebeam vessels should always be charged more they take up a vast amount of room across a river.
	No	No widebeams take up more navigational space.
	No	No, all size elements should be considered as per council tax
	No	No, I think additional charges are reasonable
	No	No, provided the boat is on a wide part of the river and not getting in the way I can't see why you'd charge more.
	No	No, these boats cause more obstruction to other river users
	No	No, this is unfair. If the river is still navigable then the beam is irrelevant
	No	No. If moved they are cumbersome and present a greater risk when in motion. I think that this needs to be recognised
	No	no. Wide vessels pose real problems for other users, especially rowers
		None
		Presumably wide beams cannot already moor at narrowest parts of the river.
	Yes	Support
	Yes	Supported in line with common practice
	Yes	There should be no added charge
	Yes	Why not charge an additional amount for those with wide beam vessels applying for their FIRST license? So all those who currently have a wide beam vessel continue as before.
	Yes	Yes because widebeams on the Cam are occupied by families who need bigger boats. To charge them extra is a breach of their right to a family life
	Yes	Yes these are prime licences and a premium should be paid for them for the same reasons stated above
	Yes	Yes, I support this. Such a measure does not seem of benefit in Cambridge.
	Yes	Yes, unless there is an impact on mooring location which restricts river use.
	Yes	Yes. some widebeams are not really fit for this river, ie too wide.
	Yes	Yes. The wide beam vessels are a hazard for scullers - they create an unexpected obstacle, particularly for inexperienced scullers. They narrow the navigable channel, sometimes on or near narrow bends.

**Option 4.1 End temporary permissions to moor at Riverside, move all boats moored at Riverside wall and offer alternative moorings elsewhere in Cambridge to those boats which have registered and are regulated by the City Council and have people living aboard. Do you support the proposal to end moorings at Riverside? If not what would you propose as a solution? Is the proposal to offer alternative moorings fair, and do you have any suggestions as to how this process should best**

IP Address	Response	Comment
	Yes	Absolutely. Alternative moorings cannot be offered to those people who have not bothered in the last ~10 years to join the waiting list for official moorings.
	No	Boaters are fairly intrepid people and climbing over a guard rail isn't really going to worry them. However, if the boats are causing a problem to the substance of the wall or the railing then health and safety has to be taken into account. I would far rather see a thin floating pontoon alongside the boats (it doesnt have to be very wide, just over the width of buggy wheels) than lose a potential mooring spot.
	Yes	Definitely as these moorings are a hazard to navigation as well as the issues described above. I would like to know where alternative moorings would be offered so that the problem is not just moved.
	Yes	End all mooring at Riverside
		Have there been any incidents? If unsafe then boats should move to other sites.
	No	I do not support this proposal. You have given three reasons for ending moorings at Riverside. Here is my response to each: 1) Why is the guard rail unsuitable? The boats moored on the guard rail obscure the view of the hideous grey wall separating the river from the road. So in actuality those boats do the aesthetics a favour. And as for your other reasons ... 2) I travel along the riverside twice daily. I have never witnessed anyone having trouble climbing over the railings to access a boat or to disembark. Have you asked the current boat residents if they have trouble, as they're the ones you suggest you're concerned about? 3) By "vehicles" I assume you mean cars. Very few cars travel along Riverside as it is access only to houses, with no through traffic. Cars also move very slowly, because of the amount of cyclists and pedestrians. Is the barrier really at risk of a collision of any real impact? Have there ever been any dangerous accidents there before? In reality, risk of damage could be further reduced by improving the street scape for pedestrians and cyclists. Trees, planters and built-out pavement would all help to keep cars away from the railing. Alternatively, why not reinforce the railings so boats can moore safely?
	Yes	I support the proposal, but are the alternatives much better or feasible? There are also the problems of 1, sewage disposal and danger caused by boats blocking escape from the river when people fall in. Boat owners agreed to fit safety lines to their boats, but they have not done so, and the agreement has not been enforced
	Yes	I support the proposal to end moorings on riverside. I believe the proposal to offer alternative mooring to be fair.
	No	Leave things as they are but make it clear that moorers moor at their own risk. There have ben no accidents to my knowledge in over 30 years. Resist the attitude of attempting to control everything and stifle adventure and enterprise.
	No	No stay as are
	No	No visitor moorings can be lost is the main priority, otherwise support on safety grounds the relocation of these boats

No	No, this is not fair as these people have made their home there and are being asked to move on the basis that it is not safe for them to climb into their own boats. They have obviously judged it to be safe enough. If they must be moved then they should be given alternative moorings within a mile or so. Rather than this the moorings at Riverside should simply be made safe. I am certain that if the City Council were interested they could find a solution.
No	No, I do not support this proposal. Leave it alone, the council does not need to interfere in every part of every residents lives and try and micro-manage things.
Yes	Agreed, navigating that section of river with rowers and the moored boats can be problematic.
Yes	Definitely. Two eights going in opposite directions cannot pass under the present arrangements and smaller boats need a degree of competence in steering to do so. The situation is dangerous.
Yes	For now support. At some time in future if these could be made safe and used as visitor moorings.
No	I do not support this proposal. You have given three reasons for ending moorings at Riverside. Here is my response to each: 1) Why is the guard rail unsuitable? The boats moored on the guard rail obscure the view of the hideous grey wall separating the river from the road. So in actuality those boats do the aesthetics a favour. And as for your other reasons ... 2) I travel along the riverside twice daily. I have never witnessed anyone having trouble climbing over the railings to access a boat or to disembark. Have you asked the current boat residents if they have trouble, as they're the ones you suggest you're concerned about? 3) By "vehicles" I assume you mean cars. Very few cars travel along Riverside as it is access only to houses, with no through traffic. Cars also move very slowly, because of the amount of cyclists and pedestrians. Is the barrier really at risk of a collision of any real impact? Have there ever been any dangerous accidents there before? In reality, risk of damage could be further reduced by improving the street scape for pedestrians and cyclists. Trees, planters and built-out pavement would all help to keep cars away from the railing. Alternatively, why not reinforce the railings so boats can moore safely?
	I don't know. Technical answer needed.
Yes	I support this, though I wonder how it will be enforced.
Yes	I would support this as long as the process did not become excessively expensive to enforce.
No	No I don't, I feel that the wall mooring is a good spot it just needs to be made a little more accessible.
No	No since there is an existing 30 year old community of boaters moored there who should be protected by the council not forced to move because a developer and a new group of privileged investors put pressure, financial or otherwise on the council to do so.
No	No why should there not be boats at this point
No	no, phased shut down and feasibility study regarding the wide bay opposite kings
No	No, the boats are people's homes.
No	No, this area has had boats moored here for many decades.
No	No, this is a terrible proposal. The boat residents add character and colour to the area. Most of Cambridge is gradually being socially cleansed.
No	No. The Riverside Wall is a safe and secure mooring for boats.
No	No. As above.
No	No. Because this should not be the council's business. They should give the land up to the Cam Conservators or co-operative of boat owners to deal with. Boating is risky, those of us who live on them know this. Climbing over a railing is nothing compared to dealing with floods, climbing about locks, etc.
No	No. For the same and blatantly obvious reason as above!
No	No. limited moorings is a problem already. Loosing more is not the way forward. This area of river is of little use to other residents, it can be seen from the bridge and adds to the visual diversity of the City
No	No. Th Conservators can only designate this a no mooring area on navigational grounds, and the last time it was discussed by the Conservators it was considered that there was insufficient evidence of obstruction to navigation. Unless the position has changed the Conservators do not have the power to designate the Railings as a no mooring zone
Yes	Yes it does not seem possible that the Cam Conservators do not have byelaws that cover this stretch of the River and this needs to be addressed
Yes	Yes. But, as above, do not support relocation to other riverside areas.
Yes	Yes. People should not be allowed to moore in spaces that are unsuitable, unsafe and cause damage.

#### Option 4.3 Do you have any additional solutions you would like us to consider?

IP Address	Response	Comment
		Build a marina on Ditton Meadows.
		Build an off channel marina
		Building a marina to house these displaced boats. This would increase the services for boats in Cambridge, and also generate additional income for the council (after costs are recuperated).
		Dredge that part of the river and provide better access to boats.
		Excavate low lying land opposite the moorings to provide additional moorings or widen the river here. I think the land used to be owned by Philips Electronics but I am not sure of ownership now.
		I know some of the people and have great affection for them. Don't want to see them made homeless. Want them to have safe moorings.
		Invest in improvements to accommodate up to date mooring facilities.
		Invest in the boating community using the money set aside to improve the area. Put in gates & ladders as a minimum. More facilities.
		Isn't there any out of town moorings that can be included in the Cambridge umbrella. I wouldn't mind mooring further out of town as long as public transport stretched that far.
		Keep as is all seems happy
		Let people live the river at Riverside. Improve the Riverside streetscape. More trees, a built-out pavement and planters will help reduce conflict between all road and river users.
		Make mooring above Jesus lock on Jesus green side avsilable.
		No. From the options considered in the past, there is no viable way of making the area safe for mooring except by radical and expensive re-engineering of the riverside
		People should not think they can just moore anywhere- they should think of mooring provision before even buying a boat. Owning a boat does not mean they should be able to moore anywhere.
		Riverside should be adapted - HOWEVER, as someone who has "legally" waited on the waiting list for some time I don't think those illegally there should be rewarded.
		Suggest to boat clubs or whoever is causing this confusion to seek new grounds for their sport - people's lives matter.
		There is no problem to solve. There is a perceived problem based on the opinions of those who are not local to the area.
		There shouldnt be any need for concideration, boaters on riverside should provided with all the requirements they deserve the same as any other human in the country ie a safe community with good access, sanitation and such like
		What will you do about the illegal moorings on Stourbridge Common?
		Why can't "illegal moor ears" utilise available commercial moorings? I think the use of riverside is "playing outside of the rules" and should therefore not be rewarded. They could go to the bottom of the waiting list if not on it
		Yes, A phased shut down. Proper enforcement of any new or returning boats. maybe deputize Cam con to police this rather than the ineffective current method.
		Yes make it safe and allow people to live there

#### Option 5.1 Introduction of a revised enforcement policy with powers delegated to Council officers. Do you support the introduction of a revised enforcement policy? If not, why?

IP Address	Response	Comment
Yes	Yes	I do not object to a revised policy
No	No	I dont support any introduction of any new policy. I believe that maybe if the council were executing the current policy correctly there would not be a need for trying any alternative
Yes	Yes	I support the introduction of a revised enforcement policy.
		I think a liaison officer would be much better so communications can be upheld more easily and in a human manner.
		Maybe you should just enforce the current policy efficiently. I wrote a letter to the council outlining my frustration with the way the policy is policed, including evidence of some boat owners not using their boat as a primary residence and was then confronted by a council employee working in an unrelated department, who owns a boat and at the time hadn't lived in it for months, who had been shown the letter by a friend within the department. I thought this might be illegal?
		Mixed feelings about this, in general boating enforcement should be the duty of navigational authorities and not councils who often do not fully appreciate boating requirements and culture.
Yes	Yes	Needs to be fair and easy to understand. Boat people can't afford lawyers.
No	No	no, The council officers do not know enough about who or what is going on, on the river. use existing enforcement correctly rather than chasing punt touts around market square.
No	No	No money could be spent better elsewhere
No	No	No. The whole consultation seems designed to impinge on people's rights and freedom.
No	No	No. Boaters should be self regulating to save the tax payers money.
No	No	No. Leave people alone, to enjoy their lives. We do not need micro-managed or excessive burocracy.

	No	No. Leave people to live in peace. Stop trying to enforce everything. Work with people not against them. Engage with people. Help them to recycle and improve the environment in which they live.
		Not sure. If it's as well applied as, say, the loading ban on Hills Road is, then any policy won't work.
		There should be a number that you can call if moving on is impossible for any reason (weather/engine failure etc). This person should be knowledgeable about narrow boating as they face particular issues which are not similar to other forms of boating.
		There should be more checking of mooring boats to ensure the owners/inhabitants reside, work, live in Cambridge.
		There would need to be a robust appeals process.
		Unsure as long it does not become a witch hunt
	Yes	Yes but keep empire building and jobs for the boys to a minimum to reduce costs.
	Yes	Yes in theory but will it actually be enforceable??
	Yes	Yes, but only to remove existing council moorings from those renting out boats or those living in houses - of which there are MANY. This urgently needs addressing as they are taking up council moorings illegally that could be occupied by families with no moorings waiting on the river right now.
	Yes	Yes, I support the introduction of a revised policy as outlined here.
	Yes	Yes, it should be rigorous and the condition of vessels be a part of that. A number of vessels there are eyesores in a beautiful setting
	Yes	Yes. The current situation has arisen partly because of the slowness of Council processes.
	Yes	Yes. There is nothing more irritating to someone who is moored legally with all their fees paid to see someone just 'winging it'. Boats hanging around over their allotted time steal tourist spots and give a bad impression of boaters.
	Yes	Yes. A number of the boats moored along Riverside appear to be abandoned - they are in a very bad state and have no place there. Also I would ask if boats moored along Riverside are permitted to empty their toilet tanks into the river. I have never seen some of the boats move to the pumping station.
	Yes	Yes. Just because people own a boat that does not remove them from complying with regulations nor responsibility for others.

**Option 6.1 Location type and number of mooring berths. Do you support the current location numbers and type of mooring berths being appropriate as the permanent number and type? If not, why?**

IP Address	Response	Comment
		Cambridge should have a lot more visitor moorings.
		I don't know. Don't want people to lose their homes and livelihoods.
	Yes	I support the current location numbers and type of mooring berths as being appropriate.
		I think the number of visiting moorings is ok, but narrowboats should be allowed to double moor in certain places. All three sites for visiting moorings should work independently allowing visitors to move from one to the other and the end of the period, this will maximise local income from boaters. Boats with a residential license should not be allowed to use visitors moorings.
		I think the number should be increased - more moorings created...
		I would rather see the boats on Riverside allowed to stay there and no more mooring on the Commons allowed.
		I would support higher visitor moorings.
		Mostly (although we have been on the waiting list for over three years and are seeing no movement) I would love to see some more commercial moorings. There are many people who trade from boats and do it beautifully, they are such a tourist attraction. A line of trading boats on a year only contract would be wonderful both for the summer and Christmas tourists.
	No	No, there are plenty of empty moorings - 10 opposite us for over a year - we are on the waiting list and we are here now waiting? Where are the other people above us? Their need is not as great as ours as they would be here on the river waiting if it was. They probably don't even have a boat most of them! Or live in a house! It is not accepted that there are people on the waiting list in greater need than us, as NOBODY NEW HAS ARRIVED TO TAKE THE EMPTY MOORING SPACES UP!! Give permanent mooring licenses to everyone without one, including those on the waiting list, as long as they have been here waiting on the river for the last few years. Scrap the rest of the mooring waiting list - if people genuinely needed a mooring they would be here on the river with us waiting for one. There are spaces enough for everyone currently on the river without a mooring license and leave Riverside boaters there since they are an established community of 3 decades. ROWERS are the problem on the river. They crash into our boats causing criminal damage, they kill wildlife with around 10 cynetts pulled from the river by us on houseboats. They cannot even actually row since they are way over capacity and manage a few strokes before hitting another rower. They cause noise pollution night & day through amplified headsets and harass people on boats calling us pikeys and gypos. Their level of arrogance is deeply disturbing. It is time the council stood up for the rights of ordinary working class people and not the white male over-privileged elite that is the university. You are a LABOUR council - behave like one.
	No	No, there are too many. It is very hard for local residents to access & enjoy the river. Also they produce an overwhelming amount of smoke in winter.
	No	No, there is a housing shortage in Cambridge, with very little affordable housing... I would support an increase in the number of licenced moorings.
	No	No.
	No	No, it is too high. They block access to the river bank for the general public.
	No	no, not consistent with previous proposals
	No	No, the moored boats are for the most part in a poor state of repair, very few of them use the pumping out stations to get rid of their sewage, they pollute the river and many of their owners and occupants behave in an anti-social way.
		Not sure
	Yes	Provided that it is properly enforced, yes. Cambridge has a generally bad reputation as a place to visit. Reasons given include no available moorings, poor mooring facilities, and danger from vandalism
		There are enough moorings along Stourbridge common as it is. More would present a hazard to navigation and just move the problem.
		There is a shortage of moorings in Cambridge. The council would be foolish to move boats already with moorings on Riverside, any current spaces should be allocated to boaters on the waiting list instead of stalling proceedings in an attempt to avoid the problem they have of housing working families who cannot afford any other way of living
		These numbers, plus our brothers and sisters on the wall please
		Too few moorings have been granted in the past with many wide gaps between moored boats. There is scope for more moorings than at present which will increase income and help to satisfy the demand.
	Yes	Yes although I think there could be an increased number of narrow boats on the widest part of the river just along from the Penny Ferry on Stourbridge which could be utilised unsure as to why the Conservators do not allow moorings for this area? The visitor moorings maybe could be reduced especially during winter months and maybe auction some winter moorings for legitimate river cruisers.
	Yes	Yes in a way but why has there not been other things put in place so this could be a marina
	Yes	Yes, I consider the current numbers to be reasonable

**Option 6.2 Future reduction in the extent and number of mooring berths provided. Would you support a reduction in the overall length of riverbank provided and number of mooring berths? If not, why?**

IP Address	Response	Comment
	No	I support no reduction. We can't make the river bigger, but certainly no need to reduce mooring licences.
	No	I think the balance is about right at present. There are plenty of places along the river bank where there is access to the river.
		I worry that more space is being given to rowing and less to homes.
	No	I would not support any reduction in moorings, quite the opposite - I will fight any mooring reduction and only support an increase! There is a shortage of moorings for families on the river, any council that reduces moorings forcing people to be homeless is fundamentally inept
	No	No boats are generally a good thing.
	No	No I would not why are the rowers not being forced to build the rowing lake to enable to lowering of the demand on this small river people living on boats has been a very long history
	No	No I would not, until such time as there is evidence that the waiting list for moorings is no longer sufficiently long to justify current levels.
	No	No not at all. There isn't enough moorings in Cambridge as it is. My husband works at one of the Cambridge colleges and we are desperate to get there. At the moment he has to drive for an hour and a half each day to do his job. Reducing the moorings might mean that he finally gives up and looks for work elsewhere and that would be a really bad idea.
	No	No since everyone currently on the river without a license should be given one, including those on the waiting list, with the rest of those on mooring waiting list not given a mooring if those on the waiting list were in genuine need of a mooring they would be here on the river waiting to be given one like us who are on the waiting list
	No	No visitor moorings to be lost.
	No	No, alternative moorings should be provided to allow boat dwellers to live and work in the city. A marina in Ditton Meadows would provide a suitable community hub.
	No	No, as these are peoples homes and we pay river tax and Cam conservators fees
	No	No, there is a housing shortage in Cambridge, with very little affordable housing... I would support an increase in the number of licenced moorings.
	No	No, you have no where to put people and you already anticipate moving people from Riverside onto existing moorings.
	No	No. I think that the current sites are appropriate and if we'll managed are an asset to the general ambiance of a river city
	No	No. Leave it as-is. Because there really isn't any issue.
	No	No. There is no problem with the current number of mooring berths.

		Only if done very slowly and in such a way that all those who currently live on the river are able to continue doing so for as long as they wish to.
		Remove the Riverside Wall moorings, that will be enough
		Removing riverside mooring will do this, I don't see the need to reduce other moorings which provide an ecologically and environmentally friendly living space to a cross cut of the community.
		That depends on the type of vessels. There is a difference between leisure vessels and those people live on. Perhaps some kind of differentiation between types of vessels should be considered.
	Yes	Yes. Get rid of all the moored boats.
	Yes	Yes. So that the general public can enjoy the river at Jesus Green, Midsummer Common and Stourbridge Common.

**Option 6.3 Would you support a temporary increase in the number of Residential Mooring Licences from 70 to accommodate those displaced from Riverside? Licences would not be issued to the waiting list until the number of licences returns to**

IP Address	Response	Comment
	No	Again no visitor moorings to be lost.
	No	Depends on where they are and how temporary. Probably no
	Yes	I agree the council needs to give permanent mooring licenses to everyone currently on the river waiting for one but disagree that this should not include people on the waiting list. EVERYONE on the river now without a mooring license should be given one, including those of us on the waiting list. Anyone else on the waiting list that is not here in the river waiting for a mooring is not in genuine need and should not be given one.
		I see the sense in this, but people on the waiting list have been waiting years, and have been kept very badly informed about what is going on, with a number of requests not being returned at all in the last year (personally) and no updated list. Perhaps allowing double mooring over a temporary period would be better, while a temporary inconvenience it will work out for the best in the long run.
	Yes	I support this.
	No	I would not support any temporary increase, only a permanent increase irrespective of the councils attempt to ethnically cleanse riverside moorings. People living on the river should be given preferential treatment over anybody using it for leisure. If there is an issue of congestion then the amount of rowers should be reduced as many of them are also inexperienced and dangerous
		I would rather see the boats on Riverside allowed to stay there and no more mooring on the Commons allowed.
	No	No because those on the waiting list should have priority
	No	No, the number of licences should match the available space that is safe to use and not be based upon number of current vessels moored
	No	No, the waiting list is the fairest system and those on Riverside should stay where they are.
	No	No. See above
	No	No. Don't displace anyone. Leave as-is.
	No	No. I would prefer the mooring to be at Riverside where they do not interfere with public enjoyment of the river than on the commons. They should be moved as a priority as licences become free elsewhere.
	No	No. If people decided to use a facility that did not exist they chose to operate outside of the terms and conditions of mooring. I do not think that they should be rewarded for this. I have been on the list for a number of years already
	No	No. people have been on the waiting list for many years. These people have put their lives on hold. Waiting to join the list was a choice. But to be moved further back is just unacceptable.
	No	No. reasons stated above.
	No	No. these people could have joined the official waiting list at any point but have not bothered to do so. They should not be pandered to.
	Yes	Not ideal but probably the best option.
		Not sure how this can work in any way
		Only if it was really necessary. The failure by the Council to administer the residential moorings in the past has led to abuses, for example, boats being sublet, boats being unoccupied, boat owners allowed to remain despite being in breach of the Conservators Byelaws, particularly by failure to pay registration fees.
		Riverside should be adapted - HOWEVER, as someone who has "legally" waited on the waiting list for some time I don't think those illegally there should be rewarded.
	No	So it sounds like you've made your mind up. I do not support the removal of any boats from the Riverside railings.
	No	What about those of us who have patiently sat on the waiting list and haven't broken the rules by bringing our boats down and parking them illegally? This option would mean that we, those who have done things right, have to slip down the list so that those who did it all wrong take the places. no no no. that is not fair. If they are on the waiting list then by all means find them somewhere else but if they're a long way down they have to take their place like everybody else.
	Yes	Yes as long as they are situated in locations which do not hinder other river use.
	Yes	Yes but see reply to option 6.1.
	Yes	yes, but any people from riverside who do not comply with current mooring requirements should not be given a licence.
	Yes	Yes, provided that suitable places were provided and that some kind of inspections were made of boats to ensure they were moored properly and being maintained properly.
	Yes	Yes, temporary increase may be suitable if space can be found on the river.
	Yes	Yes, this seems like a reasonable expedient in the circumstances.
	Yes	Yes. Don't want to see people evicted.

**Option 7.1 Establishment of short term licenced winter moorings. Do you support the Council's position not to establish winter mooring sites? If not, why?**

IP Address	Response	Comment
		I agree there should be moorings available for constant cruisers however the visitor moorings should not be used for these as it would compound the current problem with liveaboards staying on these moorings for extended periods.
	No	I would love to over winter in Cambridge
	No	No - what is the point of this consultation? Because it seems that nothing will actually change?? No to an increase, no to winter moorings, a poor way to solve a problem (Riverside) you've not been able to solve??
	No	No I think that a cost for these could be made higher than the 25% and maybe this would be an option for people on the waiting list to pay for these during the winter which may actually reduce enforcement work from chasing them around the River during the winter
	No	No once again. The penultimate paragraph states that not introducing these licences would be a burden on the council. It is not looking after barges interests.
	No	No, due to the demand for permanent moorings there is not space for the council to supply storage for boats that are only used in the summer
	No	No, facilities should be provided to accommodate use such as a marina.
	No	No, The Cam is a dead end, unlike the canals where this is appropriate. This will also cause problems for visiting boats.
	No	No. I imagine these would just be uninhabited during the winter while the owner goes to live in a house.
	No	No. No benefit to anyone.
	No	No. once the boats have arrived their owners/occupiers will seek to stay.
	No	No... Winter mooring sites are essential for those who travel for most of the year.
		Not many people cruise in the winter so unnecessary.
	Yes	Yes, as there are those of us who do not even have the luxury of an ordinary mooring license. Why on earth would you start giving away winter licenses when some of us have been waiting patiently on the waiting list here on the river, with our children for years?
	Yes	Yes, no winter moorings
	Yes	Yes. The visitor moorings should be better advertised as available all year round. It's not as if hire craft don't have heating.
	Yes	Yes. Marinas offer a competitive rate for continuous cruisers
	Yes	Yes. Often winter is a time to moor up. Take stock and address personal responsibilities for many boaters, having a winter mooring will help those who will be forced to continuously cruise due to loss of, lack of moorings in and around the city. The very people who caught to keep our canals and rivers navigable, who left a legacy and tourist attraction are now being penalised and pushed out. We owe it to those boaters who have struggled to maintain the boating lifestyle and to accommodate new boaters where possible.

**Option 8.1 Retention of closed waiting list. Do you support the waiting list remaining closed to new applicants for the foreseeable future? If not, why?**

IP Address	Response	Comment
	Yes	I suppose so - if the list is full you may as well not give people false hope. Alternatively, you can let people join the list but tell them they may be very old or dead before they get a mooring. That's what Arsenal Football Club do for their season tickets.
		It doesn't really matter. Any new applicant is going to get a silly number and if the list remains closed they not going to get a number at all either way they don't get a mooring so what difference does it make.
		It should be checked regularly to see if people still want to be on the list.
	No	No, all should be able to join the list
	No	No, this is not fair. Especially on those who are young or have just moved to the city.

	No	No. People have to live somewhere and housing in Cambridge is in crisis.
		Now plan should be put in place to provide for future use and facilities, any closure should be time limited.
		Unsure think that any new licences should be auctioned to the highest bidders or move back to categorising those on the waiting list who have already own a boat.
	Yes	Yes - little point in opening it
	Yes	Yes as we have this major problem for people on boats already
	Yes	Yes if there is no additional space/capacity.
		Yes it should remain closed but mooring licenses should be granted to those of us on the waiting list who are actually here on the river waiting with our families AHEAD of all others on the waiting lists. If the others on the waiting list needed a mooring that badly, as we do, they would be here waiting with us for one. Nobody new has arrived on the river to take up any of the empty moorings opposite is in the years we've been here - where are they? Do they even have boats? Do they live in Houses? Moorings should securely be given to those on the waiting list who are also on the river now waiting for one. All others on the waiting list should be denied a mooring license since they have no immediate need for one. If those on riverside railings are to be given mooring licenses, so then should those of us who have give to great efforts to wait patiently on the river with our families for one.
	Yes	If those on riverside railings are to be given mooring licenses, so then should those of us who have give to great efforts to wait patiently on the river with our families for one.
	Yes	Yes there are already a large number on the waiting list. Open it up when it drops to about 50 and cap at 100
	Yes	Yes- unless more space becomes available.
	Yes	Yes until the riverside issue is resolved.
	Yes	Yes, as it is clearly not practical to open it.
	Yes	Yes, but the boats currently renting there boat/mooring should be addressed.
	Yes	Yes, keep it closed until the backlog has gone while the Riverside Wall situation is resolved
		Yes, this is the only sensible way to do this, until such time as the waiting list becomes very much shorter and estimated wait times on the list fall below three years. But I still support Option 8.3 below as an emergency exception to this.
	Yes	

**Option 8.2 Those regulated moorings displaced at Riverside are offered Residential Mooring Licences on the Regulated Moorings elsewhere before those on the waiting list to assist those who may be impacted by any decision to remove**

IP Address	Response	Comment
	No	Absolutely not. Those of us that did the right thing and placed ourselves (years ago) properly on the mooring lists shouldnt be pushed down by those who just felt it was fine to do as they wished and park where they wished.
		I assume it is not that expensive to add new names to the list so why close it. Charge a nominal fee (£25 pa) to be on list to cover costs, this will also remove non serious applicants..
	No	I do not think this will work leave the people where they are as there are no other moorings for them
	Yes	I support this.
		If this is the solution then priority must be given to families with children who attend local schools and those who work locally in Cambridge. Like a catchment zone.
	No	No - Riverside should be adapted - HOWEVER, as someone who has "legally" waited on the waiting list for some time I don't think those illegally there should be rewarded.
	No	No- illegal mooring should not mean people jump the queue who have complied with the rules.
		No, the moorings are not permanent or even legal, just because they have been able to get away with mooring inappropriately for this long does not mean they should be given any special treatment
	No	No. If space can be found for boaters moving from Riverside it can be found for others. Riverside should be improved.
		No. many have had to pay to reside elsewhere and have there lives inconvenienced during the time they have waited patiently for a licensed mooring. These should not be made to wait any longer due to lack of spend or loss of facilities. Our city is growing and these very people are the ones who build it daily. They deserve to be placed inline where they have waited, not shoved further back on the list.
	No	No. Not a fair system for those who authentically put their names on the list
	No	No. Riverside is not a mooring. It is used by chance by those not prepared to wait
	No	No. These people clearly decided not to apply for an official license years ago. They should go to the end of the list.
	No	no. They don't pay and are not on the list.
	No	No. we need to get rid of all these boats.
		Not sure, this does seem unfair to anyone who has gone about things the right way.
	No	Once again, I do not support the removal of any vessels from the Riverside. If you do insist on making people homeless due to pressure from wealthy residents and University rowers, then an alternative and PERMANENT solution must be found.
		There is no need to displace these homes.
		They should be offered financial incentives to moor elsewhere, eg March, Ely, Peterborough
		Those on the waiting list who are currently waiting here on the river on a boat with families should be given mooring licenses as a matter of priority, before anyone else on the waiting list who is not currently on the river waiting for a mooring as they have no immediate need for a mooring and in fact may not even live on a boat! Leave the riverside boating community alone. They were there long before the developers of the flats came and deserve to be protected as an established community.
	No	Those that are already on the waiting list should be offered a licence as they have shown commitment to wanting to join the boating community on the river and comply with the residential moorings policy and its terms and conditions, those that are not I am unsure will want to.
		Well if you are going to chuck people off Riverside, which I am against, but it seems a totally done deal, despite the fact that there's this "consultation", you have to let them moor elsewhere quickly.
		yes , But you need to ensure any late comers or free loaders , are not added to this list, also any widebeams should be carefully placed. Also that any people from the riverside moorings should strictly adhere to the current mooring requirements, no exceptions, they should not ne allowed to move onto any other mooring until all mooring criteria are met.
	Yes	Yes, but really you should not be moving them from the Riverside anyway

**Option 8.3 Those regulated moorings possibly displaced at Riverside should be added to the waiting list in chronological order based on evidence of first occupancy at Riverside. Do you support this? If not, why?**

IP Address	Response	Comment
		Again NO! For three years my husband and son have been travelling into Cambridge for work and college. they travel for over an hour and a half a day and the fuel costs are ridiculous. It would have been so easy for us to bring our boat down and park it somewhere illegal but we didn't and many others haven't either. If those that are on the railing moorings aren't on the waiting list that's a problem they should have sorted. If we get pushed down the list by someone who has muscled themselves in by parking badly what message does that send to those who act properly?
	No	I do not support this as I believe it to be very difficult to establish who has been where and for how long. How would you prove anything?
	Yes	It's fair to say that they will need re mooring. But they have had the opportunity to moor their boats up for those years/ months that those on the list have had to find alternative accomadation or moorings. Please don't penalise those that have waited patiently for licensed moorings.
	No	No - Riverside should be adapted - HOWEVER, as someone who has "legally" waited on the waiting list for some time I don't think those illegally there should be rewarded.
	No	No - very difficult to prove first occupancy.
	No	No- illegal mooring should not mean people jump the queue to those who have complied with the rules.
	No	No, I do not think you should move people from the Riverside. However, if you do, the only humane response is of course to give them a mooring immediately. Where on earth are you going to put them and their boats otherwise?
	No	No, it shouldn't be based on first occupancy but on need (children, families who work locally).
	No	No, leave riverside boating community alone. Protect them & put in gates/ladders and better services as they deserve as an established community if 30 years - long before riverside was gentrified by the developers.
	No	No, there should not be displaced at all.
	No	No. I don't think people should be displaced from their own homes.
	No	No. Because I don't support displacing anyone.
	No	No. Existing moorers should be given preference
		No. If they are not on the list now, why not? If they go on it should be at the end otherwise they are jumping the queue and gaining an advantage over those who have behaved appropriately. I have been on the list for years and do not think it is fair that queue jumping is appropriate or fair. It discriminates against those who have entered into this properly
	No	No. if they are not on the list they should not get put in front of those following the rules
	No	No. They have wilfully declined to join the waiting list, and as such should go to the end of the list.
		Other criteria could be taken into account, e.g. vulnerability, presence of children etc.
		Probably
		Sounds better, but why aren't they already on waiting list.
		They'll only squat somewhere else illegally unless you tow them away.

		Unsure
		Very difficult to assess. Some boats may have come and gone and then returned at a later date.
	Yes	Yes, but only because its not clear what a better policy would be.
	Yes	Yes, I support this - for this category of existing river residents ONLY

**We have identified a number of options which could be realised. Are there any additional items you would like us to consider when revising the River Moorings Policy?**

IP Address	Response	Comment
		? Moorings for non liveaboards
		A few pre-bookable visitor moorings???
		As a holiday hire boat operator on want to keep as many visitor moorings clear for visitors as possible. Also would like the consideration of how a hire boat on two separate holidays is policed. A £1000 fine for someone who didn't realise a previous customer had spent 48 hours in Cambridge would be unfair.
		AT present the council do not enforce the mooring policy very well, i doubt that any one from the mooring team would know my face, The cam con do. Do you think its time for the Cam con to be deputized by the council and take over the mooring policy. thereby streamlining the whole process and taking it off the hands of the council , who clearly dont or cant be bothered to run it properly. Also how many consultations do you need? if the council acted on previous consultations There would not be this situation.
		Boats which are wider than the traditional narrow boat should NOT be allowed to moor in the narrower parts of the river - particularly Riverside.
		Condition of vessels maintain acne and appearance, beyond simple registration is appropriate. The river should be enhanced by the presence of boats and not be a dump
		Create several new marinas. Reduce the waiting list and resettle those from the riverside to either of their choice. Be proactive. Build for the future.
		Fundamental investigation should be considered to this waterway as a waterway and sufficient capacity provided for future use based on sound transport planning principles.
		I feel that in light of the consultation bargees interests should be addressed - better access to boats from the towpath and moor secure moorings i.e. metal rings to tie boats to.
		I should like to know of these options. How can I find them out? jonathanellams@hotmail.com
		I think that Cambridge needs the boats they are a part of the scenery. But I also think that more could be done to make a feature of them such as the trading boats and that sort of thing. These should be seen as an asset to the city not a liability.
		I wish there was a solution to keep boats on the railings. They add to the local culture. Good antidote to millionaires row!
		I would like to see the Council be intelligent and compassionate in this matter.
		Leave everything as it is.
		Leave it alone and enforce the current regulations properly. Accept that the riverside boating community have been there for a considerable time, form part of the wider community and deserve to have their homes protected from this type of stress and uncertainty which seems to raise it's ugly head every couple of years thanks to the shortsighted snobbishness of a few monied, champagne socialist residents who have moved to the area with the intention of gentrifying and socially cleansing their surroundings for the sake of their already overpriced houses.
		Moorings licenses should be granted as a matter of priority to those of us on the waiting list who are actually here on the river waiting with our families AHEAD of all others on the waiting lists. If the others on the waiting list needed a mooring that badly, as we do, they would be here waiting with us for one.
		Note my comments on sewage disposal to which may be added disposal of waste oil. Note also the need for escape lines where vessels block river banks
		Please build a serviced marina in Cambridge/Fen Ditton
		Residents and visitors to the City are denied access to a lot of the areas now taken up with moored boats and a price should be paid for this. Recreational activities especially fishing from the riverbank is very limited now. Some areas of the River especially Stourbridge Common are turning into no go zones for residents and visitors as boats are not looked after and large groups gathering with animals and lighting fires and causing a nuisance. This isn't acceptable especially with the Council investing money in nearby parks for children. Riverside really needs tidying up it is unsightly for residents and visitors and does not give a good impression of the City.
		This is a difficult issue, but if approached with the appropriate respect for the lives and opinions of those most affected, a satisfactory outcome can be reached.
		Wheelie bins
		Yes it should be noted that the boating commiuty enhance Cambridge and have very little demand on anything in Cambridge putting up up with poor provision at the pump out never knowing if it works we should have rights and we should be respected as we respect others
		Yes, remove the council entirely from anything to do with boating and moorings and hand over everything to the Cam Conservators. Compared to the council they seem to have a brain and some humanity.