

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

IP Address	Response	Comment
	Yes	Assuming that facilities are also improving!
	Yes	I strongly support the maintaining of the mooring fee at its present level and oppose a sharp hike. I myself rent property in central Cambridge very close to the Common and am all too aware that we pay very high prices for the privilege of living in such a dynamic and historic town. Houseboats provide a practical solution to the issue of affordable housing in Cambridge. I know of no-one who objects to a gradual, index-linked rise in fees - this is entirely reasonable - but for owners who have spent years on a waiting list to suddenly be told that their cost of living is to potentially double seems draconian. Imagine if Council Tax were to be doubled overnight: residents would take to the streets!
	No	I'm a resident and I pay a lot more to live in Cambridge than the boat dwellers. This is unfair.
	No	Why would people on the river start to pay a lot more than what they are already when they've been there for so long. Living on a boat is meant to be an enjoyable, self-sufficient way of life, not paying massive amounts of money on council fees
	No	This is not compatible with the resources needed for the stated objective of providing a more comprehensive service including monitoring of mooring sites.
	Yes	I think the rates are fair if changed to length of vessel style charges
	Yes	Because rises above inflation would be difficult for the boat owners to afford
	No	It would mean that boats carry on paying less in Cambridge than anywhere else in the country.
	Yes	This appears to be a continuation of current policy as fees have increased each year since I took up residency.
	No	I didn't realise they paid so little. One thousand a year isn't very much given they don't pay council tax.
	No	Common land should be in law open to the commoner and his boat to moor on with his horse or goat or chickens or whatever they choose...not the council to make a claim over something that is not theirs to enclose and tax
	Yes	Yes, broadly speaking but in the context of overall river use/amenity costs and review eg looking at what should be contributed from main are of use increase, which is rowing
	No	The fees must be brought in line with market rates. All forms of housing in Cambridge are expensive and demand for river moorings far outstrips supply (hence the multi-year waiting list). The only way to fix this disparity is by a large correction over a short period of time. Perhaps not all in one go, but over several years the rental rates should rise to move in line with market rates, then continue to increase with the Retail Price Index (or similar).
	No	These moorings should be charged at the same rate as other boats in the cam & Ouse marinas
	Yes	those on boats tend to be poorer paid and cannot afford increases.
	Yes	The council provides only a very basic service i.e. Permission to moor, i.e. does not provide services such as electric hook up
	Yes	Facilities provided by the council for boaters are minimal therefore a fee increase is not justified
	Yes	The current fees represent the current lack of services
	Yes	The annual increase should be in line with inflation, with a cap to allow boaters to plan and budget for the future.
	No	They should be at a level slightly below Marina levels. These moorings are prime locations, local marinas may have better facilities but are not in prime locations.
	No	There are too many scruffy poorly maintained boats which appear to be unoccupied.
	No	The cost/income ratio is wrong. The fees are the cheapest around and prevent the council properly managing the moorings including illegals
	No	lower fees are detrimental to other social service budgets
	No	Should be graduated increase but not to level mentioned in option 1.2
	No	Cambridge City Council has a duty to council tax payers and city residents to run its business effectively and efficiently. As current mooring charges are out of step with other regional providers, Cambridge should increase charges significantly.
	No	Massive over demand leads to shortages, so prices should rise to reduce this shortage
	No	The aforementioned argument would suggest this is a bad option.
	No	Fees should be increased to a new baseline level that is a reasonable 'equivalent' to comparative locations and should not be based on marina/offriver fees which would not be fair at all. If this is difficult then the increase should still proceed but be more limited if there is no defensible comparative mooring to use.
	No	Mooring fees in Cambridge should be equivalent to those charged by other providers in a 60-70 mile radius of London for similar mooring type and services, not lower than those charged by any other provider in the country.
	Yes	This should no way be a revenue resource for the local council it would lead to a lot of hardship if mooring fees were increased and make even more people homeless which Cambridge City Council is not addressing either.
	No	If the fees are usually much higher (e.g. twice as high for the most comparable provider), an increase only by the annual inflation would take a very long time to reach a comparable fee. Especially as other providers should also increase their fees at least by the inflation rate. A sudden doubling of fees seems like a huge burden on mooring holders, so maybe a mixed model with a substantial rise now and annual increases (e.g. over the period of 3-5 years) might be the fairest option.
	No	As mentioned above, this does not provide enough income to cover the operational costs and provide for some reinvestment to improve the Cam
	No	There is a problem with overcrowding and the resource should be costed in line with other cities
	No	Moorings must be charged at the 'going rate' given the level of facilities provided, but this must not be based on marina sites which are not comparable.
	No	Because it's unfair that people mooring in this river have the benefit of paying less than people mooring in other rivers.
	No	It does not seem fair that people have access to all the services provided by the council, but pay very little for it
	No	There are many fees and rentals that do not increase yearly automatically. This is especially true in low r.p.i. and inflation years.
	Yes	You can only argue for parity with other areas if you are providing the same facilities to the boaters.
	No	The current licence fees are far too low, especially compared with other providers.
	No	the majority of boaters are disrespectful of their environment and consequently spoil the enjoyment of the river for the majority, they should pay for privilege of their inconsiderate and destructive behaviours the rest of us have to endure
	No	They should be set at the level needed for effective provision of minimum services and regulation
	No	The Council has a duty to all tax payers to maximise income
	No	moorings are a limited resource that is in demand. There is no justification for artificially suppressing fees or for fees not covering the full cost of providing, administering and developing the resource.
	Yes	But only in line with inflation unless there are significant improvements to services provided.
	No	The environmental impact of houseboating requires income to be combated. Cambridge has become known as a cheap haven for houseboaters which has exacerbated the current issue.
	No	If there is significant demand for spaces, and the council are charging significantly less than other providers, prices should go up.
	No	The council should not undercut the market rate as this distorts the market and is unfair to commercial providers whose taxes and business rates support council services.
	No	Substantially below market rates. If the council is to charge below market fees then this needs to be justified and applied for in the same way as other housing benefits
	No	The current fees do not reflect the congested river and the restricted space for mooring.
	No	Unfair on other people renting or buying houses in Cambridge- why should river dwellers have a subsidised life style?
	No	Land-based housing is significantly more expensive in Cambridge and the license fees need to be increased to reflect the demand.
	No	The council has a responsibility to maximise income from its assets for the benefit of all residents. The council should not subsidise residential moorings.
	No	The fees do not cover the services provided.
	No	If you are charging less than the going rate, then you should raise it so that the boaters are paying their fair share of the Council's costs.
	No	I don't think the price should rise just because the Council has realised that other authorities charge more. If there is a deficit then an increase should be charged to cover this only. I don't believe a profit should be made out of it to spend elsewhere unless the riverboat residents have specified a service that they think is in need of attention.
	Yes	The fact that no indication of the identity of the other 'mooring providers' used for 'benchmarking' purposes is given hardly engenders trust in the Consultation
	No	The fees are not high enough there are no band A flats in central Cambridge.
	No	Should be in line with other providers since mooring doesn't form part of social housing.
	No	The current fees are very low and attract people who have non-habitable boats to moor them, creating a nuisance without providing living accommodation.
	No	Why should residential boat owners get subsidised moorings when everyone else is paying a fortune to live in Cambridge?
	No	The current charges clearly do not work (certainly on riverside). There does not seem to be any duty of care exercised by boat dwellers along this stretch.
	Yes	Mooring fees should be on a sliding scale of 2% of annual income
	Yes	To avoid introducing further homelessness to Cambridge
	No	It acts as unfair subsidy to those boats and distorts the housing market
	No	Because, as I understand it, fees are currently far less than on other popular waterways. They should be substantially increased.
	Yes	The only justification for a substantial increase would be if facilities such as power, toilets, showers etc were to be provided.
	No	Should be in response to demand and in line with other parts of the country
	Yes	Tracking mooring fees to the lowest band of council tax, as it currently done seems very fair.
	Yes	Increases should be linked to council house rent rate increases, the people who live on board boats are saving money and resources in comparison to if they were to make forcibly make homeless because of a drastic mooring licence increase
	No	As an asset to the council, they should be put out at the best price the council can obtain.
	No	There is no help for housing I cannot get any help so live on the river
	No	Facilities are poor at the moment. It is unclear how boat owners get hold of water and where they dispose of dirty water/waste. A few of the boats appear abandoned, owners need to be incentivised to move unused / derelict boats. Fees need to be brought up to similar levels in comparison to other local authorities.
	No	Council needs to afford improved facilities and rents are low
	Yes	Cambridge isn't like other cities or other authorities in wanting to milk people who live here for all they've got. I think we value the many qualities that boaters bring to the city and enjoy the fact that there is some small measure of genuinely affordable housing here. The facilities here are also not great, it's not good to benchmark against other places without taking existing facilities into account.
	Yes	There must be clearly said what is going to be done with potential increased fees. Cambridge City Council is not a commercial mooring provider, and thus it is ill-reasoned to compare it with mentioned Marinas.
	No	If the moorings are not social housing allocated on social need and there is no means testing, then the fees should be set at market rates. They are in prime central Cambridge locations, taking up riverbank space and blocking views in our commons and parks. Perhaps higher fees could go to help pay for proper social housing. If it is true that Cambridge is charging the lowest mooring fees in the country, this is ridiculous.
	Yes	Cambridge isn't like other cities or other authorities in wanting to milk people who live here for all they've got. I think we value the many qualities that boaters bring to the city and enjoy the fact that there is some small measure of genuinely affordable housing here. The facilities here are also not great, it's not good to benchmark against other places without taking existing facilities into account.
	Yes	There must be clearly said what is going to be done with potential increased fees. Cambridge City Council is not a commercial mooring provider, and thus it is ill-reasoned to compare it with mentioned Marinas.
	No	If the moorings are not social housing allocated on social need and there is no means testing, then the fees should be set at market rates. They are in prime central Cambridge locations, taking up riverbank space and blocking views in our commons and parks. Perhaps higher fees could go to help pay for proper social housing. If it is true that Cambridge is charging the lowest mooring fees in the country, this is ridiculous.
	No	They should be increased to market rates.
	No	It is clearly a little too cheap. A reasonable increase could see demand level with supply. Although people who cannot afford it should be helped
	No	Because I want to comment that the preamble suggests annual increases in line with the Consumer Price Index (CPI), whereas the question itself suggests annual increases in line with the Retail Price Index, a different and usually higher measure of inflation. Increases in housing costs should be determined with reference to the CPI, as the RPI is itself affected by increases in housing costs.
	No	I believe that the fees are substantially below market rate.
	No	the fees should be comparable with those elsewhere in the country
	No	This area being so low in cost leads to the huge overcrowding in house boats that we have seen. Making it more expensive will ease the pressure of the river, encouraging less people to moor here.
	Yes	Increase by a very small amount. Most moored boats are owned by poor people
	No	Rates should be similar to comparable rates in other places. This is minimal as Cambridge is a highly desirable place to live
	No	I'm not sure how this would work out, but why shouldn't boats or mobile homes pay the same kind of council tax as a fixed property.
	No	The council should maximise this revenue stream in the same way as it does council taxes.
	No	Why should boaters benefit from cheap mooring. They are not necessarily the MOST deserving of cheap housing, they are just the ones who got in first. We would all like to have cheap/free housing. I do not see why Cambridge council should offer it to a self selecting few.
	Yes	The people living on the boat will need time to adjust their finances if you suddenly change this.
	Yes	With the price of housing as it is, the absolute minimum increase should be made, if not a reduction
	Yes	I know quite a few people on the boats, and I think this is the best option for them. They are not rich.
	No	This will not fund the operational costs of the service, also boat dwellers should pay towards the broader services they use.
	No	I think this is very cheap. I know it is supposed to be related to a band A property, but for central Cambridge, with the floor space of some of the boats, it should be higher on that basis.
	Yes	The mooring fees based on band A council tax is fair and reasonable. It gives predictability and recompense for the council services used by the boating community.
	No	Incomes are often not increasing in line with inflation
	Yes	Substantial increases may unfairly penalise the inhabitants of the boats who may struggle to find alternative accommodation. Homelessness, if it results, will place an unnecessary strain on council resources.
	No	Boat owners should, at least, pay equivalent to other parts of country and there should a reasonable comparison made with cost of renting a flat/bedsit
	No	fees are currently charged at a council tax rate relative to the value of the 'property', without taking into account the location of the 'property' which is evidently a huge factor in the value of any residential property!
	Yes	The licence fee should be based on council tax, and increase like with council tax, maintain the link with democratic council elections

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	modest annual increase determined by inflation on the basis that the boats are homes not leisure craft and the council would not double the council tax on house dwellers who all have much better service provision for less pe square foot than any of the boats
	Yes	£2000 is not unreasonable to live within walking distance of the city.
	No	0%
	No	0%
	No	0%
	No	0% increase. Similar authorities in Great Britain provide the following. Electricity, showers, toilets, diesel, parking, postal address. The City council provides none
	No	0% with annual increase in line with RPI
	No	0%. The provision for mooring permit holders on the commons is minimal, arguably non-existent. It's just a river bank! The recent refurbishment of the concrete along the bank of Midsomer Common could have easily incorporated mooring rings, but didn't.
	No	10%
	Yes	10%
	No	10%
	No	-10%
	Yes	10% per year until the current charge is doubled in real terms
	Yes	100%
	Yes	100% e.g. Doubling
	Yes	100% increase
	Yes	100% increase would be appropriate. Any increase in fees to existing users should be phased in over 4 years to provide some help with this imposed increase.
	Yes	100% increase would still be very low
	Yes	100% increase, perhaps in stages over a few years
	Yes	100% minimum
	Yes	100%. Do this over a number of years if you must.
	Yes	15% per year. And also require boats to be in a decent condition. I suspect that many of the boats (particularly those on Riverside) would not be accepted in a marina because they are in such poor condition and kept in such an untidy state.
	Yes	15% would not be unreasonable. I think that in exchange the council should provide better services for moorers - improved water supply, potentially direct electricity supplies, better access and communal waste areas.
	Yes	150%: Cambridge, as a much better location than others, should be a premium location.
	No	2%
	No	2%
	Yes	20%
	No	20%
	Yes	20%
	Yes	25% per annum
	No	25%-30%
	Yes	25%pa
	No	4%
	No	5%
	No	5%
	No	5% over inflation
	No	5% over inflation rise annually above the current baseline fees.
	Yes	5% per year
	Yes	50%
	Yes	50%
	Yes	50% per annum for a period of three years
	No	A 100 % increase in licence fees would have detrimental social impacts for many residents.

No	A disproportionate increase in fees from their current level will have the unpleasant consequence of making people homeless. Don't do it. Cambridge is expensive enough to live in as it is.
No	A doubling of fees overnight for those who do not have a large amount of disposable income each month is entirely unfair - a 5% increase which is regulated and consulted would be much more reasonable.
No	A one hundred percent increase in fee is completely unreasonable and unjustified. Why would the council choose to disproportionately target this small community to raise additional funds? An increase in fees is not justified by the costs of administering the mooring licenses and is not matched by a planned increase in service provision. I find it staggering that the council would even consider doubling the cost of someone's home. It is an obscene proposal.
No	A sliding scale. 2% of annual income
No	A smaller increase would be more appropriate. 10-20%.
No	a) many people currently living there wouldn't be able to afford this b) the council doesn't provide any facilities except being able to more there (other places have electric hookups, showers, toilets, etc so the prices are not comparable)
No	An increase that reflects the running costs of the area. I believe the area is already in profit so I see no reason for an increase
No	An increase with inflation will be more appropriate.
No	An inflation rise is a reasonable amount. It is ludicrous to double the fees. Nobody would ever expect their council tax to double in one year, and it is beyond unconscionable that it raising fees that much could even be suggested.
Yes	Any increase necessary to bring fees in line with similar providers.
No	Any percentage increase would have to be in line isn't past raises in council tax as it affects households, or boat holds in the same way. To sharp a rise would mean making people homeless.
No	Around 1% would be the highest raise I could bear to see, inflation is a measure that is quite far removed from people's lives and real money in people's pockets is going down.
No	as 1.1 - the lack of facilities, rights and security means that charging similar to other places is disproportionate
No	as option 1.1
No	as option 1.1
No	As stated in option 1, in line with inflation.
Yes	As suggested (ie 100%).
Yes	At least 100% increase. I cannot believe that the city is charging so little. At least charge the same as other councils. If people are on low incomes they could claim housing benefit.
Yes	At least 50%, probably double then moderate inflation increases
No	Baseline fees should be based on the cost of providing services: in that context, it makes sense for them to be comparable to the council tax payable for a modest dwelling.
No	Better facilities if you want to higher fees.
Yes	Bring in line with other providers, but in a series of annual increments over, say, 4 years.
Yes	Bring it in line with the country if not in line with the current accommodation market in Cambridge. The river is for everyone to enjoy, to use it as budget accommodation for a few is a waste.
Yes	Bring the fees upto what others charge - doubling fees
No	Broad benchmarking against distant mooring situations is far less relevant than the local context and local river strategy informing provision, funding and income policy
Yes	But the increase should be done on a gradual basis, so that the licence would be in line with elsewhere in say 5 years. There would of course be a duty on the Council to then provide the level of services that Riverside land residents receive.
Yes	Cambridge is an expensive place to live for its residents and as someone who pays a fortune for rent, I kind of would hope that everyone else pays a fortune and contributes to local services similarly.
No	Cambridge offers very little in terms of riverside supplies. The narrow boat dwellers are not allowed to use the public bins, there are no electrical supply points and only two local water supplies. Doubling the fees does not match the amenities that the current dwellers receive.
No	Consumer price index
No	council provides no facilities to justify 2k charge, no power or waste or water, and nothing else. 1k is fair for no amities for a boat of 70feet
No	current baseline
No	Current fees appear to be set at a maintainable level for the services provided. The fee's should represent the councils costs in maintaining moorings not how much people are willing to pay.
No	Current providers actually provide more for boat residents than provided by Cambridge at current prices. Increases will create hardship for people with mortgages on their boats.
Yes	Double
Yes	Double the fee then apply inflationary increases
No	Doubling fees overnight would be a horrendous way to treat people, many of whom have lived in the area for many years. It could make a number homeless almost immediately and force many to leave jobs and livelihoods in the area.
No	Doubling fees would price out many community members and would not provide any of the services which the moors you speak of have. Just because other parts of the country make it hard for boating communities doesn't mean you should.
Yes	Doubling sounds fair.
No	Doubling the amount seems ridiculous and greedy.
No	Doubling the fee overnight is unethical and would make people living in an environmentally healthy way homeless.
No	elsewhere in the country fees are for luxury boating, for holiday and second home boats, belonging to people with large incomes. Many of the boating community would be unable to pay this and would be forced out of their homes as a result.
Yes	Enough to match what other councils charge for the same services.
No	Entirely unfair to increase fees to a baseline comparable to other providers when Cambridge council does not provide ANY of the facilities offered in other locations. If hot water, showers, electrical hook ups, gas boaters, storage space, more than 2 water points for over 100 boats.
Yes	For city centre residential mooring with a fixed location a charge of £4500 per annum would not be unusual. Bearing in mind the fact that there are not allocated spaces a lesser fee, but in excess of £2000 would still be very fair.
Yes	full potential should be exploited - so higher rates in line with 'similar' providers -
Yes	Greater than 100% - see below answer (essentially, as Cambridge is so popular, you can charge more than other areas).
No	have charges for servicing the moorings doubled over the past 5 - 10 years?
Yes	However I think that this needs to take into account incomes or help those who are not able to pay this amount...at least for the first 5 years to give them a chance to find alternative arrangements
No	I am horrified that a doubling of fees could be introduced at a stroke. Many boat dwellers operate quite near the breadline already and this would put them off the river and very likely unable to find other affordable accommodation nearby.
No	I do not agree with such a substantial increase in one go. I feel that a gradual increase per year would be a much better way to approach this. I am not certain what would be an appropriate increase without seeing the figures.
Yes	I do not know enough about the numbers to determine an appropriate increase
Yes	I don't have enough information. Clearly fees should to some extent reflect the level of facilities provided, though.
No	I fear this option would a negative effect on the ability of those on low or modest means, if there was a simple way of safeguarding access for those of low or most means I would support it.
Yes	I support the significant increase if the facilities are brought up to date and in line with rest of the country
No	I think this should be done in line with appropriate local comparisns as I suggest in my answer to 1.1
Yes	I would suggest an annual increase plus inflation to bring charges in line with common scales elsewhere.
No	If done this would be best implemented slowly over a number of years to reduce the impact.
No	In line with inflation
No	In line with inflation
No	In line with inflation. Sort out empty unused boats which will increase Council money. Don't punish those who have always paid.
Yes	In line with similar facilities elsewhere
Yes	In line with the National average.
No	In line with the rate at which changes to other household incomes such as increases to Council Tax. A recommendation to double the mooring fee with the incursion of VAT which must be paid brings the contribution the Council would be expecting from all boaters to Council services above the contribution expected from houses in Council tax band F. Adding this to the expense that boaters also have of their river licence would bring their standard expenses up to a minimum of £3000 a year
Yes	Increase to the same as other rivers.
No	Indexation to cost of living increases
No	Inflation
No	Inflation as measured by RPI
No	Inflation: A substantial (100%) step-change in fees will leave many current residents struggling by significantly changing their budget calculations without any warning. Altering the rates they used when making investment choices such as buying a boat so rapidly and significantly would be completely irresponsible and unfair.
No	In line with inflation or the increase in council tax, whichever is the lower amount
No	Insupportable economic hardship to boaters.
No	It is completely immoral to double the costs overnight for any residents of the city, especially an established and stable community.
No	It is not feasible to predict a fair increase without visibility of what facilities would be introduced.
No	It is unfair to current boaters to massively increase their fees. If an increase is deemed necessary, it should be done gradually, so that people have time to adjust to the new system.
No	It seems punitive to suddenly double the costs of anything. Imagine the uproar if this principle was applied to Council Tax or parking fees. If the council wanted to bring fees in line with other providers, I would suggest that it should be done over a number of years and for the increase in facilities to be very clearly spelled out.
No	It would be too drastic a change and drive off many existing residents. I'd also like to see the figures for mooring costs across the country.
No	It would be unreasonable to double the fees - imagine that happening to your council tax - particularly in view of the council-admitted low level of facilities provided. Perhaps a 25% increase with better facilities and then a slow increase yearly based on inflation would be more reasonable.
No	just inflation.
No	less than 5% is reasonable.
No	Less than 50%. The cost of running my boat, mooring fees, river tax etc used to make it roughly the same price as my much bigger flat.
No	Making moorings double the price would simply make it less available to those who cannot afford that. Elsewhere in the country for that price a full supply of amenities including secure gated moorings and toilet and shower facilities is provided. Current charges are in line with mooring on public accessed riverbanks.
Yes	Market price should be sought like all rents and charges for houses and shops in the city
Yes	Minimum annual increases until comparable rate is achieved. For example rate should increase by the largest of 5% or CPI. This is not onerous and is fair.
No	More closely linked to the amenities provided. I cannot imagine the council has thus far been operating the moorings at a loss? An overnight doubling of mooring fees (or any other form of living cost) is utterly unreasonable and takes no account of people's budgets. Has the other mooring provider mentioned had their mooring fees costed to find out whether they are fair? Or has the council just felt that if the there was a chance of getting that kind of money, that they should ask for it? What facilities exactly are being charged for other than a waste disposal point, two water points and towpath litter collection?
No	Most of the people living on boats have a low income. RPI or similar
Yes	moving toward rate similar to other providers on the network make sense though for most berths there are limited facilities hence you should not be charging full marina rates
No	nil increase
No	no appropriate percentage - see option 1.1
No	No change
No	No evidence that a higher fee is necessary beyond minimum as above. Affordable and low cost housing is in such short supply that it seems churlish to ask for more given the low numbers involved.
No	no increase
No	No more than cost of living/services provided cost increase per year.
No	No, many of the boat residents with mooring licences in Cambridge, including families with single parents/disabled children, who have lived on the Cambridge moorings for decades, would not afford this increase - there is no where else locally to move their boat so that they can moor and access school. Many of the boat residents, including some vulnerable people, are on a low income and would be forced out of Cambridge, where they work, if fees are increased, so that better-off people, from out of Cambridge, can instead move into the mooring space. This is outrageous social cleansing, in a time where there is a serious affordable housing crisis in Cambridge. It is clearly an unethical moneygrabbing attempt by the council.
No	None
No	None other than inflation yet again your forcing people from there homes
No	Not 100% increase! If this goes ahead it's appalling
No	Outrageous to increase the fees by so much in these difficult times
No	Overly sharp increase, perhaps applied over a few years this would be reasonable
No	pegged to inflation/cost of living would be reasonable, doubling the rates to boaters without a suitable notice period to allow for planning would be unacceptable
Yes	Perhaps a stepped increase over several years would be more manageable for those living in boats.
Yes	Phase in the increase to the benchmark over a number of years in order to make it planmable for current licensees.
Yes	Provided it was phased in over several years to avoid a financial shock.
No	rate of inflation
No	RPI or less
No	Same as council tax in the locality
No	Same percentage as council tax
Yes	Same rate as council tax increase for the least.
Yes	say 30% first year 60% second year 90% third year 100% fourth year
No	See above. Why increase them anyway without any change in the service provided? It makes no sense to put people out of their homes.
No	See answer above on affordability
No	See answer to 1.3. Please note that 1.1 has two elements - to use current fee then apply inflation adjustment; 1.2 does not have future inflation adjustment. A hybrid of these is required.
No	See comments above.
No	Services offered on the river Cam do not offer similar facilities to the majority of sites offering residential moorings elsewhere in the country. In fact facilities offered on the Cam are minimal, rendering such a high increase unacceptable and unsustainable, as it would make fees unaffordable for many.
Yes	Should be baselined against similar places by an independent body
No	slightly above inflation only
Yes	Staged increase over e.g. 3 or 4 years
Yes	Stepped increases over 4/5 years
No	That is a significant increase all in one go and would not really be equitable. It is not the fault of the boat owners that CCC have charged a lower rate. Would support a graduated (Over a number of years) increase to to 75% of comparable services elsewhere
No	That is far too much for the basic level of facilities provided.
No	The boat dwellers are low impact...have access to no services...consequently they are mostly low income and should be treated fairly...not regarded as a revenue stream!
Yes	The change to higher charges in line with regional providers should be made gradually over a period of 6 years, to allow current mooring licence holders time to adjust to the higher levels. Any new arrivals should be charged at the same 'current' rate and be informed of the planned changes.
No	The council needs to provide facilities to justify such an increase. Whilst facilities for boaters remain basic a fee increase cannot be justified, the lack of facilities is the central factor that leads to issues.
No	The current system of basing the fees on the lowest level of council tax seems fair, increasing this because other places are more expensive (and it seems offer much better provision of mooring services) does not seem a fair approach for those people living on boats
No	The existing agreed method of setting fees to match band A council tax is reasonable and predictable. Imagine the outcry if the council doubled band A council tax in one year. Comparisons with private moorings are unrealistic because no provisions are made (not even rings) to attach mooring lines).
No	The improvement of facilities is too vaguely defined to vindicate double price.
No	The local mooring fee has been set for years to be equivalent to the Council Tax on a similarly sized flat. This seems reasonable.
Yes	The mooring fees should be brought in line, but gradually so over 5 years
No	The official UK inflation rate is for 2016 was 1.4%
No	The rest of the country has a significantly larger cruising area and provides boaters with more facilities. I thought the idea was to charge boaters a similar level as the lowest council tax, which seems sensible. It would be outrageous if it cost twice as much to live on a boat than a house in Cambridge!
No	The same as council tax + any additional costs not related to similar services received by ordinary homes eg pump-out facilities or mooring ring maintenance. People should not be priced out of living on Boats in Cambridge.
No	The services are completely substandard compared to a mooring of double the price.
No	There are no services provided by the council other than the bare right to moor, which are not available to anybody paying the navigation licence. So this is a false comparison. Magic an electric hook, give us vehicular access and so on and it might be comparable, at the moment it isn't.
No	there is no appropriate percentage as a, the council provides little in the way of facilities and b, considering the miniscule carbon footprint most boats achieve we should be rewarded not penalised and c, boat owners are not rich.
No	There should be NO increase
No	This is a ridiculous proposal. The council should be ashamed. Boaters have minimal facilities, and also pay for these facilities via the River licence
Yes	This is about charging market rates not giving subsidised rates...you could achieve over a phased period e.g. 3-5 years.
No	This is manifestly unfair as you provide very few services to boat owners
No	This is not reasonable and would cause great harm to those currently depending on these facilities. We are talking about people's homes!
Yes	This must take account of the services you are providing. Like; footpath, bollards, bank stabilization, lighting, security, electricity, waste disposal, dredging, grass mowing etc.
No	This would cause great economic hardship to many boaters, many of whom have mortgages on their boats that they need to repay and have very little spare money each month.
No	This would produce great economic hardship
Yes	To be in line with similar situations elsewhere - possibly over a few years.
Yes	to bring in line with charges elsewhere
Yes	To bring them in line with national average and increase them annually across the board by e.g. inflation.
No	To go up with annual earnings
No	To hold license fees at current levels with a modest annual increase determined by inflation.
No	To keep them as they are: it would cause great economic hardship to those, and make many homeless - it's not a particularly clever idea for the council to make people homeless that will just end up on their housing lists! But of course many of these would not fall within the categories of the council being obligated to house them - so they would have no safety net! Please don't make people homeless who are living in happy communities, with jobs in Cambridge, and children in local schools, all for the sake of making a bit of money! You aren't providing the facilities that other providers of mooring do: those on the Cam get nothing so you're doubling the fee and will be offering nothing back in return, which is absurd.
No	Too high too soon
No	Unchanged, given that no facilities are offered, so that comparison with charges elsewhere may be misleading
No	Use the current fees as a base line and increase fees in line with increases in the Council Tax

No	We are appalled at the prospect of fees doubling overnight. This could cause great harm and hardship to many boaters
Yes	Whatever brings fees in line with other providers in a 60-70 mile radius of London. The cost of a mooring will still be very low compared to other forms of boating.
Yes	Whatever is required to make them equivalent to current commercial providers.
Yes	Whatever the market rate is
No	why not keep them at the level they are at. The current residents can afford this and increasing it will be detrimental. In line with similar facilities elsewhere is meaningless.
No	Why should you charge more, when you have no repair or maintenance or repair responsibilities for the vessels? The provision of waste disposal and potable water is also minimal so you can hardly compare with either housing or private boat moorings.
Yes	with a deduction for people who are working in the city and means tested
Yes	Yes double would be reasonable
Yes	Yes. Cambridge is a popular city to live in. Buying or renting a house is significantly more expensive than most other places in the country. Therefore I don't see any reason not to bring mooring fees to the same level as elsewhere.
No	You have yet to organise payment of licence fees from all those using the moorings, so this massive increase will unfairly hit those boat dwellers who have worked with you and followed your rules for a long time. They have experienced fellow boat dwellers who have consistently ignored your rules and moored for free. You will lose much goodwill if you now 'punish' those who have consistently paid for a licence. Only in line with inflation.
No	You should no more than 10% with an annual increase in line with inflation.
No	You would make many boaters homeless by a huge increase and we already have enough rough sleepers in Cambridge to make me ashamed of our council.
No	You'd be causing homelessness, many people who moor on the river would not have the means to rent privately at Cambridge prices, the homeless situation is bad enough as it is, it's not in the Council's interest to make it worse

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
Yes	A cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation.	
Yes	introduction of a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation so that we can plan securely for the future	
No	We'd love to see the introduction of a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation so that we can plan securely for the future.	
Yes	1. The cost of providing the mooring service divided by the number of issued licences plus a percentage of the lowest band of council tax to cover the services available to boaters. You could offer a costed projection each year for improvements that the council want to undertake along the riverside and what increase this would add to the licence the following year/two years/three years etc. 2. Link the cost of annual mooring (taking into account the expense of river licences) to the value of the home/asset in a similar way to Council tax. At present the £200 licence plus £800 river licence each year equates to 6.6% of the value of my home. (£31,024 would be the equivalent on the value of the average home in Cambridge) Assess and establish a financial value of the council services used by boaters and equate this to a percentage of the lowest rate of council tax then add these two components together.	
Yes	25% per annum until target figure is reached	
Yes	5 % increase over inflation	
Yes	5 year licence at fixed rate to allow people to plan	
Yes	5% cap for increases	
Yes	5% cap on fee increases above inflation unless services are significantly improved	
Yes	a cap introduced on fee increases of no more than 5% (over inflation).	
Yes	A cap of fee increases of no more than 5%	
Yes	A cap of no more than 5% over inflation.	
Yes	A cap on fee increases at no more than 5%.	
Yes	A cap on fee increases of 5% would allow local houseboat residents to plan their futures more securely.	
Yes	A cap on fee increases of no more than 5% above inflation so that people living on boats can plan for their future.	
Yes	A cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation so that we can plan securely for the future.	
Yes	A cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation to allow for safe future planning by boaters.	
Yes	A cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation, so that the boating community can plan securely for the future.	
Yes	A cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation, so we can plan securely for the future.	
Yes	A cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation.	
Yes	A cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation	
Yes	a cap on fees at 5%	
Yes	A cap on future increases so they stay in line with the equivalent council tax	
Yes	A cap on increases	
Yes	A cap on the fee of no more than 5% over inflation so boaters can budget without the undue stress and upset sudden price hikes cause.	
Yes	A hierarchical scale based on availability of services such as water, postboxes and electricity - the latter of which are not currently provided by the council at all. These fees should also rise in line with inflation levels, to prevent sudden increases leading to financial hardship of boat dwellers.	
Yes	A lower price increase to allow the current moorers the chance to plan for the extra charges, you are expecting human beings to either pay up or get out which seems very unfair, especially in today's financial climate, at least give them the chance to increase what they can afford.	
Yes	A rent rise may be needed if rents are much lower than other cities but it is not right to double the rent. A moderate approach would be a small rise of 20% max this year and then in line with inflation subsequently	
Yes	A River Tax put on Rowing clubs as they have more of detrimental effect on the wildlife and general peace and quiet of the area.	
Yes	A sliding scale, 2% of annual income	
Yes	A small gradual increase that is no greater than inflation	
Yes	A small gradual increase that is no greater than inflation or it is fine as it is!	
Yes	Adjust current fees according to boat length about a mean so those with boats shorter than the mean pay a bit less than now and those with longer boats pay a bit more than they do now.	
Yes	Affordability should be the guiding principle, not market rates. Housing across the UK is too expensive and alternative housing, such as boats, should provide an opportunity to use housing models that are socially fair, not financially punitive.	
Yes	Allow the boaters to self manage	
Yes	An increase of an agreed % as renting a property	
Yes	An introduction of a cap on fee increases no more than 5%	
Yes	Annual fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation, capped.	
Yes	Another alternative that could also be taken in to consideration is charging by length of boat. When the flat fee was introduced when the mooring fee came in many boaters of smaller boats instantly upgraded to longer boats as fee was same.	
Yes	Any increase should be gradual and capped to a fixed percentage above inflation. This would help limit the damage to vulnerable residents	
Yes	Any large step-change is going to be very difficult for the river users to deal with, capping any charge seems fair and reasonable. Given that moorings in general are a scarce commodity in popular areas and thus subject to commercial pressures the 'fair market rate' must be treated with caution by a public body.	
Yes	As for housing fees should be commensurate with the size of the boat, however, how this is determined is up for debate.	
Yes	As per housing association rents - inflation + 1%	
Yes	Ask the Inland Waterways Association	
Yes	Auction of all new mooring licences to maximise income for the council.	
Yes	Auction slots on annual basis - highest bidder wins	
Yes	Auction-based distribution	
Yes	Base it on the council tax lowest band.	
Yes	Based on actual costs of any associated services.	
Yes	Based on Council Tax Band A.	
Yes	Based on council tax. Small boat up to 50' foot Band A, larger boats + wide boats Band B	
No	based on income	
Yes	Boat length seems a logical bases upon which to determine fees and charges.	
Yes	Bring boat owners under the general council tax system, e.g. a boat could be comparable to Band A.	
Yes	Bring fees in line with other providers but with increases staggered over an defined time period to enable the boaters to plan	
Yes	Build a marina	
Yes	Calculate mooring fees based on average council house rents in Cambridge. Boats should also pay council tax but it could be less than the lowest band for houses. The size of the boat could be compared to a typical Band A property to make it fairer.	
Yes	Cap fee increase per year at no more than 5% over inflation	
Yes	Cap fee increases at 5% - needs to be in line with wage rises or National Income	
Yes	Cap fee increases at no more than 5% over inflation so people can budget accordingly.	
Yes	Cap fee increases to prevent unfair rises	
Yes	Cap fees at inflation only. Additional income if needed could come from charging for Riverside moorings.	
Yes	Cap fees at say 5-10% above inflation per year to avoid dramatic increases	
Yes	Cap fees to no more than 5% over inflation	
Yes	Cap increase at 5%	
Yes	Cap increases at 5% above inflation	
Yes	Cap increases to no more than 5% per year.	
Yes	Cap of 5%	
Yes	cap on fee increases	
Yes	Cap on fee increases based on a percentage above inflation, e.g. 3-5%	
Yes	Cap on fee increases no more than 5% over inflation	
Yes	cap on fee increases of no more than 5%	
Yes	Cap on fee increases of no more than 5% above inflation	
Yes	Cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation	
No	Cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation	
Yes	Cap on fee increases at no more than 5% over inflation	
Yes	Cap on increases of no more than 5% over inflation so that we can plan securely for the future	
Yes	Cap rises at no more than 5% above inflation to allow for predictable financial planning by residential boaters.	
Yes	cap the fees!!! No huge increases over 5%	
Yes	cap to no more than 5% above inflation	
Yes	Capped annual increases to allow boaters to budget for the future, and give the council flexibility to increase when costs increase. People shouldn't have to live with the prospect of fees today, gone tomorrow councillors and officials occasionally picking large numbers out of a hat	
Yes	Carry on as at present with a mooring fee set at Band A Council Tax rate in total, tied to a residential requirement.	
Yes	Changes probably need a 1-2 year announcement given for how long most boats seem to have been down there. I guess something similar to what is done elsewhere, e.g. Colleges, is to plan ahead and set something that people can plan with, but also something that is reasonable. You are talking about increase by inflation in Option 1.1. Having a maximum that is no more than a few percent higher than inflation would certainly help to plan with a yearly increase.	
Yes	Charge by length. This is the normally way of doing things for moorings. It also means it's more affordable for people to have smaller vessels. However, it would be unfair to dramatically increase anyone's fees but I do think if money is truly needed for investing in the river then larger boats should pay more.	
Yes	charge by width x length (over all size of boat)	
Yes	charge more for wide-berthed boats which are a) less attractive and b) cause more nuisance to other river users.	
Yes	Charge ONLY Band A Council tax (no additional mooring charge) because that is commensurate with the size of property (-boat) and the services provided.	
Yes	Charges should reflect the cost to the Council of providing services to boaters.	
Yes	Charging should be set at close to inflation rates	
Yes	Commercial vessels should have different rates/charges to domestic vessels	
Yes	Consider the length of time a boat is moored for, time based fee structure.	
Yes	Consult the boaters association and make sure you are not forcing people from their homes	
Yes	Cost of maintaining the moorings + small admin charge divided between all users of the Cam.	
Yes	Could you do a survey of the boaters to see if they would be in favour of a modest increase in fees in order to provide improved services	
Yes	Council tax at local basic rate, for rubbish disposal, policing etc.	
Yes	Council Tax Rates + 'cost of providing moorings' capped at say 10-20% of Council Tax so it covers costs but isn't prohibitive.	
Yes	CP on fee increases in line with inflation	
Yes	Do not change the fees until you have found a means to fairly justify the price hike. Increase and improve the almost nonexistent amenities available to the boating community.	
No	don't raise the charges.	
Yes	EA method	
Yes	Expenditure on supporting the facility and licensing process plus 20% on top to invest in the river health, or just introduce "river health" fee for every vessel separately and invest it in support of Cam cleanliness and ecohealth, and only charge proportionate amount for mooring.	
Yes	Fee increases have to be consulted with the boaters first to see their take on how fees are proportionate to services provided.	
Yes	Fee increases should be allowed to rise in line with inflation, and there should be a firm cap on price rises (e.g. no more than 5% above inflation). This would provide security for the boat owners.	
Yes	Fees by boat length are normal practice elsewhere.	
Yes	Fees should be capped to take into account the fact that the boating community provides essential affordable housing in Cambridge	
Yes	Fees should be equivalent to council tax charged for land-based properties of comparable size and location	
Yes	Fees should be in line and comparable to what the council charges land based residents. It's unfair to have small rises for house dwellers and double boaters fees	
Yes	fees should be increased annually by Retail Price Index	
Yes	Fees should be linked to council tax - therefore equivalent to other services. Council Tax is not subject to annual review. Inflationary increases in fees (if agreed as option 1.1) should be capped at 3-4%	
Yes	fees should be set at a level which covers the cost of providing services to boaters an annual increase at rpi or similar would be acceptable but with a cap of max 5% over inflation in any case, so that boaters can plan with some financial certainty	
Yes	Fees should not be doubled, this would make boat living unaffordable for many	
Yes	Fees should reflect the cost to the council of maintaining moorings. No more, no less.	
Yes	Fees should rise higher than inflation	
Yes	Fees were based on council tax band A and should remain.	
Yes	First establish, or re establish, communications with the parties involved. Make the changes necessary or deemed necessary to fit in with health and safety regulations, as far as is reasonable to expect, and then consider any price changes.	
Yes	For long term dwelling fees should be charged on a per person basis, boat owners get little to no facilities or services compared to people with street addresses. However in saying that (and this should be the same with normal housing) if no-one is actually living on the boats for a certain amount of the year (2nd home kind of thing) they should be charged more council tax they are effectively the cause of housing issues elsewhere.	
Yes	Given the popularity of the Cam, you could probably charge more than the surrounding areas, making other areas far more attractive.	
Yes	Grandfather rights	
Yes	Having a cap on fees to ensure the boating community can afford to continue living where they do	
Yes	How long the residents have lived on the river, whether that is their only residence. Increased priced for those who own property. Increased fees for those looking to buy and live on boats in the future.	
Yes	I agree that they should be pegged to inflation and capped at no more than 5%	
No	I believe they should be capped to prevent the council from gentrifying the area for profit.	
Yes	I don't have sufficient information to provide detailed alternatives	
Yes	I fully support a scheme which would cap fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation so that those on liveaboards can plan securely for the future.	
Yes	I think the baseline fee should be re-linked to Council Tax Band A. Failing that it should be increased only in line with inflation annually.	
Yes	I think ultimately fees should be in line with national averages but would suggest a longer term increase, say 25% per annum over 4 years. This would give the owners time to adjust and plan for the increased cost	
Yes	I would consider raising them above the wider market rates until demand balances supply. I.e., a real market	
Yes	I would like to see the introduction of a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation so that boaters can plan securely for the future.	
Yes	I would suggest that fees increase in line with inflation.	
Yes	If fees have to be increased, then it should be done slowly over a number of years so boat dwellers have time to plan and organise their finances. If the number of boats remains as it is (rather than the boats along Riverside being removed) then this already increases the overall sum due to the council.	
Yes	If more revenue is needed an increase of say 5% plus inflation in spread out stages (over say ten years) to make an overall increase of say 25% would be reasonable	
Yes	If review shows that the fees are too low, then a more gradualist approach is needed (RPI + X). Sudden doubling is too much of a shock.	
Yes	If the aim is to improve the aesthetic environment of the river, as appears to be a priority, then a fee which might be higher than currently, but part of which can be offset by proving expenditure on external maintenance of the boat might encourage better maintenance - for example, raise fees to £1500, but allow them to be reduced by £100 for every £150 spent on maintenance per year, up to a maximum of £300. The same revenue as would be derived from doubling fees and removing 1/3 of the boats could be obtained by incorporating the 30 or so boats along Riverside in the licence scheme and raising the individual fees by 1/3.	
No	If the current rate means that enough is being generated then why increase it?	
Yes	If there is say, a 10% rise in council tax across the whole of Cambridge, I could get behind putting up the mooring fees by a commensurate 10%. But don't treat the river differently.	
Yes	If you were to improve facilities, for instance an electrical hook up, which would reduce the need for onboard generators. Then you could charge an initial hook up fee and an annual maintenance charge.	
No	In line with council tax for band for small properties - why should boaters pay more than residents in small houses nearby (if am a local resident)	
Yes	In line with council tax if you upgrade the moorings and services!	
Yes	In line with inflation with no sudden hikes causing hardship to those affected	
Yes	in line with inflation, based on today's price	
Yes	Increase from current levels in line with the lowest band of community charge	
Yes	Increase licence fees for all users including rowers anglers & leisure users not just moorings.	
Yes	Increase usage of winter moorings.	
Yes	Increases must be capped to avoid sudden unexpected hikes in cost.	
Yes	Increases to be matched to rate of inflation.	
No	Inflation based rises on the current fees would seem to be the fairest way to charge the boat owners	
Yes	Introduce a cap of 5% rises above inflation.	
Yes	introduce a cap on fee increases	
Yes	Introduce a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% above inflation so that boaters can plan for the future	
Yes	Introduce a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% above inflation	
Yes	Introduce a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation so boaters can plan securely for the future.	
Yes	Introduce a cap on increases made to fees, so there are no nasty surprises for boat owners	
Yes	introduce cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation so that boaters can plan securely for the future.	

Yes	Introduce the new high fees for all future licenses, and either maintain fees for existing licenses or very slowly increase them.
Yes	Introduction of a cap on fee - increases of no more than 5% over inflation
Yes	Introduction of a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation
Yes	Introduction of a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation so that people can plan securely for the future.
Yes	It is fine to increase the fees, but this needs to be done over time, and with the provisions of exceptions for 5 years of so to allow people to make alternative arrangements if they cannot live here any longer...as I don't think that it is fair for them to end up being evicted as this may mean that they would lose their job, or their kids would need to change school...
Yes	It is not helpful that boats do not have fixed locations as this encourages anti-social behaviour. When a craft is in a 'prime' location they are often nervous of leaving even to use the pump-out facilities for fear of losing their space. The fees could be banded by broad locations i.e. Jubilee Gardens the most expensive etc.
Yes	It seems unfair that boaters are under constant threat of fees being possibly doubled. A cap on fees of some sort would be reassuring and ensure fairness.
Yes	It would be good to see the introduction of a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation so that we can plan securely for the future.
Yes	It would be ideal, but probably impossible, to have a lower fee for the unengaged and the low-paid, and a higher fee for those who could afford it. I don't think length of boat should matter.
Yes	It's a very sensitive issue and I have no idea how you would do this - but currently some on the river could pass afford to pay more. We could, for example, but there's no way we could have several years ago when first starting out and there's something tragic about changing things so abruptly you will close down river living as an option to many. But manesting could be an option? There may be a perception that some on the river, particularly the minority who own property elsewhere and rent it out, are rich. But most are "not". Blanket sweeping the entire community with a huge hike will price out those genuine fulltime, lower income boaters who depend on their boats for their only homes. Forcing people onto benefits to cover fees is fiscally dodgy for the council, as saves you no money whatsoever, plus can have extra impact on people in terms of their pride, self esteem and dignity. Many folks on the river are proud of not having to claim housing benefit and being independent - why force them into a benefits trap that will just cost the council more money? You'll just force them to leave. Housing benefit is very difficult to claim anyhow. Disastrous ideal! Easiest option is to keep it as it is, but asking richer residents to pay a bit more, rather than threatening everyone, seems a kinder way of doing things.
Yes	It's usually pay by the 'foot' that's 12 ms on mooring sites or marinas, put into asap.
Yes	Keep it pegged to Band A council tax. Stop wasting time contemplating and consulting expensively on unnecessary changes. It would be prudent if the council, in every case, had a default procedure for considering doing nothing. Often this will be found to be the better option.
Yes	Keep on putting them up until the waiting list is a reasonable length.
No	Keep the fees as they are unless you are able to start providing greater services for the boaters.
No	Keep them the same.
No	Leave it as it is
Yes	Length
Yes	Length and berth should determine price
Yes	length of boat as elsewhere
Yes	Length.
Yes	Levied on a scale based on length x beam
Yes	Limit fee increases to less than 5% over inflation.
Yes	listen to the boat people
Yes	Look at how the Dutch deal with this issue: https://www.waternet.nl/about-us/
Yes	Make it equivalent to council tax for similarly sized homes. These people are citizens, not customers you can price-gouge.
Yes	Make it free.
Yes	Make this similar to council tax, where river wall is assigned a price and depending on length taken up a tax largely in line with council tax is paid (perhaps plus any associated costs)
Yes	manageable increases inline with inflation to help guarantee affordability for all mooring residents
Yes	Market rates, could be established with a bidding scheme. This needs further careful thought, but would eliminate or reduce the tedious waiting list.
Yes	Matching council tax levels
Yes	Maybe a cap on fees linked to inflation by a certain percentage.
Yes	Maybe based on income of those mooring, as increasing too much may make more people homeless which would not be helping anyone. There should be a review on what services people mooring would receive for paying more. It is unfair to compare to other moorings which charge more but also provide more.
Yes	Monthly payment option.
Yes	Moorings fees should be based on the services provided. The consultation is probably the worst I've ever seen, full of assertions without evidence. The only service provided is a chargeable pump out station. It is inconceivable that a fair presentation of accounts would not show a considerable surplus. The council should invest in providing a number of mooring positions with power and water connections if it wants to increase charges. It also needs to provide more and better pump out stations for the vessels without these facilities.
Yes	No facilities provided (power or mooring posts) unreliable Pumpout. Change s could be introduced if better facilities and more water points provided
Yes	No increase
Yes	No more than 5% over inflation.
Yes	No more than 5% to ensure boat owners can deal with raised living costs and inflation.
Yes	Not for determining fees, but I believe there should be a stable predictable way of making sure there are no suddenly huge increases so that people living on the boats can plan for their future. I do believe that areas that charge the much higher fees you're suggesting often have plenty of extra facilities that benefit boat owners, (showers etc) which the Cambridge mooring doesn't offer. Therefore the relatively lower cost of mooring here seems to make sense to me.
Yes	Number of occupants will have an impact on the resources used. Boat dwellers are often very environmentally conscious, but more than one person will clearly use more resources
Yes	Offer paid for services to monetize the river bank. Internet, fuel, rubbish collection etc.
Yes	One idea would be decision by executive councillor after a public consultation which is truthful and balanced. Introducing a cap on fee increases would be a good idea to give boaters some ability to plan for their future and their families future.
Yes	pay per length with an additional set fee
Yes	peg the fees to band A Council Tax
Yes	People's wages usually remains the same so increasing the fee will most likely mean they can no longer afford to live where they are. This is gentrification and does not support the community. Introduce a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation.
Yes	Phase in option two over 3 years
Yes	Property/boat value Mooring position/where it's moored Based on the investment the council may make to improve river facilities in the area
Yes	Raise fees by £350 per license for 100 moorings over 5 yrs. £70pa. Here's how. Use RIVERFRONT COST CENTRE MODEL. Income from current mooring license fees (£70k and add the Riverside boats £30k) would be £100k. All riverfront costs are £70k and direct costs/overhead share for moorings are c. £35k, so £65k already being contributed to community = equivalent to an extra £650 'fee rise' already paid. Add £70 pa over 5yrs the notional contribution is then £2k per boat. Add rowing's rates of £40k to create a reinvestment fund over 5yrs of £200k. Create a Riverfront Community forum of moorings, rowing clubs and riverbank house residents. Make the riverfront something worthy of Cambridge - at last!
Yes	Refer to Option 1.2 above. I think it's really important to realise that most people living on boats accept the poorer living conditions and probably cannot afford anything better. The Council policy of stating there are no social housing aspects is totally misguided and inaccurate. You will in effect banish these people from the river because they cannot afford these proposed increases
Yes	Reintroduce concessionary rates, including concessions for those on a lower "household" income, if they voluntarily supply financial data e.g. paylips in confidence to the Council, to offset any fee increases.
Yes	Relative to a low band council tax
Yes	Rising in line with inflation, so people can actually manage to plan for the future.
Yes	Boaters who are temporary residence should pay a greater percentage. Most boaters are already paying taxes via their payroll taxation.
Yes	RPI
Yes	See above.
Yes	See answer to 1.1
Yes	See answer to 1.1
Yes	See answers to first two questions.
Yes	Significant changes should not be made, unless it can be clearly evidenced that the current fees are not covering the costs of delivering and administering the services offered. Should this prove to be the case, consultation as to an appropriate phased increase would be the only acceptable solution, with a cap on maximum increases each year as they move to the new rate.
Yes	Similar fee policy as the Canal and River Trust.
Yes	Size of vessel
Yes	Some form of means based testing
Yes	Some sort of cap for fees would be beneficial, so that increases do not disproportionately deviate from inflation.
No	Speak to the boaters themselves! Children live on those boats get their ideas
Yes	Surely fees could be set at a level comparable with the local council tax for a property of similar size? I guess this might be similar to a small flat overlooking the river.
Yes	Survey mooring fees around Greater London and see how they have increased over the last few years.
No	Survey mooring owners and determine whether they actually wish extra services. If not, retain the current level of provision and charge.
Yes	Synchronise with council tax band A. This is straightforward, fair, and does not require special mechanism.
Yes	Talk to the boating community on the river. They will need to be able to plan their payments so that they can pay them.
Yes	That is a significant increase all in one go and would not really be equitable. It is not the fault of the boat owners that CCC have charged a lower rate. Would support a graduated (Over a number of years) increase to 75% of comparable services elsewhere
Yes	The Council must assimilate the Cam Conservancy, collect and use the navigation licence fee.
Yes	The current system of setting mooring fees to the lowest band of council tax is more than fair.
Yes	The fees and charges should be in line with current providers, but need to be phased in over 2-3 years to avoid hardship.
Yes	The fees should be the same as elsewhere on the river system but any changes in fees should be gradual
Yes	the introduction of a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation
Yes	The introduction of a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation
Yes	The introduction of a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation
Yes	The introduction of a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation.
Yes	The level of fee should be linked to the cost of maintaining the moorings and associated riparian issues. It would be unfair for river dwellers to be required to pay more in total than council tax payers who happen to live away from the river. Simplest solution is to assign a council tax band for river dwellers & establish fees (Though not necessarily collection mechanism on those lines)
No	the market place should dictate the cost, that is how life is and the council are duty bound to obtain best results from its assets.
Yes	The mooring rate should reflect the council tax band for similar fixed properties in the area - e.g. a one-bedroom studio flat on Riverside - rather than the value of the 'property'.
Yes	the price should increase with inflation. The boats already pay the cam conservators a license fee for the upkeep of the river - the council do a costing analysis and provide a breakdown of how much money that actually spend each year to provide services to liveaboard boating community - the mooring fees should surely reflect this???
Yes	there are so many schemes and economic models available, don't be lazy - do the research yourself
Yes	There must be a clear summary of how much are the incomes and costs and how much are the potential investments to new facilities to calculate any additional fees. Council should generally support any type of "housing"
Yes	There should be a cap on any fee increases written into the policy.
Yes	There should be a cap on fee increases such that boaters can plan for the future and know there won't be any major rent increases overnight that might well make them unable to pay.
Yes	There should be a cap on fee increases to protect these residents some of whom have lived here a long time
Yes	There should be a cap on future fee increases so that permanent boating residents can plan for their future.
Yes	There should be a fair flat rate linked to inflation and the cost of services provided of which there don't appear to be any other than collection of monies at present
Yes	There should be no fee its common land given to the people of Cambridge Everything was fine until the council got involved to make money!
Yes	They should be introduced slowly over time in line with wages and inflation
Yes	They should cover the cost of providing the facilities, not be used to cross subsidise other council activities. Before improving facilities, the river community should be asked if they want this in return for higher fees. Given the high demand for licences at the moment, it does not seem that more expensive facilities are necessary to attract boats.
Yes	tie to council tax for equivalently sized property
Yes	Tracking above national rates, not below
Yes	Use your common sense to figure out the kindest approach to increase fees if you must increase fees. Act with kindness, always.
Yes	We need to know the comparator: it should be a river-bank fee in the Anglian region, to be fair. If this results in a substantial increase, it could be phased (say over 4 years). But when the stable fee level is reached, it could still be uprated for inflation annually using RPI. It is desirable to match regional maxima for like moorings, as there is insufficient mooring capacity in Cambridge for its mooring to become a kind of 'sink' mooring.
Yes	We'd love to see the introduction of a cap on fee increases of no more than 5% over inflation so that we can plan securely for the future.
No	What do the fees and charges actually cover? Charging for the sake of making money from boat owners is wrong. Charging for facilities that don't exist is also wrong.
Yes	Why not leave a longstanding cambridge community to their own devices without shaking them upside down to see what can fall out of their pockets?
No	Why the sudden need for an increase in charges?
Yes	Width of boat - to be taken into account
Yes	Work on a similar basis to council tax
Yes	Would be good for a cap to be put on fee increases, no more than 5% over inflation to ensure those people effected can plan for this and their homes are not threatened
Yes	You could charge according to how long a boat is but that might encourage more boats into the river

Option 2 1 A penalty charge of £100.00 is set for each 24-hour period or part thereof when a boat overstays on a designated visitor mooring and enforced through a Fixed Penalty Notice Model. Do you consider that this is a proportionate penalty charge?

IP Address	Response	Comment
	No	0
	No	25
	No	25
	No	30
	No	30
	No	30
	No	50
	No	50
	No	50
	No	60
	No	500
	No	500
	No	£30 per day. More may risk valueless, visiting boats accruing large fines, being abandoned and costing even more to dispose of.
	No	£30 per day.
	Yes	£ 50 Maybe: £100 seems a bit high and draconian. Also would allowance be made for break downs, navigation issues, and if the pump out facility is broken.
	No	£10
	No	£10 one hours pay at the living wage.
	No	£10 per day
	No	£10.00
	No	£100 is far too high. There are a number of reasons that someone might be unable to move their boat. And £100 per day could bankrupt someone already in a difficult situation. £25 per day seems enough to discourage abuse.
	No	£100 is OK, but only with safeguards in place for necessary overstays such as flooding, illness, mechanical failure.
	No	£100 is outrageous!! £25
	No	£100 is way too much, especially if someone breaks down and has to wait a few days for parts. However in saying that fines should increase with frequency. I.E. someone has to stay a couple of days due to low river levels or being broken down = £20 fine, a week later they stay again, fine increases to a max of £100 a day. That way people with genuine reasons for staying won't be quite so put out and people taking the mick will get the message. After all tourism is a key part to Cambridge and the last thing that you would want is to put visitors off. I got a parking ticket in Canterbury once (I'd paid for the ticket but it blew over as the door shut and I didn't notice it), after several hours waiting in the council offices to complain about it I still ended up having to pay a £25 fine. All that resulted in me deciding never to go to Canterbury ever again, which is a shame as I went to University there. The council will never get any more money from me for parking, shops and restaurants will never get any more money from me there either, all because the council were more interested in getting the money than anything else. I know it's not much but none of my friends want to go there because of what happened to me, and so I feel being too draconian could result in similar tourist views of Cambridge.
	No	£100 may be considered a cheap price for a days accommodation in Cambridge city centre. £250 may provide more deterrent
	No	£100 seems a bit steep, why can't it be £50
	No	£100 seems disproportionate. Perhaps £50 has the sting but doesn't seem unreasonable.
	No	£100/day or part thereof is quite disproportionate. £25/day would deter deliberate overstayers and not unduly penalise an accidental overstay or a breakdown
	No	£15
	No	£15
	No	£20
	No	£20
	No	£20
	No	£20 but with a warning only on the first day
	No	£20 one off fee, with assistance offered to remove the vessel before another 24 hours elapses.
	No	£20 or £30 a day
	No	£20 per day
	No	£20 per day
	No	£20.00
	No	£200
	No	£25

No	I would make it much much less
No	I would need to see a cost evaluation of this proposal in how it is paid for and what the appeals process and what safeguarding plans are in place as the rate of £100 per 24 hours could quickly create real financial issues for an individual
No	I would not support a penalty charge of £100. The houseboats should be given a reasonable amount of time to move on. This is more important with potential council scheme to limit the moorings in Cambridge.
No	I would suggest £30 per day. Any more than that discriminates against the poor.
No	I would support a charge of up to £30 per day - when visitors overstay it is usually for a mechanical reason or because of inclement weather conditions or because the river is too busy to navigate for example during rowing competitions
No	I would support the penalty charge at this rate (£100/24h) if there is provision for extenuating circumstances such as engine failure or such situations. Otherwise it should be reduced to a more manageable level if it takes someone time to get repairs done in such situations.
No	If compared with 50£ car parking tickets and its 50% prompt payment discount, 100£ is a quadruple price for very similar offence. Managements arrangements can't be much higher than in latter case.
No	If costs are a problem in enforcement, then you are enforcing too much. A small charge that builds up to a larger one would be preferable. Start at non-punitive rates.
No	If someone breaks down and it takes ten days to repair their boat, this could cost £1,000.
No	If the boat has broken down, no fee. If boat owner has ignored notice to leave, a rising fee over a week, then a large charge.
No	I'm shocked at the amount and the proposition of a penalty charge, what if there was a serious, emergency engineering problem and a temporary stay was needed. If you must apply one £30.00 is more than enough.
No	In some cases there are reasonable circumstances that prevent a skipper from moving, e.g. illness, adverse weather. In the absence of such circumstances, a fee of £25 (like on visitor moorings managed by the Canal River Trust) would be more appropriate.
No	Is there anyway you can apply for longer period visitor passes so that those with genuine reasons can moor for longer for example first 2 days as above and £40 a day after for maximum of a week. This would cover things such as breakdowns or family emergencies. Those without visitor pass pay the bigger fine
No	It depends on a case by case approach. 100£ is a lot and not appropriate if the boat is facing some kind of problem. I would recommend a smaller amount, such as 30£.
No	It depends. I came to this through the camboaters website (though with no particular affiliation to them and with an open mind as a Cambridge river user) - they make the point of someone broken down, and thus being stuck. Could there be different levels for willful overstaying, and people who are actually in difficulty? They suggest £30 a day. Having said that for "willful" overstaying £100 seems like a good deterrent.
No	It is important that there is a right of appeal so that anyone who finds themselves stuck through mechanical failure is not penalised. Also, if the objective is deterrence and not revenue generation, couldn't £50/day be the initial charge?
No	It is not proportionate but punitive, but that is the ideal. Visitor moorings should be for visitors and overstaying should be prevented. It is unlikely to pay for the costs of enforcing the management arrangements if it works!
No	It is not required this is purely a way of making money and has no benefit to the boating community
No	It isn't clear whether this is a real problem at all. What is the point of limiting the mooring period to 48 hours, just to have boat owners constantly rotate their locations in a perpetual game of musical chairs? If someone like an enforcement officer is already monitoring the duration of boat moorings and therefore present on site anyway, that person should simply speak with the owner rather than issuing a fine. In any case a penalty charge of £100/day is grossly excessive.
No	It seems a bit high - maybe £50 would be more appropriate. There would need to be adequate provision for exemptions if overstay is unavoidable, and a pre-defined set of circumstances under which this charge would be waived.
No	It seems a bit steep compared with parking tickets. Is there a reduction for swift payment and an appeals process as with cars?
No	It seems excessive. I think an escalating penalty would be better. say £25 for the first day and then increasing to £100 per day to deter long term stayers.
No	It seems rather a lot
No	It seems rather high, what if someone got stuck and was unable to move on, would they have any other options?
No	It seems very high. A fee of £30 a day would be more appropriate.
Yes	It would depend totally on circumstances. Visitors would be put off by an automatic fee, the council/cam con should have the power to issue fines, but only under certain extreme circumstances such as blatant squatting
No	It's excessive. It requires significant enforcement
Yes	It's not proportionate for the legitimate visitor who inadvertently overstays, but it is proportionate for those without permits abusing the visitor moorings.
Yes	It's proportionate for gratuitous breach, but there should be a defence when a visitor boat is stuck for some good reason such as ill health or breakdown.
No	It's quite a lot. Same as a parked car fine would be better 60 pounds with a reduction to 30 for payment within 7-14 days.
No	Just charge visitors £10 day for visiting after 48 hours. Genuine visitors will pay, whilst illegal moorers can be dealt with with the same fee. You must clamp down on illegal boats
No	Less. I don't understand the purpose of these proposals. They are vindictive
No	Ludicrous. Boat life is not all roses and boats break down, and can not always be fixed instantly. £100 a day????????? how on earth would people on a low income afford this? if people couldn't pay up in time they would also receive fines and fees for late payment - people could end up owing thousands and bankrupt.
No	Max £30
No	Max 10.
No	max 20 GBP per day
No	Max 40 pounds.
No	Maybe £50
No	Maybe an increasing one that goes up by 20% per day over stayed?
No	Maybe increasing fees for each day? Starting at £30 then increasing by £5 for each additional day, to a maximum daily charge of £100
No	Misfortunes happen and this is a very high penalty level for those who break down/are ill/or for any other reason might not be able to leave. £30 should be the maximum penalty.
No	More info needed on why people are overstaying, and the scale of the problem, before deciding the best way to enforce this. If people are overstaying because they have nowhere else to go, then more, affordable long-term moorings are needed.
No	more like £25 per day
No	More like a parking fine. £60 but if paid within 30 days then halved to £30.
No	Much higher
No	Much less, and extenuating circumstances taken into account eg illness, breakdown, need to repair.
No	Much smaller level. What if the engine is broken? Or they have had to go to hospital? This is excessive.
Yes	Must be enforced to be worth having
No	No - it should not be the same as a car parking charge - it is harder to move a boat.
No	No charge
No	No Charge
No	No charge at all. Some people need to moor for longer if their circumstances require it such as access to medical treatment, injury, illness, pregnancy, floods or mechanical breakdown
No	No more than £40
No	No more than £40 per day
No	No more than £50 per day
No	No more than 50% of this with discount for prompt payment
No	No on the basis that any penalty should be investigated because boats are not the same as cars there are many reasons why a boat may overstay eg illness
No	No penalty or charge
No	No. I think CART over stay fees are £25 per day. It should be the same as CART.
No	None
No	None, without more information about how the charge and the short mooring period would affect itinerant boat dwellers.
No	None. People who live on boats and continue to be on a waiting list for a mooring license should not be penalized when there are boats that have a mooring license even though the owners have land homes. The need of the boat occupiers should be considered in all cases. This is only fair.
No	Not more than £40
No	Not proportionate to cost of service or loss. What's the loss? £25
Yes	On the assumption that a prompt payment discount applied
No	Only a charge in place with a slightly longer time was spent say more than 48 hours
No	Perhaps £30 per day
No	Prefer an escalating penalty scale: modest for first day, rising to 'very persuasive' after, say, a week.
No	Proportionately increasing charge from first 24-hour overstay period, first offence appeal available, and repeat offences increasing charge.
No	Roughly 10% of the present fee, to prevent an accidental overstay (e.g. due to engine breakdown or hull damage) from being a deterrent to future visitor mooring.
No	Same as parking violation for cars. Doesn't seem too different.
No	Seems a bit excessive
No	Seems excessive dependens on the circumstances. So either lower fixed penalty (30£ or so) or a penalty related to the issue
No	Seems excessive for just a few days.
No	Seems rather high. £50 wd be adequate
No	Seems way too much. 30-50% of that would be better
No	Set at Canal & River Authority Level. I don't really mind the level, the important thing is that it is enforced rigorously and you have a way of making people pay up! What do Oxford do?
No	Should be the same as local parking fines
No	Similar to a parking fine - or less as parking in Cambridge is more of a problem
No	Similar to overstay in car park. £20-30. With right of appeal for extenuating circumstances
No	Since that proportion of the boat dwellers who do not look after their boats would probably not be able to afford the fines, imposition of fines at any level is ineffective unless further supported by a "towing away policy" if there is repeat offending. The fines if imposed should be sufficiently punitive to deter e.g. £200/day plus the cost of towing away if it comes to it. The equivalent of this is what happens on many roads.
No	Something which would be affordable, around £10
No	Sounds rather excessive and punitive if there were circumstances which made moving off difficult or dangerous. It sounds strange to give the method by which visitors are managed a "penalty model". Sounds as if it is designed to firstly be unwelcoming and punitive, rather than a method of management.
No	Stop taxing the poor
No	Such a charge that is representative of actual losses. As there would be no tangible loss, something more reasonable such as £20 to £50 at most.
No	Sufficient safeguards to ensure that this punitive penalties are not applied to those who find themselves overstaying through no fault of their own need to be in force.
No	That is a bit steep, the charge used by East Cambs seems less like a deterrent for overstaying and more like a punishment for being a traveller. It should be half of that at most.
No	That is WAY too much! About £30 a day
No	That sounds excessive! How much do people pay for a car parking ticket? Make it similar. Boats break down sometimes ... they are not easily towed away to a garage and parts worth are not always found easily £100 a day on top of that scenario is not in any way fair or appropriate.
No	The boat is a home, not a car. I would support no level of charge. It's ridiculous.
No	the Canal & River Trust, who are home to a huge number of continuous cruisers using visitor moorings only charge £25 per day for overstays on popular moorings. Exemptions from fines should be available to those who are genuinely stuck due to, for example, mechanical difficulties.
No	The charge could relate to length of boat - between 25 and 50 pounds per day
No	The charge is OK but I would allow 96 hours before operating the charge. This would give time if there was a breakdown and would also allow a reasonable time of visiting the town, etc.
No	The fee could be set more in line with parking charges - say £60 with a reduction to half for prompt payment.
No	There are situations where mooring is the only option - around £50 a day would be much more appropriate.
No	There are times when flooding or breakdown means a boat can not be moved. There needs to be a right of appeal if there are reasons. Maybe £50.
No	There should be a charge but the example they quote if an engine break down isn't fair either.
No	There should be a maximum fixed penalty fee of £30
No	There should be a sliding scale for this. With concessions built in for circumstances where boat breakdown is the reason
No	There should be NO penalty charge.
No	This charge is far too high. Around £30 per day, perhaps increasing after a week, would be fair.
No	This document does not explain how expensive the enforcement will be. In the absence of that information £100 is shockingly high. Between £20 and £35 per 24 hour period would be more reasonable.
No	This is a lot higher than a parking fine. £50-£60/day would seem more proportionate.
No	This is a ridiculous charge.
No	This is absurd, waterways do not have the same infrastructure as highways, boats break down, weather, streams, floods, cause more problems and unexpected delays, it would be completely contrary to accepted safe practices
No	This is horrifically excessive and will lead to poor people being evicted and not being able to pay up the fees. Think about it like this. That is £37k a year (of course they wouldn't break the rules for that long, but still). The people on those boats are 'living', there, and the last thing they need is such an exorbitant penalty charge.
No	This is more than a street parking ticket: seems fairer to match charge to that.
No	This is outrageous! £10 a day would be more reasonable.
No	This is outrageous! The charge for cars is £50 with a 50% reduction for prompt payment and a possibility of waiver if there is a genuine reason for being stuck there ..ie. breakdown.. it does NOT cost more to issue a penalty notice to a boat!!!
No	This is really high and disproportionate for people who by definition will probably have a lower income. Maybe half that or less.
No	This is too steep, around £30 per day seems more reasonable.
No	This is unnecessarily high, a £25 fee would be adequate to deter people.
No	This is very high and the reason for the overstayed should be considered
No	This is very steep. A charge in the region of £30 to £40 would be more reasonable.
No	This proposal gives no indication of how often this happens but £100 per day seems far out of line with the mooring fees and so seems disproportionate. There may also be genuine reasons why someone has had to overstay, such as illness or boat problems. Persistent offenders should be targeted separately but I believe a standard fee should be much lower.
No	This seems a bit expensive. I agree there should be some kind of charge but maybe around half this amount for the first day at least - plus reasonable allowance if someone overstays through no fault of their own (broken down boat that can't instantly be fixed for instance).
No	This seems a huge charge, given you make no provision for unforeseeable circumstances. What if the boat had engine trouble, or someone needed urgent medical care? Would they still be fined at this rate? You also indicate no studies as to what a sensible figure is, or the reasons people over stay. £20 - £30 pounds a day seems more appropriate. A higher rate could then be considered for longer overstays.
No	this seems disproportionate. a fine of £30 per day would be more realistic
No	This seems excessively punitive and something more like £25 might be more realistic. There may be a bona fide reason for someone overstaying and this should be borne in mind
No	This seems high (but then I'm poor and I suspect many could pay this) Given modern computer systems it would be simple & more equitable to live £50 for 1st offence and £100 for subsequent repeat offence. Although enforcement costs will be a factor. I assume though that every boat is identifiable by licence no. and so no reason for cost to be excessive?
No	This seems rather excessive.
No	This system will only ever be fair, if you have a clear safeguarding policy in place, supported by Camboaters and other stakeholders, which protects boaters with a safe to use appeals policy. People's engines may break down. It might not be safe to cruise that day. Those without permanent moorings reliant on visitor moorings for their homes, may have issues that impact their ability to move on. It all needs looking at.
Yes	though I would support higher charges.
No	Too high, how about £25?
No	Too high. 30-50
No	Too much for just one day, £10.00 per day if at all
Yes	Use this as the starting figure and review once we can see if it is having any effect bearing in mind that Cambridge is a more desirable location to moor in than East Cambs for example. If not then raise it again to £150 and so on until it does act as a deterrent to overstaying.
No	Visitor moorings are often ignored and extended. It should be a higher penalty in order to provide a suitable deterrent. A 10% of the new, increased mooring fees might be a good option.
No	We recognise that enforcement is important, this does seem rather steep. A poor visiting boater whose engine broke down and was stuck on the visitor moorings for a week could end up £700 out of pocket. We suggest that around £30 per day would be more appropriate
No	What happens if a boat breaks down on a 48 hour mooring? It could cost the owner thousands if they can't get it fixed quick.
No	What options do you have in place to avoid penalising visitors who encounter a problem with their boat and have to spend longer on a visitor mooring while the problem is fixed?
No	Whatever the monthly charge is, divided by 28 days, and then add a further £20 fine to it. £100 per day is obscene and doesn't take into consideration circumstances such as breakdowns etc.
No	When I had a boat only four years back, the going rate on waterways managed by the Canal And River Trust (the vast majority of the national waterways) was £25 per day for overstaying
No	Where is the option for 'little to no charge'?
No	While a penalty charge is reasonable, this seems too much. £20 to £30 would be more reasonable.
No	Would advocate a progressive charge, so small infringement is punished less severely than extended overstays. Say £25 for first day, and ramping up by £25 for each additional day. Fees for 1 week would be same (£700).
No	Yes, but if there are other circumstances, ie. broken down, then this needs to be considered at a lower rate
Yes	Yes, but needs to be enforced. And maybe there needs to be more visitor mooring.
Yes	Yes, that is fine, as this is for non-residents
Yes	Yes, this can even be higher.
No	You will make Cambridge the most unwelcoming destination for boaters across the country. It takes several weeks travelling by boat to reach Cambridge. If you are concerned about "squatters" there are legal methods available, do not penalise bona fide boaters
No	Zero charge for otherwise homeless, until a permanent mooring is offered.

Option 3.1 Mooring fees to be based on length of vessel. Do you support this change?		
IP Address	Response	Comment
No		Base on value of vessel as in real estate
No		A boat is a boat and uses the same amount of support
No		A boat is a boat and a mooring is a mooring.
No		A boat is a boat. 5 extra feet of living space really doesn't warrant an extra charge.
No		A boat, irrespective of length, offers the same facility for occupiers, ie a place to love; similarly, all boats make equal use of facilities
No		A fee should be based on services provided

No	A flat fee seems fairest, as the boats all receive the same services.
No	A home is a home. A longer boat doesn't mean the occupants can afford to pay more. And if you want to limit the no.of moorings a long boat does not deprive someone else of a space
No	A longer boat doesn't mean one is richer.
No	A maximum length is already established, the existing pricing scheme covers the cost of providing minimal services to residents of the river and therefore should remain the same. Adopting a pricing policy based on length will not encourage shorter boats as the vast majority of boats with residential moorings currently on the river are privately owned. Penalising those with longer homes will not have the effect of supporting them to downsize
No	A mooring licence should cover any vessel up to a certain length (maximum to be determined)
No	A mooring licence should cover any vessel upto a certain length (maximum to be determined)
No	A short wide boat has more impact on river space than a longer one of the same volume! If you're going to introduce a charge based on the size of vessel, surely it make more sense to base it on the vessel's displacement?
No	A vessel uses the same facilities, pretty much, regardless of its length. It is not like a house where the size can indicate amount of bathrooms etc.
No	Again, this is not supposed to be a money-making venture, but should be based on the cost of providing council services.
No	All boats are very small homes. A flat rate easy to understand.
No	All boats get the same level of services from the Council
No	All boats should pay the same
No	All boats use the facilities the same regardless of length.
No	All boats use the same amount of the meager services
No	All the boats are roughly the same length. Why should some owners / tenants suddenly see their costs go up?
No	An earlier consultation said this method of charging fees is unfair.
No	Aren't your costs mainly overheads per boat; the boats don't vary that much. Just base the cost on an average boat length. It would be cheaper for you to administrate.
No	At marinas it makes sense, on a riverbank where no facilities like electric hookup are being provided, it doesn't.
No	Bank space aside, smaller vessels benefit from the same facilities in the City that the fees support.
No	Because a boat is a boat - it would be a shame for people to have to give up a good boat simply because its length suddenly incurs higher fees
No	Because a longer boat does not necessarily entail more use of the limited services you provide.
No	Because boats all roughly take up the same space on the river
No	Because each boat only uses the same amount of City Council services, and the number of boats is restricted by the council, so it would not be possible to fit in more shorter boats.
No	Because every citizen ought to contribute to local services. Council Tax Bands seem appropriate here.
No	Because families with children needs larger boats and they can not be penalised for this reason.
No	Because I don't believe the variation in boat lengths is that great, and I also think vessels with a much greater than average width are a much more serious inconvenience. Since the way you seem to be phrasing these proposals, additional charges for wide beam vessels would be an addition to charging by length, rather than instead of it, I unfortunately can't support that proposal either.
No	Because inevitably this would mean an increase in fees for larger boats rather than a reduction for small ones.
No	Because it discriminates against owners who need more accommodation and own long vessels in order to house eg themselves and their children. Long narrow vessels are the norm on British waterways. Given that the Council wishes to decrease moorings by one third I do not believe that 'increasing the number of moorings available' is a genuine reason for the proposal.
No	Because it doesn't take individual circumstances into account. Many of the families who live on boats do so to alleviate the ludicrous housing costs in the city or because they wish to lead low impact off-grid lifestyle on very low incomes.
No	Because it may make mooring for some boats unfeasible. I think the council should look at what is best for the boat community in Cambridge.
No	Because it's the council's fault for charging per foot from the start and allowing each person with a mooring license a boat of up to 70ft. It means license fees could triple for some people also how would the council work out if there were any increased mooring spaces when you don't have a fixed mooring so one day a 70ft boat could be in a space move off the next day and a 30ft boat moves in means there's 40ft of space each side, unless somebody if out with a tape measure every day they will never know how many mooring spaces there are, it's just a way of getting more money out of the boats, yeah in a marina they charge per foot but they also provide you with your OWN safe and secure mooring with electric hook up, water tap, post box and rubbish collection.
No	because length of vessel has no reflection on use of resources. As long as there remains a cap on number of residential mooring licences then it won't be a space issue either.
No	Because people who live on boats have already bought the boat. To change the fee structure after the fact is unfair. If the council wishes to charge based on length, the fee should only apply to new boats and currently moored boats should be grandfathered in. Furthermore, the length of boat does not affect the resources that the council provides.
No	Because services provided are services provided, irrespective of boat length.
No	Because that is ridiculous. Base a fee on the cost of providing services to people who live there.
No	Because the mooring charge would not go DOWN for small boats. You would just put UP the charge for longer ones.
No	Because the mooring fees should be charged to subsequently provide the boat citizens with the same services that land dwellers receive. Boat length does not affect how many/which services the boat dweller receives, therefore it is not a sensible charge.
No	Because the same services are provided by the Council. From my observations of the river there are also very few longer vessels.
No	because this doesn't reflect the cost of services provided to the vessel.
No	because you are not running a marina for profit, provide no facilities, and therefore do not actually 'need' to do this to increase spaces. IE please try and be consistent with your aims as avowed in the introduction/social housing section
No	Benchmarking is a red herring unless the council publishes an analysis of the variety of conditions and policies of the other councils it has surveyed, in terms of i) characteristics and location of the waterway; ii) demand; iii) competition for available resources; iv) relative affluence of the people affected.
No	Boat board tend to house families and children would suffer most in your proposals
No	Boat owners are not able to alter this factor so this is not fair.
No	Boat owners have purchased vessels with the knowledge the same fees applied to all lengths. Possibly bring in the charge for new permits only
No	Boat size is not relevant as the services are the same for everyone regardless.
Yes	But charge extra if materials are stored on the bank as this creates eyesores and is effectively taking up more room.
No	But if it takes up more than one spot then a bigger charge
Yes	But in line with Camcon Tariffs by length in bands.
Yes	But phased in to soften impact. Also should no be direct ratio of boat length to charge as i) repair/maintenance costs per bank length actually less for long boats. ii) more smaller boats likely correspond to more people hence greater draw on Councils wider service provision
Yes	But this should not mean an increase in fees for longer vessels. Shorter vessels should receive a % decrease on mooring fees levied.
Yes	But to the proportionate rate as charged not this should be an excuse to increase the overall charges per foot
No	Cambridge provides very few facilities. These moorings are flood and are insecure. The pumpout regularly doesn't work. The moorings are not well maintained. An increase in fees as if the moorings were professionally and well managed particularly if that increase were to double the cost for some boaters seems unjustified
No	Charges should be based on service usage
No	Charges should be based on services provided. Length is largely irrelevant.
No	Charges should be based on services used not on length
No	Cost of providing services is the same for all boats regardless of length.
No	Cost of providing services to boat dwellers the same irrespective of length of vessel
No	Cost of services are the same regardless of length
No	Costs to the council in providing services are not affected by length. The only justification for this would be if you were going to increase the number of moorings by attracting shorter boats, and even then you would be gaining an extra set of fees.
No	Council provide no dedicated spots for each boat it is based on each boat and a set number of spots with no guaranteed mooring
No	Councils actions ought to be non discriminatory if possible. Benchmarking really only leads to rising costs in a one way escalating direction.
No	Currently boat length is not a limiting factor on number of boats on the river bank - there is lots of space between boats to enable extras to be moored. If it was clear the current pricing would apply to either the longer or maybe median - ie 60ft? - vessels, and the shorter ones would experience a reduction in cost then maybe it would be worthwhile. I however feel the council is more likely to add surcharges for longer vessels...
No	Define 'parking lots'
No	Do not believe that it is appropriate to price based on length given the potential to abuse this charge: basing price on cost of services seems more appropriate.
No	do not think it will make much difference
No	Doesn't seem fair
No	Domestic/residential vessels are adversely impacted
No	Don't see a strong reason to change current arrangements
No	Don't see any reason to change
No	every boat whatever size needs the same facilities
No	existing boat owners would all of a sudden be penalised and there is no way of just switching to a shorter boat
No	Existing license holders should pay a set fee as many will not have the income to support a per length charge. Apply the per length to all future licensees
No	Fee should be based on the cost of providing services to those living in the boat and not on its site.
No	Fee should be based on the cost of providing services to those who live on the river. Those services are the same irrespective of the length of boat.
No	Fee should be related to the service provided. These are homes to people. You don't have a fee based on the length of the house.
No	Fees should be based on cost of providing services. It is ludicrous to charge by boat length unless you can guarantee that a space on the bank appropriate to each boat length will always be available. If a 70 ft boat moves for water and some other boat moves into their space, they will struggle to moor and will have a case that they are paying by the foot for a service you cannot provide without allocating specific spots to specific boats and enforcing this.
No	Fees should be based on cost of services provided rather than length of boat.
No	Fees should be based on need.
No	fees should be based on the services provided
No	fees should be based upon providing services only
No	Fees should be related to services provided (same for short or long, thin or wide boats). In fact long boats take more space, so need fewer services per length of mooring, so you could even charge less for longer boats!
No	Fees should reflect the services required by the boat ie its occupation, rather than size
No	Fees to based on services provided.
No	Flat charge for all. The services provided are the same, irrespective of the length of boat
No	Formula should be length x beam
No	Giving shorter boats a discount or allowing you to hike up the price on longer boats doesn't feel like it's solving anything. I'm unconvinced that more shorter boats would be encouraged by this policy.
Yes	Greater use of land
No	he fee should be based on the cost of providing services to those that live on the river. Those services are the same irrespective of the length or width or boat that we have.
No	Houses aren't charged council tax based on square feet
Yes	However difference should not be ultimate, for small and long vessels.
No	I am not convinced that length of vessel is a determining factor in the cost of services provided.
No	I do not see why you have to follow the criteria set out by other places. Cambridge should use policy appropriate to itself and not follow others who obviously have different reasons for applying their charges.
No	I do not support this because we are already charged on how much river we take up but this will be for services provided and in that instance we all use the same
No	I don't have strong views on this but it would seem to make things more complicated to administrate without any significant benefit.
No	I don't know what an additional charge will be based on
No	I don't see what additional costs accrue to the council due to the length of the boats. Fees are being charged as a way of covering the cost of services, not to maximise revenue.
No	I don't support a pricing scheme based on length. The fee should be based on the cost of providing services to those that live on the river. Those services are the same irrespective of the length or width or boat.
No	I don't think trying to fit more boats on the river is a viable method - you would end up with a lot of "non-river worthy craft" and cruiser style boats bow to stern. Wide beams should be charged as the infringe the navigation of the river. Narrow beams to not.
No	I feel the cost should reflect the facilities provided. Private marinas which do charge by length also provide electric hook ups and other additional services.
No	I know one family that has hardly any money, and needs the space. It's a very small space for a whole family, and charging them more for it would be an added difficulty.
No	I suggested that this should be considered in the same way as Council Tax is considered.
Yes	I support this change solely in the interests of increasing the number of moorings available to facilitate more people to move off the waiting list and become part of the community. I do not support it if it implies that the current mooring area is reduced as this implies the council are looking at methods to remove residential boats from the Cam incrementally.
No	I think the current arrangement is fair and reasonable.
Yes	I think there is some logic to this, more boats could fit onto the river if they were smaller. However I don't think a boat which is twice as long should incur twice the fee. Everyone who lives on the river gets to enjoy the river. Perhaps moorings for a longer boat should cost something like 30% more than a short boat.
No	I think width has more a bearing on this river. The narrow boats are fine and length isn't too much of an issue. Fine and further restrict the width of the vessels. Sorry, didn't see question below :)
No	I would not support an extra charge for longer vessels already moored on the river. Maybe there should be allocated plots, and if a boat exceeds the length of this plot, an extra charge could be added. Plots should be of adequate size for a reasonably sized boat.
No	I'd worry about those who bought their longer boats based on a particular fee structure, who may be dramatically impacted by any sudden hike.
No	If a boat fits in its moorings, it shouldn't matter
No	If such a charge were made it should be phased in over a number of years. I don't see how the additional revenue would justify the extra complexity though. In any case it should be based on council tax bands and be capped at band B.
No	If there has to be a charge it should be per resident
No	If you're not going to charge for width then why length?
No	I'm not sure that length of vessel affects the costs of providing services?
No	Increasing the density of boats, by promoting the adoption of smaller boats increases the cost of support services. This is a perverse incentive.
No	It could penalise families
No	It does the longer, more substantial vessels. the length of the vessel bears little relation to what the council needs to provide to justify the fee
No	It discriminates
No	It doesn't increase the cost of the services provided.
No	It doesn't seem fair for a narrow boat to pay more than a bigger, but shorter wide beam add on more length x width categories
Yes	It is not a simple scaling but the cost should comprise a vessel length cost + an overhead for facility use.
Yes	It just makes sense to be charged based on how much space you occupy
No	It makes little sense.
No	It penalises current users retrospectively
Yes	It seems ridiculous that a very long craft occupied by one person pays the same as a very short craft.
No	It seems that there is a simple, fair system in place at present why mess about with it and over complicate it? It sounds like the council are looking to exploit the boating community in Cambridge. Just charge a fair rate for the (very minimal) services that are provided.
No	It should be based on the cost of providing services
No	It would appear to produce an overly large increase in fees for people which would result in homelessness for some. Act with kindness, always.
No	It would disproportionately affect people who have already bought boats of a longer length because there was no difference in fee and when there is already enough room for 70 boats of 70 ft.
No	It would make moorings unaffordable for many who currently live on the river
No	It would mean a huge hike for longer boats in one go. Some of the big boat owners are paying a mortgage, this could cause problems to them.
No	It would seem likely the cost to the council re maintenance are not really determined by boat length. Occupancy may, but I believe that there is already a discount for single occupancy.
No	It wouldn't work to introduce this retroactively, because you have an existing community of boaters. It is not realistic to encourage people to sell their homes and buy shorter boats or face an increase in mooring fees.
No	It's complicated and will require additional work by officers to check boat lengths. It could also create an additional trend towards shorter but wider boats, and then maybe the council would want to charge more to moor wider boats, and then there could be a trend towards taller boats. Would the council want to charge by height as well? Or number of rooms? Number of occupants? Let's keep it simple, tied to council tax.
No	It's good that Cambridge charges for the services used i.e. per boat. I wish other authorities did this. It seems unfair that longer boats are penalised.
No	It's just unfair. A family or less able adult may need a longer or wider boat and will to pay more. Cambridge is so hard to live in already.
Yes	It's like every other marina in the world.
No	It's unfair
No	Just because other people (who are presumably hungry to make money as commercial operators) do it, is no reason that we should. It seems like simply a way to try and make more money, and create division between different boaters on the river? I would suggest as an alternative/compromise an extra charge for "extra long vessels" but specifically ones which are a long way outside of the average / normal range.
No	Just because other people do it, why should we?
No	Just because someone has a larger boat does not mean that they are in a better financial position. This issue should be thoroughly explored with large and small boat residents to come up with a fair solution.
No	Just charge a flat rate fee, a boat is a boat and differences in length in reality are probably not a significant factor in making room for others. Scaling based on length would only fuel the perception that the Council was seeking to "punish" someone with a longer boat, which frankly I don't see as an issue, or otherwise taking advantage to generate revenue.
No	Keep a single annual fee. Having different fees is more complicated and will invite more dispute over the difference in price.
No	Keep it simple. You already have an occupancy rate which gives a discount for 1 person boats.
No	Length and/or width of a vessel do not reflect the costs of providing services to this vessel.
No	Length has little to do with the cost of providing services for boaters.
No	Length is by no means a reflection of facilities or services used. Number of people living there should be used instead.
No	Length is just not relevant. Charge for services.
No	Length of vessel does not affect services supplied.
No	Length of vessel doesn't relate to need of services
Yes	Length or width but not both.
No	License fees should be charged at a rate determined by the services provided. These do not vary by boat length
No	Living space is very little as it is - any change would badly effect families on the river
Yes	Longer boats take up a greater amount of mooring space: of course they should pay more. They also cause considerably more river congestion when 'spinning' because they take so much longer. Wider boats cause a great deal of problems for other river traffic when moored because they effectively narrow the river so much.
No	Makes no difference to the devices you supply.
No	May increase boats to the river
No	Maybe only charge a higher fee for disproportionately large boats.

No	Whilst there is some precedent elsewhere for charging by length, this only seems reasonable in the case where more boats are allowed to moor if shorter (e.g. if one space may be occupied by one 70' or two 35' vessels). Otherwise, the charge is for services and unless a longer vessel costs more for the council to provide for it seems unreasonable.
No	Why not based on the overall length by width to be fair?
No	Why is there a need to change the mooring fees?
No	Why not keep the current fee structure which everyone is happy with.
No	Wide beam boats should pay more. The wider they are, the more obstruction they cause.
No	Width is more important really...
Yes	Within reason, but the charges should not be hugely different. The boats are using the same services after all, just taking up slightly more space.
Yes	Yes, in part, there needs to be a general formula for pricing and this could include an element of differentiation for length/width of boat, services, and different levels of mooring facilities.
Yes	Yes, this seems only fair.
No	You do not make parking charges based on the length of a car...This is not a marina and charges should be based on the cost of services and provision of licenses, which is very low...not to make income.
No	You have x number of mooring spaces. That mooring space contains one boat. Will you be charging car parking fees on the size of the cars next?
No	You will make an unnecessarily complicated system. a flat fee for all is easy to administer

IP Address	Response	Comment
		As a boat is a boat, if you allow it a mooring space, then they pay the price.
		A charge based only on length of vessel, but not width would in effect punish users of narrow beam vessels; in that case I would have put my name on waiting list for wide-beam licence instead (more living space for same charge).
No		A maximum width should be set that is reasonable and would not be a danger to other river users, otherwise this is the worst form of commodification and financialisation that any accountant could dream up.
No		Actually the river is narrow. There are conflicts with rowers and widebeams should be discouraged for this reason.
No		Additional charges might not be appropriate, but limiting the maximum width is. This would limit the reduction of the river width for other users.
No		Additional charges should be applied according to width as well as length.
No		Additional charges should NEVER be applied as this is covered by river navigation licences & the Navigation Authority should regulate where wide beam vessels are permitted to moor to ensure clear navigation at all times.
Yes		Again the width of the boat does not affect the resources that the council provides.
No		Again, discriminatory.
Yes		Again, fee levels should be based on availability of services. An increased incursion into the main riverway of ~ 4 feet on average does not provide undue inconvenience on a river as wide as the Cam, and thus should not be taken as an excuse to increase fees.
Yes		Again, what would be the point? What is it you're charging for exactly?
No		All boats use the facilities the same regardless of width.
No		As explained in the introduction: Double mooring is not allowed anyways, so the width of the vessel does not influence the amount of mooring space being occupied by the boat.
Yes		As historically it didn't have a different fee to add one on now would be unfair when you can't change your boat easily.
No		As previously the space taken should be secondary to the facilities provided.
		Badly worded question
No		Basically for the same reasons as above. Services again the same.
No		Beam irrelevant on these moorings and shouldn't be included in any additional charges.
No		Because I am opposed to constant financialisation.
No		Because wide beams take up more space
No		Because wide boats take up more river space (and parts of the Cam are very crowded and busy)
No		Because you cant just double somebody's mooring overnight
No		Bigger boats, more people
No		Boats are all shapes and sizes and are people's homes...they do not use more or less services according to the width of their boat!
No		Both length and beam should be taken into account. There are some boats moored along the Cam that are inappropriately wide for the width of the river.
Yes		But as indicated this should be placed in reserve until the effects of the new length based fee system has been reviewed.
Yes		Cars are not charged by the size of car even though some are wider than the car park sites giving less space to enter and exit your car.
No		Charges should be based on services used not width
No		Charges should be based on usage not size
No		Charging according to width is fairer.
No		Charging by volume makes some kind of sense, as wider boats limit navigation.
No		Charging on a length x beam basis is fairer.
Yes		Conditionally yes, if applied to those wide beams moored in narrow sections. Speaking as a rower, wide beams in narrow sections are a pain.
No		Cost of services are the same regardless of width
No		Depends how wide
No		discourage wide beams now as the river is not wide enough
No		do not think it will make much difference
No		Doesn't seem necessary or fair
Yes		Doesn't take any more length of river bank.
No		Double mooring is not permitted
No		either length or width not both
No		Essentially taking up further space on the river that one would pay more for if owning a property on land.
No		Even though alongside mooring is not permitted wide beams make it harder to navigate the river when it is full of rowers, particularly when they are novices
No		Exactly as above.
No		fees should be based on the cost of providing services to those who live on the river. Width of boat does not affect these services.
No		fees should be based on services provided
No		Fees should reflect the services required by the boat ie its occupation
No		Fees to based on services provided
No		For the same reason above.
No		For the same reason as above
No		From rules of natural justice. If a narrow boat parked at right angles to the bank would that reduce its charges?
No		Generally, rowing Eights can just about pass each other safely without having to come to a standstill, if coxed and rowed well. However, wide beam vessels, while maybe not taking up more mooring space, do narrow down the river by another meter or two: this can be the crucial meter to make passing safely impossible. This in turn leads to boats stopping, drifting into the bank and moored boats (with the usual arguments happening afterwards), and generally 'piling up', potentially bringing the whole traffic to a stop, a river traffic jam.
No		The fee should be based on the cost of providing services to those that live on the river. Those services are the same irrespective of the length or width or boat that we have.
No		Housing generally applies an area criterion for charging purposes, boats should be treated equally.
Yes		However this may encourage the use of wide vessels which could be detrimental to river navigation.
Yes		I do not agree with a pricing scheme based on width of vessel for the same reasons as above.
Yes		I do not. I do support NOT applying additional charges. Please in future word questions to be more clear.
Yes		I do support it! I don't support attacking the boaters with new schemes and fees every year or two!
No		I don't agree - think length is enough
No		I don't see what additional costs accrue to the council due to the width of the boats. Fees are being charged as a way of covering the cost of services, not to maximise revenue.
No		I don't think that extra fees should be applied but the number of wide beam licences should be limited to suit the number of places that wide beam vessels can be safely moored.
Yes		I don't think there's any harm in wide beam vessels. They are actually more likely to be hit and damaged by amateur rowers so there's an argument that they should be charged less. The Cam is one of the most dangerous rivers in the UK to live on because there are so many amateur rowers.
No		I expect this involve employing some hapless soul to go round with a tape measure
No		I need more information
No		I presume if thy are bigger vessels they have more occupants so are using more council facilities
Yes		I support a proposal in which there would be a limit on the width of boats, as the Cam is very limited width in many places and rowing is impeded by wider boats.
No		I think if the larger vessels have enough space on them that they'd be in higher council tax bands, then they should pay equivalently.
Yes		I think it could be beneficial. The Cam is not wide, and it would be good not to encourage wide beam boats. They are likely to have an adverse effect on the navigation in some locations. It would be good to add to discourage length-based fees leading to a proliferation of wider craft within each length category.
No		I think some fair play about length x width would be more appropriate
No		I think the mooring fees should be homogeneous across the whole boat community.
No		I think widebeams should pay more at this stage. Because they use more space, just like in a marina
No		I would be in favour of this charge being applied with immediate effect.
No		I would prefer to see them charged more and eventually phased out altogether. They do not suit the River Cam.
No		idem
No		If a boar is of a larger size I think it's fair for the mooring to cost more
No		If it is fair then why not introduce it at the same time?
No		If such a change were made it should be phased in over a number of years. I don't see how the additional revenue would justify the extra complexity though. In any case it should be based on council tax band and be capped at band C.
No		If the length of the vessels matter, then the size (width) of the vessel matters as well.
No		If the width of the craft has no impact on navigation then it would seem optimal use of the waterway would allow wider craft. There may be mooring restrictions placed by the Cam Conservators on wide beam craft, which should be born in mind when allocating spaces.
No		If they occupy more river space, they should pay. Or wider vessels should be banned.
No		If you are doing size it should be width and length
No		If you are to charge by length then breadth is also appropriate! Perhaps size i.e. Square footage.
No		If you charge by length you should also consider width, lots of issues are created but wide boats as the river is so narrow.
No		If you're wanting to base mooring fees on length of boat then you have to consider width, some of the dutch barges are twice the width of a narrow boat. And again make it crystal clear
No		In many ways, wide beam vessels use a larger part of the infrastructure than a narrowboat of the same length (e.g. no sharing of locks, larger water tanks, mooring space, etc.). Thus, it is reasonable that owners of wide beam vessels contribute a larger share to the maintenance of the infrastructure. On the canal network managed by the Canal and River Trust, the length-based fee policy has led to an drastic increase in the number of wide beam vessels. In addition to increased strain on infrastructure, many members of the public find that the visual impact of a greater number of large wide beam vessels on the picturesque canal/river landscape is a concern.
No		In most cases at moorings widebeam have to pay, more so it should apply here
No		Is this a trick question?
No		It doesn't make sense and no one else does it.
No		It doesn't matter how wide they are
No		It is a narrow river and they will intrude more into the channel
No		It is not proportional to the amount of shoreline used.
No		It is the breadth of the boats that is important to the rowers - broader boats lead to more of the river occupied, so narrower passages through which rowers can go through.
No		It isn't relevant to services provided!
No		It penalises current users retrospectively
No		It seems fair that much bigger boats should pay more than Narrow boats.
No		It would imply that double mooring were possible and encouraged. If this is the case I would prefer there to be recognition that there is sufficient width in the river to fit pontoons along Riverside and provide improved access for the boats moored there and a secure long term prospect of using these as additional moorings.
No		It would seem likely that the cost to the council re maintenance are not really determined by boat width.
No		It's a narrow river; higher charges for wide-beams should form part of a suite of measures to limit the number of wide beams and the locations where they can moor. The greater area of river occupied by wide-beams denies other river users of less water.
No		It's the overall footprint (length x beam) that determines how much amenity a houseboat 'consumes' and charges should therefore relate to this.
No		Just because the cam does not allow double mooring doesn't mean they aren't twice as big.
No		Leave as is, it's working
No		Length or width but not both
No		Like you said, "In the case of mooring sites where double mooring of vessels is permitted there may be some support for this charge, i.e. the wide beam vessel is in effect occupying two narrow beam moorings. As Cambridge City Council does not permit double mooring this situation does not arise."
Yes		Locations that wider vessels moor in should also be controlled
No		Makes no difference to the devices you supply.
No		More space to live on a wide beam, better mooring places (eg above Jesus Lock)
Yes		much greater navigational hazard presented
No		Needlessly encourages smaller living areas
No		No charges on width either!!
No		No increase in services
No		No point
No		normal practice elsewhere is to charge by length with a high base rate for wide beam vessels
No		not relevant to cost of usage
No		Not unless there is a demonstrable problem this charge would attempt to alleviate.
Yes		Obviously VERY wide vessels shd not be allowed
No		One mooring should be one fee
No		One of the special problems on the Cam is the limited space for navigation past moorings. Additional width is more important to control than length.
No		people consume services, not boats. The size of the boat is not relevant
No		People with wider boats don't have access to more, or better services.
No		Perhaps the size of the boat should affect the charge?
No		Pricing scheme based on services provided to the river residents. It is irrespective of width of boat, all users are using same services
No		Prices should reflect the cost of services used, not the size
Yes		Provided there is a max. limit (there exist some very bulky vessels, very much out of character for a waterway like the Cam).
No		Reasonable charges for very wide boats in key parts of the river, causing difficult to navigate areas, seems reasonable.
No		same as above, no fixed moorings are provided, only licences to moor?
No		See my arguments above for longer vessels, in this case given that moorings are linear the width vs. density argument does not apply and the case seems even weaker.
No		See the above
No		Service provided is the same irrespective of width
No		Services are provided/used are not dependant on vessel size
No		Services are the same regardless of the size of boat
No		Services provided are the same
No		Services provided are the same, irrespective of length or width
No		Should be based on services not the length of the vessel.
No		Should not be applied at all. Should be based on service provided.
No		Size matters depending on where the vessels is. One could discourage or encourage 'wide beams' by charging where they prove problematic.
No		size of boat should not be the factor of determining charges
No		So if you have fewer boats because they're longer widebeams, you'll be in theory providing these (non-existent) services to fewer boats, so less cost, and less time spent on administration for fewer licences, therefore longer widebeam boats are not more expensive to have on the river. The cost of moorings should not be based on how much money you can squeeze from people, it should be based on the cost of delivering services to these citizens. Bearing in mind that the cost of providing services to a widebeam boat are the same as another regardless of width, this is illogical and unreasonable.
No		sort out this issue once and for all not dealing with this now will mean another consultation. Enough discussion get on a act!
No		The amount of mooring is fixed and the amount used per boat is determined by the length of the boat only. To ensure as many boaters as possible can use the scarce resources, charging by length makes sense. Wider boats don't take up other people's mooring spaces.
No		The Cam has a much higher usage of the navigable waterway than other rivers. Wider boats reduce this navigable waterway more so than thinner ones and there is no incentive currently to have a thinner boat.
No		the Cam in of near Cambridge is only just wide enough for rowing as well as moorings. Wide beam vessels (and some are very wide) should be discouraged
No		The cam is a narrow river and some allowance should be made for this if amenity space for rowers, other craft + wildlife is restricted by a wider vessel then a modest adjustment (eg additional 10%) could be made (eg for any boat > 30% std width)
No		The Cam is a narrow river, and unsuitable for many vessels which have previously taken up mooring.
No		The Cam is extremely narrow and wide craft limit the use of other river users, not just other house boaters, hence they are causing a cost which they should pay for
No		The Cam is not a wide river and it is a very crowded one. Wide beam vessels are taking more of the water space away from everyone else who uses the river and block more of the view and they should pay extra to do that.
No		The charges should be based on services provided.
Yes		The cost should simply be the reflection of the cost of providing services for those living on the river, regardless of varying boat widths.
No		The council license cap is by boat numbers and each of these boats will have a similar footprint when it comes to services and facilities required.
No		The council needs as much revenue as it can get and wider boats with larger square footage of space should pay more. Also larger boats could accommodate families and larger no of people in the boat should pay more.
No		The council provides the same service to a boat irrespective of length
No		The fee should be based on the cost of providing services to those that live on the river.
No		The fee should be based on the cost of providing services to those that live on the river. Those services are the same irrespective of the length or width or boat that people have.
No		The fee should be based on the cost of providing services to those that live on the river. Those services are the same irrespective of the length or width or boat that we have.
No		The fee should be based on the cost of providing services to those that live on the river. Those services are the same irrespective of the length or width or boat.
No		The fee should be based on the services provided not the size of the vessel

No	The fee should be based upon the cost of providing services to those who live on the river. The services are the same irrespective of width of boat.
No	The river is relatively narrow, and it would be inadvisable to encourage boats that are shorter (thus incur smaller fees) but wider (because there's no financial deterrent)
No	The river is wide enough to accommodate most widths of vessel. Only extreme cases should be charged more
No	The river is wide there so width is not a big issue and services provided cost the same for thin or wide boats.
No	the services provided are the same for all vessels
No	The wording of this question is ambiguous... Is the question relating to the charging of a license fee by beam, or does the question relate to the deferral of such a charging scheme? Either way license fees should be charged at a rate determined by the services provided. These do not vary by boat beam
No	There are too many large boats on the Cam now and this would discourage it. The river is becoming difficult to navigate due to the number of wide boats parked in narrow locations.
No	There is at least one broad vessel near where I own a home (alongside the river) and it is not very aesthetic to look at. My major concern with boat folk living across from where I own a home, is that we pay huge prices to own a home here - they do not - so they should move away from where they are currently moored to open spaces and away from residential property. There are some awful looking boats alongside Jesus Green swimming pool (The Lid) and opposite some very nice property - I feel sorry for those property owners as the poor external condition of those boats opposite would be a deterrent to me purchasing a property there.
Yes	There is no reason other than greed to charge wider vessels a larger fee.
No	There should be NO additional charges on top of mooring fees
No	These barges have a much larger floor area. If I live in a larger house I expect to pay more council tax.
No	They do seem a large waste compared to narrow boats
No	They do not occupy any greater length of bank. Wider beam vessels should not be allowed to moor on the narrower stretches of the river. The wide beam boats are generally very attractive and provide good family accommodation.
No	They do not take up extra length and can only moor in certain areas of the river where there is the width.
No	They occupy no more of the riverbank which the council is the riparian owner, than a narrow vessel. The navigation is no concern of the council just the land they own.
No	They really ought to be charged more as they take up more of the river.
No	They take up more space. So should be charged more
No	They take up much more space an affect navigation
Yes	This is a leading question
No	This is a relatively poor community that will suffer from such change.
No	This is also arbitrary rather than being based on the services provided.
No	This part of the Cam is not really suitable for wide beam vessels at all.
No	This too should be based on cost.
No	unfair
Yes	Unless beam of vessel is an intrusion on the main channel.
No	Unnecessary
No	Unnecessary
No	We don't support that either as a wide beam owner I have lived on this river over 20 years and the sudden changes will make it difficult to afford to stay here
No	Well maybe based on the housing model where council tax is charged based on size. There should also be restrictions on where wide beam vessels may moor.
No	While wider boats seem to be particularly a hassle to rowers the river is wide enough in most places to accommodate them easily. Again, a boat is a boat. Keep it simple.
No	Why not? If you allow wide beam vessels the same rights, there will eventually be more of them. The river is not wide enough.
No	Wide beam boats are too big for the Cam
No	Wide beam boats can support more people and families, therefore they should be set aside for couples and families and charged accordingly as more resources would be used. This would also mean boaters could plan to upscale their boats if planning a family
No	Wide beam boats take up more river space and add to congestion
No	Wide beam licences are limited and people can use them as a floating apartment; whereas narrow beam owners will eventually move creating a churn effect to enable new licences to be granted.
No	Wide beam vessels are an increasing obstacle to navigation. Best of all would be to ban all wide beam vessels unless in specific wide beam spaces.
No	wide beam vessels are more problematic for the river usage and take up more space hence a logical increase in fees as elsewhere I believe
No	Wide beam vessels can only be moored in certain parts of the river and facilities have to be placed near where they can be accessed by these vessels. The additional charge would help fund these facilities.
No	Wide beam vessels cause more disruption
No	Wide beam vessels have a significantly greater impact on the amount of river space available for recreational users, especially in places where the river is already narrow.
No	Wide beam vessels obstruct the navigation more than other vessels. They should expect to pay more.
No	Wide beam vessels pose a further obstruction on an already crowded stretch of river. This should be discouraged through additional fees
No	Wide beam vessels restrict river usage further & permanently for everyone else
No	Wide beam vessels seem to be the most unsightly and unattended.
No	Wide beam vessels should be restricted where they can moor. - i.e. only on wide sections of river.
No	Wide beams are only permitted to moor in certain areas,so preventing choice of moorings for narrowbeams, notably in desirable places above Jesus lock.
No	Wide beams obstruct the navigable part of the river, there should be a charge as this is more disruptive than a longer boat.
No	Wide beams should be charged more, as same in marinas
No	Wide beams take more space away from rowers.
No	wide boats reduce the width of river available for other users, so not to be encouraged
No	Wide vessels are inconvenient for other river users (due to restriction on navigation) and hence should be discouraged.
No	wide vessels should pay more
No	wide beam boats offer more obstruction to other users, for example in over-taking
No	Widebeams are charged more across the whole country as they take up more river
No	Widebeams do pay higher mooring fees elsewhere and are more likely to be residential type boats
No	Widebeams take up the same bank space as narrow beam. Impact on river width has already been assessed and isn't impacting. The shouldn't be charges for the beam
No	Wider beam boats restrict navigable river space. They should therefore be discouraged. A higher fee would achieve this.
No	wider beam craft have a greater impact on the navigable width of river. It might be appropriate only to apply a charge bars on beam if the mooring is in a narrower stretch of river.
No	Wider beam vessels are more of an obstacle to other river users.
No	Wider boats congest the river more and should be discouraged by higher charges
No	Wider boats have a larger usable floor area per length of river bank and therefore should be charged commensurately.
No	Wider boats make it more difficult for rowers
No	Wider sizes take up more (public) space, increases the public cost of those who use the river - other boats, rowers, kayakers, etc. Makes it difficult to navigate.
No	Wider vessels are more of an obstruction on the river - they impact other river users.
No	Wider vessels restrict the river space more than vessels of an equivalent displacement.
No	wider vessels should face additional charges as they take up more physical space - if shorter vessels are to be charged less than longer ones, the same should apply for narrow vs wide ones.
No	Width affects the space left for other activities and for the normal transit of other boats along the river. I suggest total surface should be used instead.
No	Width has little to do with the costs either.
No	Width is a major concern to rowers.
Yes	width is irrelevant and no extra charge should be applied to a wider vessel
Yes	Width is irrelevant in terms of mooring.
No	Width of vessel is irrelevant to the cost of services
No	Width of vessels impacts on river space available for other uses. Need to deter overly large vessels which dominate the environment
No	Would encourage vessels to moor
No	Would not be fair
No	Would not be fair if only based on length not width.
No	You might as well get the framework in from the start.

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?

IP Address	Response	Comment
No	#BoatLivesMatter	
No		(Primarily aimed at point 2 above.) Have the "residents" complained about health and safety? If not, why declare now (after many years of successful boat-living people have lived there) that there is a problem?
No		1 Suitable mooring points can easily be supplied 2 I have seen similar access on sites where mooring is allowed eg Hull Marina + access could be improved 3 If the barrier can stop a moving car it will support a mooring
No		1)There aren't any other adequate moorings. 2)There isn't a record of higher number of accidents caused by climbing over the Riverside railing.
No		A good community has developed there and should be supported not disbanded.
No		A rise in the cost of mooring licences should be used to improve the safety of this area to keep it as a mooring zone for the long term.
No		Absolutely not! The council has had decades within which to provides gates and ladders and mooring rings if they had any concern for the safety of the boat dwellers and is cheap and simple to rectify....you will find this system all over London if you care to look...this is a feeble excuse and certainly does not warrant expensive consultations and ridiculous proposals...you have council engineers who could remedy this in a very short time at a very little cost and I urge you to do this as soon as possible
No		Absolutely not! There are families and working people who have been living at the Riverside moorings for years. They should not be moved away from where they have legally made their homes. I live on the North side of the river and cycle across the white bridge to work every day. I love the sight of the boats at the Riverside. And all the residents in the boats are friendly to me and my children.
No		Absolutely not! These moorings are part of the local character, 09/3 absolutely no problems to anyone and are many people's homes. As someone who lives near Riverside and has rowed on the river I have always considered these moorings an asset to Cambridge and a valuable source of affordable housing at a time when affordable is perhaps "the" biggest social and policy challenge Cambridge faces
No		Absolutely not. These boats have been there for a very long time and in effect have squatters rights and most of the issues identified are simply being used as an excuse to move them out because the new incomers on Riverside don't like sharing their view of the river with these boat users.
No		Access should be made through the Railings for boat dwellers and would be quick easy and cost effective to implement the cost of which should be to the city council for the safety of its moored tenants. If not leave it as it is. People need to be able to moore there.
No		Adds to the vibrant culture of Cambridge. Also there are no alternative moorings in town.
No		Adequate gating and mooring rings at Riverside should be provided as per the Camboaters report to enable them to stay safely at Riverside.
No		Already crowded elsewhere. This is their home. That is forced eviction.
No		Alternatives moorings would then be overcrowded.
No		Although many of the points outlined above are reasonable from a safety point of view, the devil is as always in the detail - given that mooring provision is already overstretched, where is it proposed that these additional boats would be relocated to? Out of the city? If so, this could be deeply detrimental to the people concerned who may be unable to access necessary facilities, incur costs to travel to work / school and other unintended outcomes.
No		Any change should be gradual
No		As a housed Riverside resident I do not want the community I live in to be broken. I do not want to see my long term neighbours put through this stress. I do not want to see the Labour council I voted for make some of its most vulnerable residents homeless (because displacing people, removing them from supportive communities, putting them under stress and making it harder to go to work etc DOES make people homeless - even if they are moved elsewhere). I do not want to live in a community where removing a "problem" is seen as a solution - it is uncreative, uncompassionate and bullying. I do not want to live in a community shaped by prejudice.
No		As a resident of Saxon Road, I consider that the people in these boats are an important part of our community
No		As a residents (and home owners) of Priory Road we have not noticed any particular issues with the boats or the boat community moored along the Riverside wall. If this length of the river is designated as moorings by the Cam Conservancy, it would seem unfair to seek to move these people. Perhaps access is not ideal, but are the boat dwellers themselves complaining, or requesting the Council to make it safer for them? We would also add that by painting the railings in 2016 and prior to this the public realm improvements undertaken in Riverside, the Council is to be congratulated. Combined these works massively improved the Riverside environment. We mention this because it demonstrates where the Council's efforts might be best focused.
No		As a rower, and as a Cambridge resident, it never bothered me
No		As a summer tourist to Cambridge, the Riverside board are part of the attraction, it makes the city less bland and shows more diverse population and possibilities
No		As a woman who often walks and rides through the area I really appreciate having people around. It makes me feel safe and secure in the dark. If it were deserted I would not feel as safe.
No		As evidenced in waterways such as London this width of river is navigable with the right pontoons it may simply restrict the angle of mooring. See little Venice moorings for evidence of this.
Yes		As long as this is a voluntary relocation and not forced then I think that it is fine. Over time the number of boats there would reduce as you shouldn't allow new boat to settle in this area if the council doesn't people there for safety reasons.
No		As this would result in the loss of many permanent residences, with no affordable housing options being provided in lieu of this removal. This is akin to making close to 50 residents (currently moored along Riverside) homeless; an unforgivable move for a council which supposedly supports the disadvantaged.
No		Bad science calculations of stress on railings - the boats are not hanging off them!
No		Because city moorings contribute to the vibrancy of city life.
No		Because his will just cause overcrowding at another point closer to town, and to move further away from town would spoil those other areas of the river for other uses of the river the towpath or the commons and meadows
No		Because I believe the boaters on the Cam are an integral part of the city, and it has been the home to many boaters for many years.
No		Because I grew up in Cambridge and find Riverside to be an essential part of the community that has been there for generations. The council needs to realize that people are not pawns that you can simply move around like human dust.
No		Because it is a perfect place to have boats, you just need to put a gate there...
No		Because it seems unnecessary to evict the current residents when the so-called "health and safety" issues sound like they could be relatively easily fixed.
No		Because it's a much-needed mooring area
No		Because it's part of Cambridge life and culture
No		Because it's silly. As a resident (in a house nearby) the boats and the boating community add a lot to the area. I'm VERY against the removal of the boats.
No		Because it's unnecessary
No		Because know one has ever been killed or injured climbing onto there boat along the railings so the health and safety aspect is rubbish,there were gates to climb down to the boats until the council welded them shut,boats have been mooring there for hundreds of years and the railings are still standing so they cant be that weak they cant take a boat being tied up to them.
No		Because people have lived there happily for years. What right does anyone have to move them?
No		Because people have lived there safely and happily for decades and there is no need to move them on. This would destroy the community living there, and place many of the most vulnerable boat dwellers at risk. It would be better, fairer and more cost effective to improve access by installing gates and ladders in the railings. This would create extra moorings rather than reducing the number of moorings in Cambridge when demand is so high.
No		Because some people have made a home there. see 4.4 below
No		Because the last thing we need to be doing is removing places that people live. We need to be supporting secure places to live, not supporting neoliberalism and insecurity
No		Because these boats are homes. Put in gates up to crash safety standards with automatic close facility.
No		Because they are peoples homes!
No		Because you would be moving people's homes, and why would you want to remove a community which adds so much to the character and cachet of the area?
No		before I could support this proposal I would want to see a detailed account of: i) how many permanent residences (of boaters) would be affected; ii) what the impact of relocating these to other parts of the Cam would be; iii) exactly what the health and safety issues are the extent to which these are the responsibility of the Council; iv) a risk assessment of the potential cost of damage, based on the evidence of what damage has been caused so far; v) an assessment of how the existing railings structure could be modified to help mooring vessels, for example the option of providing strategically placed access points for boaters, with the possibility of passing on the cost of these in charges to boaters along this stretch of the river.
No		Boaters are valuable assets to the city, visually, economically, creatively. Keep the Riverside moorings
No		Boaters have lived there happily and safely for years.
No		Boats are homes!
No		Boats are homes. Boats were there many many years ago. Other than gentrifying the area there's no just cause.
No		Boats are so key to the charm and appeal of Cambridge. I would not support any initiative that reduces the mooring zone
No		Boats have been moored along Riverside for many decades, and are a vibrant and integrated part of the scene. There have been no more than a couple of injuries sustained over the last 10 years as a result of the poor access to boats so claiming health and safety reasons looks somewhat disingenuous. There is no adequate provision elsewhere in Cambridge to move the Riverside boats to, without causing overcrowding along Midsummer and Stourbridge Common.
No		Boats have been moored at Riverside for many years and cause few problems.
No		Boats have been moored at Riverside for many years, apparently without causing any significant problems. Could new railings with gates for access to moored boats not be installed? This would reduce risk to people and damage to the railings from people climbing over them, but there would be no need for stairs or pontoons, which seem to have been unneeded up to now. If the proposal does go ahead, where will the current Riverside boat residents be relocated?
No		Boats have been moored at Riverside for years, for some people it's equivalent for someone to come to your house and tell you that to live there you need to pay to live there when you already own it
No		Boats have been moored at Riverside wall for many years without causing any inconvenience to other river users or any apparent health and safety concerns. The river is wide enough to accommodate other boats. I see no reason to change the situation now.
No		Boats have been moored there for such a length of time, they have the right to stay.
No		Boats have been safely moored at Riverside for years. If you don't like the look of the boats, then bring them into the mooring scheme and regulate them. Don't try to use some fabricated safety concern as an easy out for social cleansing.
No		boats have been there since 1968, I have photos.
No		Boats have moored on Riverside for years without problem. Allow them to continue to do so but at their own risk.
No		Boats have moored there for decades
No		Boats have moored there for in excess of 100 years,without incident. Above it states "The area is not covered by Cam Conservator bylaws" YES it is all of the river is under the cam con bylaws.
No		Boats moored here should be charged mooring fee

No	Boats moored here should be charges mooring fee
No	Boats on Riverside are part of the local atmosphere and community.
Yes	Boats should never have been allowed to continue mooring there once the mooring policy came into action. All boats there at that time were offered a permit and declined, anyone there now came knowing the mooring situation in Cambridge.
Yes	Boats which moor at Riverside originally did so without permission. Basic fairness therefore dictates that they should be removed. Additionally, the boats create problems for other groups: many are an eyesore and potential hazard due to being very poorly maintained and all boats reduce the width of the navigable river. Further, now that the council is the owner there is a risk they could be sued if they allowed an unsafe situation to continue.
Yes	Boats with people living on board should be moored further out of town.
No	Can it be demonstrated that access is any safer for boats not moored at Riverside?
No	Can't see why. Has anyone been hurt? Is the 'safety' reason just an interference excuse?
No	Contrary to customs and practice and does not give sufficient weight to the human rights of the current dwellers.
No	Cruel displacement
No	customary use, how many injuries have resulted from this 'unsafe' practice?
No	Cut gates, install ladders, some other great suggestion that doesn't restrict river width or cost millions of pounds. Of course the proposed solutions are impossible, they seem to have been thought out by a gathering of village idiots.
Yes	Dangerous and too costly to address
No	don't be a dick
No	don't support ending mooring at Riverside and moving people on who have lived there happily and safely for decades.
No	evacuating people from their homes is never going to be a good or fair option
No	everyone moored at riverside who owns and lives on their boat, and is on the waiting list as they entered into the regulated moorings scheme as arranged during the previous council consultation on the railings shout ABSOLUTELY NOT be moved on without being offered a permanent mooring in cambridge, to deny them this would be scandalous and contradict the councils promises at the last consultation. all abandoned boats and people squatting/not on the waiting list should be removed.
No	Evicting an established and largely well-behaved community is immoral. Why not install gates and ladders, or else ask residents to sign health & safety waivers.
No	Existing arrangements are fine and supported by a majority of local residents
No	Fail to see why this has suddenly become an issue. Boats have been moored on Riverside for decades with no Health and Safety issues. I am suspicious that pressure has been applied to the City Council to (a) confirm its ownership of the Riverside area (as outlined above) with a view to (b) clearing the area at the suggestion of rowing clubs and property developers with a present or potential future financial stake in the area. I draw your attention to the construction of Eight's Marina adjacent to the Elizabeth Way bridge which resulted in the clearing of boats from under the bridge. The reason given at the time was obstructing navigation into the marina which at the time appeared suspicious and still does given that few, if any, boats enter and exit it on a regular basis.
No	Find sensible boating solution, don't make everyone homeless.
No	Firstly, given a lot of boat owners have been there more years, I think it would be wrong and unfair to deny them the space there and expect them to move. I'm a resident in cherterton and rent a flat, if someone choses (or even has no choice) to live on a boat in this area, then it should be there right. I like seeing the boats there and I feel they add something to the area.
No	for the reasons stated in my letter dated 21.12.16
No	Forcing people to move from an area they call home and splitting part of our abbey community is wrong.
No	From what I know of the boating community in Cambridge, some people have been living on the Riverside area for years. It would be deeply unfair to suddenly make them homeless.
No	Gates in railings, ladders on the wall and mooring rings to tie boats to are all possible
No	Given there is already more demand for moorings than currently available, it seems illogical to reduce the number of potential moorings.
No	Good God, I am horrified that the City Council is even considering this. People live here, mostly very much part of the surrounding community and working in the city doing useful jobs. Our Riverside moorings are a unique, diverse and characterful part of my city. Clearly "alternative" moorings will be much further from the centre. If I was told to move a mile out of town, I would chain myself to the railings.
No	Got family there
No	H&S concerns haven't worried the council until the more affluent housing appeared in the area.
No	Having lived in Cambridge for >30 years, it is far from clear to me that there is really any problem with the existing arrangements on Riverside (other than potentially on aesthetic grounds and frankly the same argument can be made regarding a lot of houses). It seems grossly unfair to the boat owners currently moored there to move them on.
No	Health and safety has become an issue since the city council realised they are the owners of the land and now it feels like the council is worried about litigation if there is an accident. Surely those mooring there do so at their own risk. As a resident in the area I've seen people hopping on and off boats over the rails for years. The boats are all part of the fabric of the local community and are people's homes. I don't see that you have a reasonable alternative accommodation plan.
No	Health and Safety' is not a sufficient reason to move people who have been living there for many years.
No	Health and safety not an issue and give displacement of homes
Yes	Health and safety of dangerous access. Many boats not 'river worthy' and in states of extreme disrepair (Health and Safety + unsightly) Disposal of human waste in and around river when boats are not moved. Anti social behaviour in a residential area (drugs) 50% not occupied and used for storage etc
No	Health and safety risks greatly overstated here. There was money set aside a few years ago for gates and ladders to be installed, why was this work not completed?
Yes	Highly contentious issue to answer yes/no is not appropriate. I don't think the safety issue is an issue at all. In general this is an inappropriate location for mooring due to impedance of river navigation in addition to the awkward access.
No	historic rights
No	historically, the riverside area is 'industrial area' of our city. boats have been moored there for hundreds of years, the museum of technology is to become a hub of this element of our history...and the city council anticipates removing the boats...I ...on a flimsy 'health and safety' pretext. 1. I cannot see any documentation of accidents related to people getting on board their boats. 2. the argument about the railings not being 'strong enough' to carry boats is ridiculous - boats float. 3. Where is the documentation of council costs repairing the railings because of people moving materials over the railings?
No	I like seeing the boats there and don't want people moved from from their homes. Couldn't you put gates, ladders and mooring rings in place.
No	I am a Riverside resident, a boat owner and a frequent railing climber. The major argument in the consultation is in terms of 'safety'. However the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), which is responsible for workplace safety but sets out general principles for risk management, explicitly rejects the idea of complete safety. Instead the HSE's approach is based on the 'Tolerability of Risk' framework which "means balancing the level of risk against the measures needed to control the real risk in terms of money, time or trouble. However, you do not need to take action if it would be grossly disproportionate to the level of risk." http://www.hse.gov.uk/risks/evaluate-the-risks.htm The HSE's approach is that activities should not simply be deemed as 'unsafe' as a means to stop people doing them. There needs to be evidence of a 'significant risk' as defined here: "Significant risks are those that are not trivial in nature and are capable of creating a real risk to health and safety which any reasonable person would appreciate and would take steps to guard against." http://www.hse.gov.uk/risks/faq.htm The consultation presents no evidence of a 'significant risk'. First, the consultation states "That the barrier rail between the upper level roadway and the river is a highway barrier to contain and prevent vehicles from dropping into the river should an accident occur and is not designed to take the weight of moored boats." This, to be honest, seems rather absurd. Boats do not hang from the railings. Is there any evidence that the moorings are presenting undue stress on the railings? If there is, then surely the railings are not up to preventing vehicles dropping into the river. This cannot be considered a 'significant risk'. Second, and more relevant, is climbing over the railings. It is important to consider whether there is any empirical evidence that this is a significant risk. Has there been public demand that something should be done about it? If this practice has continued for years with no evidence of injury, then this cannot be considered a significant risk. Indeed there is anecdotal evidence of boat residents having rescued people who have fallen in the river. The apparent lack of evidence for a 'significant risk' is reflected in the Council document CONSULTATION PROPOSALS Key Decision, which explicitly says "The recommendations in this report have no foreseen direct impact on Community Safety". This statement is not compatible with a policy that is justified on safety grounds. Either there is an impact on Community Safety, or there isn't, and of there isn't then the grounds for the policy fall away.
Yes	I am conflicted about this. On the one hand, if suitable arrangements can be provided to boat owners elsewhere that are satisfactory to them, this would seem a reasonable solution. I also see the concerns raised above. However it would seem that boat owners have been perfectly happy to moor in this location despite the potential problems articulated here, and would appear to be managing just fine. This raises the question of whether these are real issues or simply the product of an excessive safety culture. If there are real issues with safety, perhaps something to consider might be to temporarily relocate boats to another mooring location, and in fact take steps to improve infrastructure at Riverside to accommodate future moorings in a way that meets the Council's requirements. I am not a boat owner and having nothing to do with this issue personally, but frankly I enjoy seeing river boats in Cambridge which is why I responded to this questionnaire. Consider that river boats are to some a rather pleasant feature for residents and tourists alike.
No	I am doubtful as to whether there is sufficient capacity elsewhere for alternative moorings. I am also doubtful about the health and safety argument. It seems to me that (a) the risks are overstated and (b) it is up to the individual residents whether they wish to take such risks.
No	I believe that these should be policed properly and used for temporary places - a term
No	I believe that people have lived on these moorings for many years and I see no reason why that should end. In addition it would create overcrowding elsewhere
No	I cannot see any good reason to move peoples homes, where they have lived securely for long periods
No	I can't see any valid reason why moorings at riverside should be ended.
No	I dispute the safety claims made, having witnessed the moorings there for decades. Why move people from their homes?
No	I do not believe that there are any health and safety issues here and that this proposal is disingenuous. There are measures which would could be implemented instead. There are other measures which work perfectly well on other parts of Riverside which the council should implement for these parts.
No	I do not know enough about the current users and the issues arising
No	I do not see any good reason for displacing these people from their homes. The boats on riverside are part of what makes Cambridge Cambridge and are part of our cities culture and community.
No	I do not see this as a hazard and I feel the move is only being done in the interests of the people that live in the expensive flats. I would much rather boats be moved from the commons so people can sit by the river and not in someone's 'front garden'.
No	I don't agree with teh stated problems arising from the use of the canal along Riverside as mooring space. As there is already a shortage of mooring space in Cambridge, I oppose any unnecessary removal of moorings.
No	I don't believe there are any publicly available documents showing the weight bearing capacity of the wall etc. I would support changes to the fence and addition of mooring rings along riverside. Gates and/or ladders could be provided for the moorings. The presence of boats benefits the social mix and feeling of safety along the riverside area and I feel the area would be poorer and feel more threatening without them.
No	I don't believe there is a very big health and safety risk. According to camboaters, they no 'no' injuries worse than a sprained ankle to anyone accessing boats. Where is the evidence it is actually an issue? Further the boats on riverside are a lovely part of the local identity of the area, they are a fun, picturesque and interesting thing to pass, and add to the atmosphere and diversity of the area. They've been there longer than I can remember, and I've lived in cambridge my entire life (though admittedly I am only 27). Camboaters suggest simply adding mooring rings, gates and ladders to the wall in order to cover the health and safety / access responsibility? And that seems like and eminently sensible and relatively cheap solution, that could be enacted slowly over time, so wouldn't require huge investment.
No	I don't see how it is a problem for able bodied people to climb the railings.
No	I don't see that they are troubling anybody
No	I don't support ending mooring at Riverside and moving people on who have lived there happily and safely for decades.
No	I don't support ending mooring at Riverside and moving people on who have lived there happily and safely for decades.
No	I don't support ending mooring at Riverside and moving people on who have lived there happily and safely for decades.
No	I don't support ending mooring at Riverside and moving people on who have lived there happily and safely for decades.
Yes	I don't support the view that the handrail is insufficiently strong for boats to be moored. Risk of accident and boaters falling is a serious risk however, and I don't see how the council can condone or take revenue from this state of affairs. This should be managed out over time (especially considering the council allowed this state of affairs to develop over some decades). Unoccupied and derelict boats should be removed immediately however, and new boats not allowed to fill the vacated spaces.
No	I find your reasoning specious.
No	I have been in Cambridge and using the river for over 30 years. The boats have been on riverside all this time. They make me feel safe when walking along the river at night and they do not provide an obstruction.
No	I have lived on Riverside and currently just off the river in St Bartholomews Court. I have never experienced any issues with boaters living on the railings. There is no safety issue having boats on the railings. Moorings are a unique, low impact source of affordable housing in Cambridge. The riverside boating community is threatened with decimation
No	I have responded "no", but I am broadly in favour. My problem is in not knowing where these boats will go if moorings are ended; I do not wish there to be more boats moored on the Commons, or pressure for mooring on the Halingway. It is lack of transparency about where displaced boats would moor that I find problematic. Also, I have a suggestion about an alternative use of parts of the Riverside wall for mooring - see 4.4. I am not altogether convinced by the H&S arguments for removing boats from Riverside (is there any serious case evidence here is quoted?). I would be concerned if the reason for moving boats from Riverside is being sold as H&S to disguise a different reason (such as lobbying by another category of river user).
No	I know from conversation with Camboaters that some of the most vulnerably housed boaters are based along here. I don't think the "move them on" approach is appropriate
No	I like seeing boats in this area. I feel safer in this area, knowing there are people around. This would decrease the total space available.
No	I like that there are boats on riverside
No	I like the idea that people have lived there happily and safely for decades. I cycle past daily and have never encountered any problems
No	I live close to Riverside and have enjoyed seeing the boats and their occupants alongside and have never seen a problem, or the need for change.
No	I live near the river and feel the people who live on the boats are my neighbours and part of my community. I think the area will have less character and diversity if they are moved. Boats have been moored there for more than 20 years and access to them has not proved unsafe during this time. These proposals seem to be using health & safety as an excuse to remove the boats, instead of being based on genuine concern, as surely a floating pontoon would not be the only way to enable easier access.
No	I live off Riverside and do feel the boats moored along Riverside wall add to the character and community of the area. I also feel that it's unfair to uproot residents who have been moored in this part of town for years.
No	I live on Riverside. Some boat owners are really anti social and others are not. I just wanted to point this out, how to solve it is difficult. Generators going all night keep us awake for example.
No	I love my riverside neighbours and you would be destroying our lovely community.
No	I partially support the proposal. I'm concerned that moving the boats would cause an issue as angry boat owner's caused a fuss, as they were moved further from the town centre. The safety concern seems spurious, though I'm more willing to believe that the damage to railings is a serious concern. Also, increased widening of the river would make rowing easier.
No	I really don't see why people should have to move out of homes they have occupied for years.
No	I spent nearly 10 years as boat master/driver of the riverboat Georgina which is the largest boat on the cam. I never felt they caused a navigation problem on riverside. I do think boats staying should be brought up to boat safety standards with working engines or be asked to leave.
No	I strongly object to this proposal to remove individuals from their long-term homes, to vastly reduce the capacity for city centre mooring overall, and to detract from the land-and-water Riverside community.
No	I strongly oppose this proposal. People have lived there safely for at least the last 20 years that I have known the boating community. Cramming boaters in elsewhere will have a negative impact for everybody. I believe this is about overlooking relatively new property owners wanting the boats gone from their luxury river views as there has not been an issue that I know of with embarking and disembarking, and I have done it many many times.
No	I think mooring should be allowed at Riverside
No	I think that the council should increase it's revenue from charging the Riverside boats, as was suggested two years ago. There isn't enough room for them anywhere else, and the council should stick to promises previously made. It would also be very damaging to the community. I think it's great to have boats on Riverside - it's a historical part of the river for boats.
No	I think the health and safety issues here are badly defined and evidence has not been provided for them in the consultation. It's inappropriate to omit a mention of the history of failure to act on executive orders to appraise the possibility of bringing the railings into the moorings scheme and the results of the Skanska report. The best approach seems like gates, ladders and a bit of pragmatism. It really looks like the council just doesn't want boats here and is using a nuse to try and get people onside for removing them.
No	I think the problems have been exaggerated and have not really worsened since the 1990s when I first moved to Cambridge.
No	I think there is only a problem on the bends not the whole of riverside.
No	I think you are exaggerating the problem. Just give them gates or live with the uncertainty. It's been going on for so long now, the track record is that it is pretty safe.
No	I took a look along there & there does not appear to be any serious issue. It looks to me that riverside was designed to take boats. Railings have little ladders. Living on a boat can never have great access. Surely a health and safety risk is part of it.
No	I'm not convinced that the H&S concerns justify the proposal.
Yes	If it is impossible (as stated) to provide safe, fixed moorings, there seems little option but to end moorings at Riverside. I would nevertheless prefer to see moorings remain, as the boats offer accommodation as well as adding character to the area (in general). I am frankly extremely surprised that there is no option other than offering floating pontoons to which the boats would be attached: could some of the roadway not be used for bollards, the fence taken further back into the roadway and access given through safety gates to a path along the river edge? The higher fees paid for mooring may pay for at least some of this, and would certainly cover the cost in time. As a matter of urgency, derelict boats should be removed and those that are not lived in permanently should be offered moorings elsewhere. I counted at least 3 last night that are little more than junk between Midsummer Common and River Lane.
No	If people are happy to moor there then let them. Never been a problem, never will be. River is very wide in that area, there would be no point removing mooring space.
No	If people are moored at Riverside, it is because they need to be. Make the mooring facility more convenient for those who are there by necessity ...
Yes	If people moor there they accept the hazards of getting in and out of the boats.
No	If someone genuinely has made their home there, says they want and is considerate to those around them, then they should be allowed to stay
No	If they are brought into the mooring scheme they will give the council additional revenue for a long time to come
No	If you could remove anyone who hasn't paid up in full and has not been allocated a mooring I would be happy. In terms of whether it is a suitable mooring there are areas of Riverside where the river is wide (New CRA & Leys School boathouse) and areas where it is narrow (under new footbridge). A pontoon on the wide bit with steps down and only mooring for narrow beam boats would work. No moorings around footbridge.
No	I'm sure each boater can devise a safe method of entering and leaving their boat. The addition of specific mooring points and perhaps a road level walkway on the river side will ensure there is no further damage to a vehicle barrier.
No	Improve the facilities rather than moving people's home.
No	In all the decades that it's been used, there have been no notable accidents.
No	Insufficient elsewhere, local connections
No	is it not possible to install mooring points without involving pontoons etc?
No	It adds to the enjoyable look of the area
No	It has been a part of Cambridge for years and years. It adds character and colour to riverside. Tourists and locals alike love to photograph the boats along the river. It is an iconic scene. Cambridge is being spoilt by new flats and square box houses.let's keep some personality
No	It is a community.
No	It is a good place for them. why not improve their moorings instead?You are messing with people's ways of life. You have not made a case for moving people on. Manage the system as at present. It works.
No	It is a long established refuge for those seeking a low impact living option.
No	It is a long standing and much loved part of the community

No	It is as much the context and the immediate environment of the vessel itself that is the home. Just as it is with a house dweller. The children in particular experience the immediate environment as their garden. To move these people against their will, will traumatise them. There is too much control and regulation that is not healthy to be imposed on them. It is the receiving of it, we really must begin to do life differently and not continue with this Rotheric Way of trying to regulate and control everything. Not good for council employees or the general public whether resident or not.
No	It is my home and we as a community are really happy here. We do not consider living on the railings unsafe in any way. I rely on being able to work in Cambridge. Being but on temporary moorings means I would have no security - the stress of it all is really getting on top of me.
No	It is not a problem
No	It is not fair to move on people who have lived there safely for years and decades.
No	It is unwise to people who have been there for years and are valuable residents of the area
No	It is quite appalling that the council should allow up to 36 homes to be effectively demolished. The boat dwellers there have lived alongside the residents of Riverside for years with no apparent problems on either side.
No	It is the best and safest mooring available in Cambridge. Purpose built and safe in flood conditions
No	It is unfair to people living there currently. There are already not enough moorings available, so where exactly would those people be moved to?
No	It is unnecessary and detrimental to the community.
No	It is unnecessary and unfair to the residents of the boats.
No	It really isn't a problem and adds to the character of the area
No	It should be possible for gates to be installed into the current rail and short ladders fixed to the wall comparatively safely. I do not accept an expensive pontoon system is all necessary. Also is there any evidence that there have been any incidents that occurred as a result of the present practice of climbing over the railing? Or of any part of the railing being compromised? Assertion of a perceived problem is insufficient and gates and ladders would address the problem of access easily and cheaply.
No	It will just drive them up to other less suitable moorings. Also if they've lived here for a long time, why should they be driven out? The issue with the railings and access could be eased by moving the road protection railing nearer the road where the road is wider and providing steps for safer access at various points where there is room to do so. Replacing the old fence line with mooring bollards or rings would take the strain off the fence.
No	It works well how it is right now.
No	It would be a reasonable proposal if there was clear evidence either way. At present we are given a descriptive digest by the council and a refutation by Camboaters. Neither is definitive. The council needs to present a clear and independent analysis if the proposal is to proceed. If the health and safety grounds are supported independently and can be seen to be reasonable rather than just scare-mongering grounds, then proceed. The text accompanying this question is argumentative and opinion- rather than evidence-based. If there is independent evidence - then present it.
No	It would be easy to bring Riverside into the moorings scheme - as the Council previously committed to doing - with simple modifications to the railings.
No	It would be unsettling and stressful for children and vulnerable people.
No	It would be wrong to relocate a community which has been there so long
No	It's a perfectly viable mooring on a wider part of the river. Some people have lived there for many years. It is their home. It makes Riverside a far safer and more friendly place to walk at night. Moving the boats will create homelessness, and / or cause crowding on the commons moorings
No	It's fine as it is
No	It's my home
No	It's not fair to end these moorings. Boats have moored there for decades.
No	It's part of Cambridge. Having lived on the river sun rain snow was never an issue to mine or my friends safety
No	It's part of Cambridge. I don't think it poses a great risk to health, and I don't see where else in Cambridge there will be room. There should be boats on the Cam.
No	It's part of Cambridge's history and culture. And people would be made homeless.
No	It's part of river life
No	It's their homes! Fulfill previous promises.
No	It's unfair to the people living on boats moored there
No	It's worked for many years, it's not proved to be a health and safety issue, and it would result in a substantial reduction in the total mooring space
No	It's wrong to force people to move from a well-established mooring.
No	I've lived (in a house) in Riverside area for >10 years. The health and safety & damaged railings argument are contrived nonsense. I've never seen such damage as if this is a genuine concern, simply require those mooring there to sign an indemnity against their boat if need be for damages caused by creels moorings etc. Re H&S issues - signs to say those using these moorings do so at their own risk and are unsuitable for individuals with mobility issues Council takes no responsibilities for injury etc. Incidentally how many people have officially been injured or died as a result of this supposed death-trap
No	I've seen friends and colleagues live there safely for years with no problems. Personally seeing the boats and boaters along riverside are part of what I love about Cambridge.
No	Just make it safer as it originally was designed for mooring. You are not investing any money back into making moorings railings etc safer.
No	Let people decide if they want to climb over a fence: they are adults.
No	Loss of amount of moorings. Also having boats there makes walking and cycling by the river safer particularly if you are a woman on your own. Adds to the character of the area whereas in my opinion the exclusive apartments add nothing to the local community with many being buy to let or just used part of the year.
No	Make gaps in the roadside fence to allow access safely. Erect ladders as at many harbours, add mooring rings or bollards, and if necessary narrow the road to do so. As a river user of a different type, I think these boats are an important part of the riverside scene and have been there for a very long time.
No	Many have lived there for a long time, and this does not seem to be a proposal which focuses on the needs of the inhabitants, but on those of external (economic) interests.
Yes	Many of the boats are an eye sore and a disruption (noise and smoke) to residents along the river.
No	Many of the residents in the river have lived there for long time, so the Riverside is their home, they have the right to defend their place and continue living there. Moving to anywhere else all these people are not the solution. I am agree that the amount of boats need to be controlled but expelled all of them from the Riverside is not. Furthermore, the boats are part of the city's charm.
No	Moorings at riverside is safe, people have lived there for many years - it's their home. I don't believe alternative moorings would be suitable.
No	Moorings on Riverside has been going on without incident for over 20 years, I moored there myself between 1994 and 1999 without any problem whatsoever. I have no idea why the council has suddenly decided its dangerous. Boats that are floating do not place any weight on the railings, certainly not over and above that of a vehicle hitting those railings. Boats that sink would place some force on the railings and I saw that happen but the railings never even bent. This seems to be a spurious concern.
No	Moorings along the railings (both from the street and when on the river) enrich the character of this otherwise very hard and engineered section of river. This length of river, if properly managed, can be a home to many people and the City can earn modest revenue from fees. Why 'extinguish' rights that benefit the City and make boaters homeless?
No	Moorings have been at riverside for decades. As a former resident of river lane, I always found the mooring of vessels there a charming and socially harmonious feature of the area. If the railings are now considered unfit for the purpose for which they have been used for decades, they should be modified rather than declaring unsuitable.
No	Move off empty boats then see what it looks like, could it support fewer? The boats might choose to stay and climb the railings. Is there a way of putting mooring rings along the bottom of the wall?
No	Needs to be phased, in conjunction with removing illegally moored and empty boats from other moorings.
No	Not all moorings on the river are a huge part of life here. They would be mixed and disadvantage many of the owners
No	No data exists to support the Health and Safety "risk" - has anyone ever been injured?
No	No I don't. I think the saying 'why fix something that is not broken?' says it all. I delight in cycling past the moorings every day and seeing the people living there.
No	No need to - as previous reviews have indicated, they don't present a problem, and installation of ladders would be more than adequate to deal with safety concerns.
No	No, because people live there and have done for many years.
No	NO. Please publish any evidence that there is a health and safety risk rather than supposition.
No	No-one has had an accident or died as far as I know with the current system and I like having the boats there. If necessary to remove the council's liability, ask the boat owners to sign a waiver
No	not a problem for the land residents & the wall dwarfs the boats
No	Not necessary. Council's arguments are flawed
No	Not sure there are enough places to offer alternatives for all people who need them.
No	Not sure. Cd moorings not be established on land opposite Riverside with owners permission of course
No	Not unless you can specify where the alternative moorings are and they need to be as close as possible like for like. Are you planning on moving peoples home from the centre of town to ??? The reeks of "clean up". While some boats on river side are eye sores and the area would look better without this is a very slippery slope
No	Not openly persecuting the poor
No	Part of character of area
No	people have been living on the moorings for a long time and it is immoral to make people move home against their will.
No	People have been living there for a long time without major problems.
No	People have been living there for at least thirty years, peacefully and legally, and causing no trouble (I'm a rower and have friends who live on Riverside). I see no reason to destroy a small part of our community, especially over noble "health and safety" concerns.
No	People have been living there happily and safely for decades. They should only be moved for an extremely good reason, which this isn't.
No	People have been there 20 years. If the unregistered users were moved on, gates were fitted I don't see a problem
No	People have been there for years. Where would they go?
No	People have lived at Riverside for many years. Riverside is their home.
No	People have lived here for years, some of them decades. To prevent them living here is like kurling them out of their homes for no good reason (perhaps the expensive flats don't like looking at them? not enough reason to turn someone's life upside down)
No	People have lived here safely for years, and sometimes decades. Why did the council only consider the infeasible suggestion of using pontoons, rather than safe, simple methods to improve access, such as: gates in the railings, ladders on the wall, and mooring rings to tie the boats to, where these are not already in place?
No	People have lived on boats at the Riverside moorings for decades.
No	People have lived on the railings for many years. The frequency of injury is insufficient to warrant change
No	People have lived their for years and deserve to carry on doing so. Perhaps new permissions to moor could not be granted so that slowly the area is cleared
No	People have lived there for decades with no negative or environmental impact.
No	People have lived there for decades without causing disruption
No	People have lived there for decades.
No	People have lived there for years and taken away their way of life is ab injustice
No	People have lived there for years. There doesn't seem to have been a problem with unsafe access. It sounds like a pretext.
No	People have lived there happily and safely for decades, please don't make them leave their homes. The council could not get away with behaving this way with houseweller, you shouldn't ask people to move their privately owned homes in this frankly discriminatory way.
No	People have lived there happily and safely for decades.
No	People have made the Riverside their home.
No	People have moored and lived here for decades with no noteworthy accidents reported
No	People have moored on Riverside for decades and the 2014 consultation showed clear support for their retention
No	People have moored their boats there for a long time, long before the houses at riverside were present. They provide one of the few low cost options for living in Cambridge. I have not seen or been offered any evidence of accidents at the site so health and safety issues would appear to be a red herring. Ladders could be installed to improve matters however.
No	People live here. It is their home.
No	People live there.
No	People who currently live on these moorings have no problem with access to their boats. Rowers and other river users have no problem with the boats being moored there and road users have no problem. This is a community and clearing the moorings will destroy it. If work can be done on the wall and railings, that must be the first priority. Clearing the moorings must only ever be a final resort. Act with kindness towards the people whose homes and community you want to ruin.
No	potentially creating homelessness to long term residents. unnecessary destruction of resident's community
No	Prefer Option 4.2 below.
No	provide safer moorings instead of rehoming to an unknown place
No	Provided the boats are narrow beamed and well maintained, some accommodation could usefully be provided along the Riverside wall. Have there been any accidents due to climbing over the railings? Might the registered boat dwellers sign an indemnity releasing the Council from any responsibility for accidents?
No	Publish the feasibility work undertaken so that people can independently verify the information provided in this introduction. I cannot support a proposal with no evidence base to consult and make an informed decision.
No	Put mooring rings in to stop the railings being damaged. Relocating these boats would only be at the expense of other much needed moorings for other liveaboards. At the moment there is such a shortage that they permanently occupy almost all visitor moorings, moving around them as necessary.
No	Riverside has been part of the boating community for many years and should remain that way.
No	Riverside is a good location: the safety concerns sound overblown. There is limited space for boats on the river and offering alternative moorings will ultimately mean leaving some people without a place.
No	Riverside is an established community, and the boats are longstanding contributors to the character of the area. I presume this question is intended to refer to longstanding moorings, and its duplication word for word at point 8 below is an error.
No	Riverside moorings are part of the charm of Cambridge, this would be detrimental to the Cambridge experience.
No	Riverside moorings have been in existence for decades and provide homes for a diverse number of people.
No	Riverside provides a number of berths for boats, these are part not only of the river community, but also the Riverside community.
No	Safe access is relative. No boat moorings are safe in the same way as no motorways are safe. Perhaps building latched gates every 35ft would make them safe and keep the status quo.
No	Seems a pity to disrupt the current community of boat dwellers. Surely mooring rings could be fixed to walls and ladders provided.
No	Sensible and safe alternative access measures are available
No	Several of the Riverside boat residents are long-established, and should not be forced out of their homes. Most if not all would not be able to afford alternative accommodation. A better solution would be to work with the boat residents, land-based residents and other river users to improve facilities and access, and resolve any issues. On a personal level I regularly walk along Riverside, including at night, going to and from home, and I feel a lot safer knowing that the boat residents are there.
No	Should be discussed with residents further.
No	Social diversity. Prices in Cambridge are unaffordable already.
No	Some boaters have been living there for ages and should be able to stay.
No	Some boaters have lived there peacefully and safely for years and they should not be asked to move.
No	Some boats do not have engines and do not move. How are they going to access the water and sanitary station, how are they dealing with waste at the moment? Should they be relocated to the commons (a far more public space) unless this is dealt with.
No	Some of the people have lived there for many years and it is home to them. Living on a boat is a very tough life. Some people on the railings are on the waiting list for a permanent mooring. If more moorings are available then they should be offered.
No	Some of the Riverside is fine. There are some parts of the river where it narrows or there are corners and these parts only should be treated like river versions of 'double yellow lines' these areas cause friction between rowers and barge owners.
No	Some people have lived here for decades and this has historically been a mooring area. Additionally there is no conflict in this area between the boat dwellers or other residents who also support the right to moor here.
No	Some people have lived safely on the riverside area for decades without health and safety risks. There is no pressing need to move them on. The council should explore options to make the moorings safe if they are concerned.
No	Tantamount to evicting people who have lived there for a long time (decades in some cases).
No	The boating population provide a further sense of community to these areas, and add diversity. I think many people enjoy seeing the boats moored as they walk along the river, and appreciate meeting the residents as they go about their day to day life.
No	The boats add character and diversity to the area
No	The boats add interest to Riverside and provide visitors with a different view of life.
No	The boats and the boat people are part of Riverside life. They should be treated with, and have the same rights and responsibilities as those who happen to live on the land in Riverside.
No	The boats are doing no harm and they have been there for many years. Longer than the flats. These people will not be rehoused, everyone knows that! Where do you propose to move these people to?
No	The boats are part of the local community. Boat owners should sign a disclaimer to confirm they moor at their own risk if it is not practicable to put in proper access.
No	The boats are part of what makes the city riverside beautiful.
No	The boats are people's homes.
No	The boats at riverside are integral to the feel of the city, they are themselves a community (not just hulls on water) who are a crucial part of what Cambridge is (as opposed to other cities).
No	The boats have been there for a long time, these are peoples' homes. They are not causing a problem for anybody else and if they are happy to take the risk of climbing over the railings, let them bear the risk or fit some gates and ladders. With the current housing crisis affecting Cambridge, reducing the number of available lower-cost homes is the last thing the council should be doing.
No	The boats have been there long enough to have become an important part of that area. There's been a lot of gentrification of the Riverside area and the boats help to counteract that. They also help to make that part of the river safer at night for cyclists or pedestrians passing along it, just by making the area a bit busier.
No	The boats have been there many years without issue. This is a blatant attempt to evict people from their homes simply because they are poor. If you are worried about safety, invest money to improve the safety of the moorings.
No	The boats on Riverside do no-one any harm or damage, provide a crucial alternative to crippling accommodation prices in Cambridge, and hence it is one of the last 'real' localities of the city
No	The boats there are harming no-one.
No	The boats want to stay and it has not been made clear why they should not be allowed to.
No	The case the Council sets out for removing moorings along the riverside is at best, disingenuous. There clearly are options for consolidating moorings and the potential to finance from Moorings and river related charges
No	The conclusion from the previous consultation about Riverside was that the Council would regularise the moorings at Riverside. The Council should uphold this commitment. The decision was a rational one at the time and the passage of time does not make this decision any less rational.
No	The council has not given consideration to the more feasible and less costly plans put forward by the boating community. They also have not given proper consideration to where the boats would be relocated.
No	The council should improve mooring provisions rather than remove vessels
No	The current moorers have lived there happily and safely for decades.
No	The disruption of settled people, for reasons that are not related to the actual situation, seems totally destructive and will cause more harm than it will prevent.
No	The H&S concerns are exaggerated and no proof or data has been provided to support the claim that there is risk sufficient enough to warrant such extreme action as to end Riverside moorings.
No	The 'health and safety' argument is completely specious and is being used as a cover for the partisan desires of certain interest groups. How many accidents connected with boarding or alighting from moored vessels have been reported over the last 20 years?

No	The health and safety case has not been made in this document. It is a pure assertion. It would be feasible to invest in a small number, say 25 mooring positions where the railings are gated and to drive anchor piles into the river bank. This would cost considerably less than one year's revenue of some £30,000.
No	the 'health and safety grounds' are nonsense. Decades of mooring at that location has resulted in precisely zero accidents.
Yes	The limitation of the offer to boats with people living aboard should apply to all the moorings (to be fair) as this will ensure the maximum housing benefit. I suspect that there may be an appeal if it is applied only to the riverside boats. Withdrawing permission from leisure users will make space for this proposal. If you have been following your present procedures there should be no space!!! If there are spaces, and there are, you risk the charge that the the whole management policy is unlikely to be adhered to as the previous one wasn't!
No	The live aboard boats up to the weir are intrusive and have severed the link to the river for boats so the boats should be moved down river to stourbridge past the proposed bike bridge.
No	The moorings are for people who have chosen to live there. Having consulted with people I know, the moorings are safe and suitable and very much wanted. It would be very wrong to remove them.
No	The moorings at Riverside are an integral part of its character. In a city like Cambridge where we are always aiming to reduce road traffic and increase housing it seems laughable to prioritise cars over houseboats.
No	The present arrangement is not great, but the alternatives are all worse. T
No	The reasons the council have put forward for moving boats are not an issue. There has not been a health and safety event!
No	The residents of riverside have been living happily and safely for years
No	The river boats are part of the Riverside community and should remain!
No	The riverside is perfectly good as a mooring area and people have lived in this area happily and safely for many years
No	The road is very wide and is not used heavily by cars and vehicles (rather being a primarily cycle through-route). Potential to move vehicle safety barriers inland by 0.5m then have a separate mooring feature on the bank for boats? Use of ladders to access boats. While it is not "accessible" it is practical for users to get onto boats.
No	The safety argument is not borne out by 20-odd years of experience. It's not broke, so why fix it?
No	The safety concerns seem minor - walking over a rail is not dangerous, and is the sort of inconvenience people living on boats choose to put up with.
No	The space has been used for mooring for decades. I remember rowing past moored boats there when I was a student 30 years ago. I don't recall reading lots of stories in the news about boat owners being injured trying to access their vessels.
No	The vessels moored at Riverside wall should be allowed to remain. The registered vessels pay a river fee already. They have every right to remain in their homes.
No	There are around 40 boats at Riverside, is there really enough space to move these boats elsewhere?
No	There are better solutions such as gates and ladders. Many boat dwellers have lived on Riverside for years or even decades and there is a strong community. Other options need to be properly explored before these Cambridge residents are evicted. In turn their eviction would also increase pressure on other areas of the cam, and this is unnecessary.
No	There are boats moored in this area where I know unsavoury activities are taking place. There are boats there in a bad state and something needs to be done to ensure that those mooring in this place are beneficial to the area and the river system in general not detrimental. That said the councils arguments above are pathetic and provide no justification for ending mooring in this area.
No	There are existing moorings that have been there a very long time
No	There are no equivalent alternatives given in detail just vague commitments
No	There are no health and safety concerns. The people on the boats have chosen to be there and do not need you nanny'ing them and telling them it is unsafe - they've made their decision, let them live with it.
No	There are no statistics suggesting that there are safety issues. Boaters have lived there for many years without incident. While the council is expressing financial concerns, why propose expensive plans that is fixing a problem that doesn't appear to exist?
No	There are not enough already.
No	There are not enough reasons showed by the CCC to show that Riverside boaters should leave
No	There aren't sufficient places for all the boats
No	There have not been any accidents with people getting into boats over the railings
No	There is a chronic shortage of affordable accommodation locally and few moorings making people homeless is not the answer.
No	There is a long history of boats mooring at Riverside, pre-dating my 21 years in Cambridge. If you want to make things safer, install gates in the fence. Your 'wall strength' line is not credible.
No	There is no need to move the vessels. Boat owners have lived along the railings for decades. There is no evidence provided in this consultation of accidents occurring boarding the vessels. These are mainly permanent residents and there is not enough room on the commons for the boats that would be evicted therefore causing unnecessary homelessness.
No	There is a shortage of moorings, a very long waiting list. I would love to live on a narrowboat in Cambridge and was hoping to do so in the future.
No	There is already precious little mooring space on the Cam. I suggest investigating new ways to make mooring at Riverside safe.
No	There is insufficient space elsewhere to put moored boats. Many people PREFER to moor on Riverside facing them elsewhere is cruel and unfair.
No	There is no evidence of a health and safety issue with these moorings. Any damage to railings could be mitigated by the fitting of access gates. There is no issue with compromised navigation of the river at this point. There is no evidence of disruptive or antisocial behaviour associated with these mooring. (I speak as a regular and long-standing rower on this stretch of river)
No	There is no good reason to end these moorings as far as I can see.
No	There is no real need just some HBS lies.
No	There is no reason to move boaters away from the place they have lived comfortably for many years and increase crowding of the Common land.
No	There is no reason to move people on who have lived there happily and safely for decades.
No	There is no reason to move them from riverside
No	There is no space available elsewhere, and there's no good reason to remove the moorings that are there already.
No	There is simply not enough mooring space on the river. It would be impossible to find alternative moorings for so many people. Also, people more at Riverside at their own risk.
No	There is simply not sufficient alternative mooring to move all of the residents to comparable spots. These are not strangers; they are resident members of the community who live and work here and to end residential permissions here is to evict people - people who, as you rightly pointed out in the preamble to this questionnaire, are not currently in the social housing system. Given house and rental prices in Cambridge, and the lack of alternative mooring, it seems inevitable that these people will then require social housing. While this is being sorted out, emergency arrangements will have to be made. All of this will be costly, not to mention devastating to the people who will lose their homes.
No	There's no space to move residents to equivalent mooring in Cambridge. It's hassle for HR rubbish.
No	These are homes, not an inconvenience to people living in the nearby expensive flats.
No	These are homes.
No	These are moorings occupied by some of the poorer of the boaters - why should the poorest always take the rap? Also the three numbered 'reasons' given above are fallacious: 1 True but not a problem 2 This is over-zealous use of the 'health and safety' argument to gain the Council's ends. 3 The 'weight' of a moored boat, bearing mostly on the concrete in an area, is far less than the impact of a motor vehicle. Again a self-serving safety argument. The Council is making this case entirely to achieve clearance and not because it is a necessary move.
No	These are not just boats. These are people's homes and some have been living for years where they feel settled.
No	These are peoples home.
No	These are people's homes and there isn't enough space to move them elsewhere and no evidence to support a reason for them to need to move
No	These are people's homes and they add lovely character to the city.
No	These are peoples homes and they should be allowed to remain. This consideration should be more important than freeing up space for recreational boat use. The boats add character to the city.
No	These are peoples' homes! Rendering people homeless/dependent on social housing when they have previously set about making independent arrangements within their means seems utterly ridiculous.
No	These are peoples homes. There have been boats moored there always. No sound reason for this safety not valid.
No	These are peoples' homes. Can you not put money towards improving/strengthening the railings and adding in a couple of gates?
No	These are people's homes. It doesn't seem all that dangerous to me. Admittedly, climbing over the railings when drunk is slightly risky but really some mooring rings attached into the concrete so that boats don't need to tie onto the actual railings would be sufficient!
No	These are peoples' homes. You're not providing these people with a reasonable alternative. Having boats here makes me feel safer when walking/cycling.
No	These boats and their owners are viewed as an integral part of the local community. With good design skills employed any safety and damage issues can be overcome. The Council needs to have the WILL to make this happen.
No	These boats are homes. The boat owners obviously find the current access acceptable, but if the council does not, I feel it could make more effort to look into possible solutions. Possibly move the railings further away from the river - the road is not heavily used and could take the narrowing
No	These boats have been there for ages. What's the problem with it? People seem to have managed well. Why don't we relocate Town Hall to a place that is actually accessible without having to run over 200 people first to get there?
No	These boats should be charged a licence fee. There seems not to be any serious risk on safety grounds
No	These boats should be charged a licence fee. There seems not to be any serious risk on safety grounds
No	These boats, where they are, are as much a part of Cambridge's heritage as any other residence and should remain so. Cambridge is sterile enough in its retail facilities, let's not turn it in to a rich residence only city centre please. Diversity is important.
No	These do not and have not caused any problems as claimed above.
No	These moorings provide a first step to a full Cambridge mooring licence for many people. Also many people have made Riverside their home for many years and this should not change. People on the railings are often in fairly precarious social situations and many would be at risk of being made homeless. Also, as a former resident in the houses on Riverside, I found the presence of the boat community agreeable.
Yes	These squatters should be moved far out of town immediately.
No	they add charm to our city,the river should not be for the privileged few(students) only
No	They add to the local character.
No	They are an asset to the Cambridge riverside
No	They are doing no harm along the Riverside, so long as they are regulated. I do not support efforts to ghettoise boaters.
No	They are fine: the boatowners are currently happily able to moor to the railings and safely climb over them; having the boats moored along Riverside enhances the area; therefore no change is necessary.
No	They are part of the community
No	They are peoples' homes
No	They are the safest moorings. As owners Council could make them the best moorings and charge more for them even. There may be easy option to install powerpoints / broadband cable. You'd get better standard of boats there too. Offer to current moorers 1st, then waiting list, then public moored privately in Cambridge, then the Shire, then national.
No	They do not hinder other river users so there is no reason to move them.
No	They do not present danger and narrowboats have been present here for all the decades the I have lived in Cambridge. They are part of the river's character.
No	They don't cause a problem.
No	They have been there a long time
No	They have been there a long time without problems. No where to moor them (widebeams) on council moorings - they don't want to move
No	They have been there for as long as many people can remember. Some people have lived there for 20 years. It is one of the safest spots on the river, especially in terms of lighting and security not just for the boats but also for the residents in housing who say that they feel much more secure knowing that there are people on the boats there looking out for them. If it is not deemed secure by the City Council then changes should be made to make it so. It would be neither complicated nor expensive.
No	They have been there for decades, it's home for those who live there
No	They have been there long enough that they shouldn't just be evicted with such a vague and flimsy argument. What actual damage has been done over the years?
No	They have been there many years and cause no problem.
No	They have lived there for decades
Yes	This has been the home for many people for many years (decades) who have overcome these access 'issues' without any significant safety concerns.
No	This is a particularly wide point in the river and so it seems sensible to preserve moorings here. Presumably boat owners self-select whether they wish to moor here based on their ability to access their boats but this could be improved with some gates and ladders.
No	This is a peaceful carbon friendly community and some have lived there for 30 years You should talk to this community and understand them as it is their home
No	This is completely unnecessary and unwanted by the majority of households along Riverside, as well as the boat owners. The "health and safety" argument is here being employed cynically as the Council seems to view it as an easy route to push through something against the will of the people. The issue of access to boats could be solved by installation of floating pontoons to sit between moorings and allowing access to the boats from the stern. This would not widen the space required for mooring and would be a cost-effective solution. "kissing gates" could be installed at the top of a ladder down to each pontoon. Boats that can show safe access from such a pontoon to the stern of the boat could then be permitted to moor there. Installation of pillars to hold the floating pontoons could also offer alternative mooring points, reducing the reliance on the current fence for securing vessels. If electricity were supplied to these moorings a two tier charging policy could be enacted, whereby more is charged for moorings with power laid on, thereby offering a significant additional revenue potential that would be an 'opt-in' structure from the perspective of the residents, but would more than likely be fully subscribed. It would also solve the concerns about generators and air quality implications along Riverside. The argument that the boats pull on the Riverside wall and are causing subsidence is ridiculous. Has anyone from the council walked along the Riverside wall and seen how slack the mooring lines are? There is clearly no basis for this assertion and before it is used to support an unpopular policy trajectory the claim would have to be validated by, for example, an extended period of strain-gauge monitoring on mooring lines along the wall.
No	This is effectively reducing the total mooring availability in Cambridge, at a time when increasing numbers of people want to moor here. Life aboard a boat isn't suitable for someone with significant disabilities anyway, those who choose to moor along Riverside are presumably those who can cope with climbing on and off their boats.
No	This is gentrification for profit: the result would be over crowding in other already full areas.
No	This is grossly unfair. Riverside is beautiful and loved by many in the community as well as a home to many people. You are pandering to the already wealthy by doing this and the decision is not democratic.
No	This is people's home! It adds to the river and character, it does not detract.
No	This is unfair and unnecessary. Your health and safety concerns are spurious.
No	This proposal would remove people from homes where they have lived for decades, raising families and contributing to the local community.
No	This seems a draconian response to a minor (use of barrier rail for mooring) issue. Surely it would be easier to simply provide mooring posts adjacent to the barrier rail. The issue of safe dis-embarkation is a matter for the occupants - they are not coerced to moor at that spot.
No	This will increase homelessness. These are people's homes.
No	This would be a DISASTER for Cambridge as a city. Why are you even consulting on something that has already been consulted on, with the public saying they wanted the boats to stay? You are: 1. Wasting public resource. 2. Eroding trust in the democratic process and local councillors. 3. Making promises then not keeping them - eg. £70k was promised to improve these moorings, then spirited away and debudgeted, without any public consultation whatsoever. That is frankly abhorrent behaviour, when rather than stick to promises, you are threatening an entire community needlessly. 4. Cambridge is in a housing crisis - you can improve these moorings and save 36 affordable dwellings here, which is far, far better for the city. Grasp that opportunity with both hands, work with Camboaters to get the railings sorted out and stop this nonsense immediately! 5. Rowing usage has "doubled" in the last ten years - I don't see you accusing them in the same way of health and safety risks. Why is this entire debate framed around some of the last remaining low income residents in this city being a 'risk'? This is discriminatory, unjust and totally wrong to abuse public trust, resource and the democratic process in this way, just because you may be frightened of talking to rowing clubs and houses about similar issues, because you perceive them to have more money, status and connections. 6. You claim there are enough moorings for everyone to be displaced to - but there aren't. Also, frankly, your track record of promising to improve these moorings, then backtracking and bizarrely hoping noone would notice, is not reassuring - how can anyone trust that you will genuinely accommodate these boats and not, later down the line, u-turn, smear them with another consultation like this, as a 'risk'? 7. This is unfair on those on the waiting list who face years of further waiting, for a chance to live in the city, through any displaced boats on the railings being needlessly prioritised. 8. Just. Stop. It.
No	This would be a terrible loss to the riverside community
No	This would be an act of destroying a community, without any significant net benefit.
No	This would drastically change many people's lives
No	This would force boat dwellers who have lived there for years out of their homes. They consider that there is a simple solution to safe on Riverside: gates in the railings, ladders on the all and mooring rings to tie the boats to. These are apparently already in place along some parts of Riverside.
No	This would remove an intrinsic element of the neighbourhood's character. It would be a very sad loss.
No	Those moored there have done so for many years and after the avoidance of the council to admit to it Riparian duties seems a quite hypocritical to me. This is what the rowing clubs want I believe.
No	Unfair on those who currently use it. Cycle past this way twice a day every day, and have never seen any kind of problem.
No	Unfair on those who have lived there for years.
No	Unfair to existing boaters.
No	Unless it is explained where the extra moorings are, is more bank being made available?
No	Unnecessary attempt to solve a problem that doesn't exist
No	Unnecessary disruption to long established community and the concerns about health and safety have been exaggerated.
No	Unnecessary disruption to the lives of citizens who live on the river
No	We don't support ending mooring at Riverside and moving people on who have lived there happily and safely for decades. The 2014 consultation found a clear majority in favour of retaining moorings at Riverside. The Executive Councilor then in charge made a formal decision that the Council would pursue means of improving access, and would not pursue the option of removing boaters from the moorings they have lived on for years. As far as we can tell we have freedom of information requests in and we will update this when we have more information, only one option for improving access was explored in detail by the Council: the installation of pontoons along the length of Riverside. No-one wants pontoons. As the document rightly points out the navigation authority wouldn't permit pontoons anyway - which begs the question of why the Council spent thousands on expensive consultants to draw up a plan and costings without thinking of asking the navigation authority first. The Council certainly didn't ask boaters, who think pontoons are a completely hair-brained solution. There is a very simple solution to safe access on Riverside: gates in the railings, ladders on the wall, and mooring rings to tie the boats to. In fact these are already in place along some parts of Riverside!
No	We don't support ending moorings at Riverside NO moving people on who have lived there happily & safely for decades
No	Well, my friends row and they've never had any issues.
No	what exactly is the reason for this? it is so that the people in the expensive flats don't have to see the boats?
No	Where are these boats going to be moved to? In the absence of that information, how can I know if I am in favour or not?
No	Where do I start? I have lived on the river for 28 yrs that is 28 years at least half of it on the railings and in all that time I have never heard of a boaters doing damage to the railings, in fact the only damage I have observed was a car falling to stop at the bottom of River Lane and b. I have also never heard of anyone doing themselves an injury and c, this is my home and d, where in Cambridge are you going to put all these boats that are no other mooring options or marinas. If the council want to build marinas I will be first on the list as I will then be able to access facilities water, electric points etc. that the council don't supply now.
Yes	Where will the boats go? There are people's homes.
Yes	Where will these people moor otherwise?
No	where would they go? Besides most people love to see the boats at Riverside, it makes Cambridge accessible to all kinds of people in all kinds of dwellings.
No	where would they go? there would not be enough space BUILD A MARINA!!!
No	Whilst accepting that the site is far from ideal for moorings as outlined above the is not adequate space anywhere else in Cambridge to relocate boats to.
No	Why bother? These are people's homes. No one has ever had an accident climbing over the railings in all the years of mooring there. Why not just charge them instead? Add the area to the rest of the moorings.
No	Why cause more stress on certain parts of the river making those areas struggle? The more spread out along the river the less disruption to all
No	Why end them? They have been there without issue for so long, these are people's homes.

Yes	Why is this even a proposal. The riverboats are a lovely, comforting part of my community. I have lived just off the riverside for 38 years and have felt safer with my riverboat neighbours. You might as well talk about moving the Market Place because it is a bit untidy and could function just as well in Cherry Hinton. As to safety, this would not be an issue at all - you supported the fixed ladders with handrails.
No	Why make people move? I love seeing the boats there.
No	Why move people's homes when you could just increase the strength of the guard rails? and if people are happy to climb over and down into their boats, let them...
No	Why not just make access easier for them to prevent damage to council property
No	Why pointlessly evict people from their long-term homes?
No	Why should people be moved on from the place they live?
No	Why?! Because you have provided no good reason for doing so and in so doing you would be tearing a community apart.
No	With the shortage of affordable housing and they are also lovely to look at, they add something vibrant to river not take away.
No	Without knowing the alternative moorings, & costs, it's impossible to decide.
No	Would you knock down people's houses? Why would you remove the houses of the people who live at Riverside? Some of those people have been there a long time.
No	Yes - do create extra moorings. No - please don't end temporary permissions.
Yes	Yes, the concerns definitely seem valid.
No	You are moving people from their homes. This is not fair.
No	you could easily make the moorings safe by putting gates in the railings, ladders on the walls and mooring rings
No	You would be rendering many vulnerable people homeless for the sake of a few, whose only concern is the value of their property
No	The reasons are spurious and unconvincing. The fence belongs to the County Council & is maintained by them. Most vessels are moored either to the base of the posts or to the chains at water level. The fencing does not meet vehicle containment requirements & in any case if it could contain vehicular impact then it would not be affected by a moored vessel. Moorings & ropes should be enforced by the navigation authority & not by the City Council.

Option 4.2 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. Is the proposal to offer alternative moorings fair?

IP Address	Response	Comment
No		A lot of the boats on riverside are floating 'sheds' with no engine etc They should be removed.
No		As moorings become available and to those craft that are able to move from Riverside places could be offered but not demanded.
No		provide improved access to boats at Riverside wall. The boaters are currently happy so help them and ask them what they want.
No		The proposal isn't fair. It would result in overcrowding on the Commons, which would not be fair on the boats that are already there, and on the members of the public who like access to the river too. It's not fair on those who prefer to live on Riverside and who have done so for decades - for them Riverside is home.
No		#BoatLivesMatter
No		Access to boats can be achieved by fitting gates.
No		Adequate provisions should be provided at Riverside. However, if this does not happen then alternative moorings in the city must be provided
No		Again, the boats provide cheap and sustainable housing to people who might otherwise be priced out of Cambridge and who because of their picturesque and unusual way of life, add to the interest of Cambridge as a destination
No		Again, where would they go?
No		All boats should be registered but Riverside should be improved to comply with suggested mooring improvements
No		All boats there came knowing the situation regards mooring in Cambridge and chose to continue to moor there rather than seek an alternative mooring outside the city.
No		Allow people to remain where they are!
No		Allow them to stay where they are
No		Already lots of boats moored elsewhere
No		Alternative moorings is not the answer here, leave the moorings on riverside.
No		Alternative moorings will still involve a huge change. Suddenly having to move away from your neighbours and away from the area that you are familiar would be hugely disruptive for these people. It would also greatly damage the sense of community which is a huge part of this way of life.
Yes		Although not sure where these extra mooring spaces could sensibly be.
No		Are the alternative moorings suitably close to riverside? I see no reason to change the existing arrangements for those who have chosen to live on the river.
No		As above
No		As above
No		As above - without access to specific plans it is impossible to determine the fairness or otherwise of these plans.
No		As above, the moorings at Riverside wall do not present any impediment to other river users, or health and safety concerns. I see no need for this proposal.
No		As above: the closure of mooring here is not necessary.
Yes		as long as it is in Cambridge
Yes		As long as those moorings are in Cambridge, not further out.
Yes		As long as uninhabitable or rotting boats are removed permanently.
No		As said above, there is insufficient space elsewhere. Had you actually bothered to walk along the river, count the number of boats and measure them, and assess how much space was available, this would be clear. However this has obviously not been done, leading to this flawed consultation
No		As well as overcrowding the commons, this would make Riverside quite a bland and characterless place, what's the point? I think the criteria suggest for selection is too narrow as well. I'd prefer to go for all boats which have people living aboard and are registered or known to have been a residence based within the city for over a year.
No		Basically its a way of reducing the number of moorings, and the size of the river community.
No		Because it doesn't seem to take account of those currently resident there who aren't regulated by the City Council.
No		Because it wouldn't be honoured. In a few years, there would be a consultation about the area of alternative moorings: being overcrowded and the boaters "moved on" again, as if it's not a legitimate way to live.
No		Because it's unnecessary
No		Because people do not want or need to be moved from riverside, people have lived there safely and happily for many years. Access to the railings should be imposed through gates and ladders it should be brought into the existing moorings policy.
No		Boaters have occupied these moorings for many years safely. This is their home.
Yes		Boats with people living on board should be moored further out of town.
No		Bring all riverside boat to same system as on commons, then regulate and control properly. At present CC don't manage what they have properly
No		Bring current moorings under current licence scheme, in their current position
No		Build a gate: that's where they live
No		BUILD A MARINA!!!!!!
Yes		But difficult to manage fairly. If they are moored illegally, should they 'jump' the queue? However better to do that than be homeless
Yes		But only subject to 7. above
Yes		but there are too many boats - need to achieve an overall reduction
Yes		But where is there space for sufficient alternative moorings?
No		Do all means offer alternatives, but no need to evict
No		Commons do not have enough space to take all the house boats. Commons would become overcrowded.
No		Demanding that people move their homes is not an appropriate outcome here. Let them decide.
No		Do not gentrification and tidy Riverside. Let the riverboats stay where they are.
No		Do not retract the permission to moor at Riverside.
No		Don't change the current set up
No		don't know - do the boat owners wish to moor elsewhere?
No		Don't make them move.
No		Don't move them at all, it's nice to see them there.
No		don't remove the moorings at riverside.
No		End temporary moorings at Riverside, yes, but don't offer alternative moorings in the city. The city river is a limited amenity which should be available to all, and is already excessively occupied by private boat owners/home dwellers, which effectively excludes other users (anglers, picnickers, artists, bathers, etc). Offer alternative moorings outside the city, where there is more space.
Yes		Fair if the alternative moorings are indeed in Cambridge and not out past the railway bridge.
No		Firstly there is no space to offer this provision on moorings elsewhere in Cambridge (see Camboaters River Review) so it is an empty promise. Secondly, there is no need to move boats from Riverside at all - just add some simple gates and ladders, thus adding to the number of official moorings in Cambridge and adding to the council's income!
No		For the reasons mentioned above. And I'm surprised there's sufficient room for the boats elsewhere? Wouldn't other houseboat communities be crowded with the extra boats?
No		Have you discussed with the permanent residents where they can be offered alternative mooring. If this was reasonable, many might voluntarily accept it. Also, have you checked that the appropriate current residents know how they should register?
No		he proposal isn't fair. It would result in overcrowding on the Commons, which would not be fair on the boats that are already there, and on the members of the public who like access to the river too. It's not fair on those who prefer to live on Riverside and who have done so for decades - for them Riverside is home.
Yes		However where are the alternative moorings if, as you claim, there exists a lengthy waiting list? That's very significant in making a proper opinion on this subject. It's important to solve the problem, not just relocate it.
No		I almost want to put yes, but there is a compromise solution.
No		I believe people should continue to moor at Riverside
No		I can't see why these boats should not be allowed to stay, with modifications made on the land side. The boats give the area character. Who put the barrier there in the first place? If boats were there at the time, then the barrier has created the unsafe situation and should be amended at no cost to the boat residents.
No		I cannot answer this question without you stating where boats would be relocated to.
Yes		I can't imagine where such moorings would be found. Why not leave the boats on Riverside where they are no trouble at all.
No		I do agree on the strict condition that in time the numbers are reduced to current mooring levels
No		I do not agree that people should be forced to move!
No		I do not believe it is fair because I do not believe it... where will it be?? I know there has been mention of temporary mooring on Stourbridge... for how many?
No		How temporary? I do not support an option which destroys our community.
No		I do not believe that a better alternative would be provided, and the whole suggestion smacks of greed and social cleansing on the part of the council.
No		I do not believe that alternative moorings are a good plan in the first place. The difficulty of providing them is a further factor reinforcing this belief.
No		I do not believe that offering mooring could be provided without causing overcrowding and homelessness.
No		I do not support the presumption that moorings at riverside must be ended!
No		I don't believe people who have lived in this area should be moved elsewhere. An entire neighborhood would be decimated and they will then be crammed in somewhere else and most likely separated from friends and neighbors of many years.
No		I don't know enough about this aspect. I presume there are 'legal' and 'non-legal boaters' there. In the end these are people's HOMES and everyone needs to have somewhere to live.
No		I don't know how you can imagine it is fair to turn people out of their homes when they have done nothing that they haven't been doing already for over 20 years.
No		I don't see where the boaters can be moved "to". If the council had followed up its planned Cambridge marina that could have been ready by now but I think this proposal has been abandoned. And I especially don't want to see unregistered liveaboards being allowed to jump the queue for other mooring spaces.
No		I don't think they are causing any problems.
No		I feel this is a leading question. It would depend where the moorings were and if they are equivalent. Also, it entails someone having to move house effectively against their will.
No		I see it as unfair on those forced to move and those obliged to receive them.
Yes		I still do not agree that my neighbours should be moved from where they are.
No		I support it, but it depends crucially where you move them to...
No		I support mooring at Riverside
No		I think the onus is on the Council to demonstrate why this should happen and why there are suddenly after 25 years 'health and safety' concerns.
Yes		I would recommend that an assessment is undertaken and published (without personal data) regarding the length of time people on the wall have lived on the river, the date at which they entered the waiting list (if applicable) and when they were offered temporary permissions more and feed them into the waiting list at the appropriate location so that the rights of anyone on the waiting list for longer are also take into account in the same process. Those on the wall should be allowed to remain on the wall and the offer until their turn to be offered a full license.
Yes		If anyone has a mooring there then I believe it is imperative to find them and reserve a new mooring before a potential leave.
Yes		If at equivalent cost. This appears to be identical to option 4.1. Could no one be bothered to check this?
No		If it aint broken then dont mend it
No		If it were clear at this point what alternatives could be offered it might be possible to give a reasoned response. As it stands it looks like eviction followed by Hobson's choice.
Yes		If people are on the waiting list for a mooring then it is fair to offer alternatives. (where?). If people are not on the waiting list, you should give a longish notice to quit as the Council has responsibility for the current situation. Minimum 6 months.
Yes		If people aren't living in Cambridge then their boat isn't their prime residence. They should be moved to make space that would make it their home.
No		If the council had alternative moorings they would be using them already and, as you have stated, you wish to encourage tourists and visitors, then visiting moorings are an essential part of the city's provision and appeal and should NOT be scrapped...not all visitors wish to stay in Travelodges!!
No		If the permanent moorings are maintained, I see no reason why the temporary moorings should not also be retained.
Yes		If the proposal goes ahead, then of course people must be offered alternative moorings. My concern would be that these might be much less convenient, and that the Riverside community would be broken up.
Yes		If the vessels are to be moved the should be given other moorings.
Yes		If these moorings absolutely must be removed then alternatives must also be provided in the local area
Yes		If these moorings are to be removed then alternative moorings for boat residents must be made available, and in locations as close as possible to their current mooring in Riverside.
Yes		If they are available without being at the expense of others
Yes		If they must be moved, they must be offered alternative moorings in Cambridge.
No		If this route is chosen, it should be done in such a way that does not penalise the existing registered occupants.
Yes		If you really have to move them, then they should be given priority. But as a Riverside resident, I would prefer things to be left as they are.
No		If you were to demolish a building previously housing squatters would they all be offered a council house? Do travellers being evicted always get offered a site to move on to? If they are to be offered moorings then it should strictly be for boats with safety cert, insurance, licence in place and can be proved to have been paying and legit for at least 10 years. The list is long enough and places limited enough for keen responsible boaters who are willing to pay so why should they all have to wait longer for squatters, half of which haven't had their boats in order or have only arrived in the last few years hoping to gain an otherwise impossible to get mooring via the council.
No		In Item 6, the 7th paragraph in the preamble makes an important point about the value attached to the river bank by the general public, beyond boat owners. I think the displaced boats from Riverside would inevitably impact negatively elsewhere, and there is no evidence of a planned and controlled management of this displacement.
Yes		In principle, as long as the alternative moorings are in a comparatively attractive location, which doesn't seem likely
No		Is there space elsewhere. Wouldn't it cause overcrowding? And since the reasons for 'needing' people to move are unconvincing, this just sounds like an unreasonable plan to force people to move their homes.
No		It could cause overcrowding at the alternative moorings and as stated earlier Riverside is their home
No		It depends on where and what the other moorings are. It's not a big river, I can't think where the council may mean and since it's not specified here, I suspect the council don't know either?
No		It depends where they are, but if there is already a long waiting list, I don't see how this could work
No		It depends. The reason for moving them away has to be compelling. Having someone dream up 'safety' reasons strikes me as questionable. If the reasons are real and compelling, yes offering alternatives are a good way to go.
No		It does not take into consideration these people's lives. For some, Cambridge is the most suitable mooring place. For some boaters, they may be forced out of the area as a whole.
No		It follows from my view in 4.1 that alternative moorings are not needed
No		It forces people from the place that is their home
No		It has already been stated that space elsewhere is limited. People have lived on riverside for a long time and I don't agree with moving people from their homes unnecessarily.
Yes		It is fair if you are going to kick the boats off riverside but there simply isn't enough mooring spaces anywhere else in Cambridge.
No		It is fair only if mooring licenses are more fairly granted.
No		It is like saying the council is going to move my house where I have roots. You should not be dictating to people who decide to live on boats.
No		It is not a credible solution - there are long waiting lists for moorings and this imposes a registration requirement contrary to current customs and practice. Does not give sufficient weight to human rights of dwellers living in the location to which they are accustomed.
No		It is not clear what problems would be solved by such an action
No		It is not clear what the existing residents at will increase crowding and river users access to the river. The riverside is their home!
No		It is not fair to the people who have been waiting on the list for years. I suggest investigating new ways to make mooring at Riverside safer.
No		It is not fair unless the craft concerned can meet a number of pre-conditions, such as being insured, having a boat safety certificate, valid licence from the Cam Conservators and showing that they can and actually do dispose of sewage properly.
No		It is not right to offer alternative mooring to only those who are registered, it should be offered to all. However I do not believe the boats should be moved.
No		It is only fair if mooring costs are pegged to the rate of inflation. Given the lack of facilities provided increasing costs above the lowest band of council tax would not be fair.
No		It is unfair to people living there currently. There are already not enough moorings available, so where exactly would those people be moved to?
No		It is unlikely that you would be able to find sufficient alternative moorings and it is very likely that overcrowding would result in other areas
No		It might be fairer than leaving people on the streets if you HAD to end moorings but you don't. So don't.
No		It reduces the capacity and thus the viability of the community.
No		It will cause completely inappropriate overcrowding down by the Commons.
No		It will cause overcrowding elsewhere.
No		It would be fair to remove those boats that are not occupied continuously, those that cannot move and those that have sewage arrangements that pollute the river. It could be considered that the wide beam boats should be swapped with narrow boats from moorings on the river to improve navigation for rowers and pleasure boats in the Riverside section which is narrower.
No		It would be too crowded elsewhere
No		It would cause overcrowding elsewhere on the river.
No		It would create overcrowding and prevent access for other people on different parts of the river.
No		It would make it overcrowded on the commons. They are used to where they live as they have been there for decades
No		It would result in overcrowding in other areas and would not be fair to those already there in addition to those being asked to move from what is their home. It would also restrict access to others who would like to access the river too
No		It would result in overcrowding of other mooring areas. Why not make mooring safer at riverside instead by modifying the railings?
No		It would result in overcrowding on the commons
No		It would result in overcrowding on the Commons

No	It would result in overcrowding on the Commons, which would not be fair on the boats that are already there and compromise river access for the public.
No	It would result in overcrowding on the Commons, which would not be fair on the boats that are already there, and on the members of the public who like access to the river too. It's not fair on those who prefer to live on Riverside and who have done so for decades - for them Riverside is home.
No	It would result in overcrowding on the Commons, which would not be fair on the boats that are already there, and on the members of the public who like access to the river too. It's not fair on those who prefer to live on Riverside and who have done so for decades - for them Riverside is home.
No	It would result in overcrowding on the Commons, which would not be fair on the boats that are already there, and on the members of the public who like access to the river too. It's not fair on those who prefer to live on Riverside and who have done so for decades - for them Riverside is home.
No	It would result in overcrowding on the Commons, which would not be fair on the boats that are already there, and on the members of the public who like access to the river. It's not fair to move on those who have considered Riverside their home for decades.
No	It would result in overcrowding on the Commons.
No	it would result in unsightly boats on the commons rather than where they are now
No	It would seem unfair to those currently moored on the commons as overcrowding could follow.
No	It would unduly crowd the commons and penalise those who already have mooring licenses. Also it makes a flat out mockery of the council's previous stance on the waiting list
No	It wouldn't be fair to overcrowd the other areas of the river, nor to move boats on from the place they've moored for years.
Yes	It's fair to offer them moorings elsewhere rather than leaving them homeless. However, all the other people on the mooring waiting list will then be leap-frogged, which doesn't seem fair. Only those riverside boats who are currently on the waiting list should be helped as they've always known that the arrangement was probably temporary and should have taken action to seek a more permanent mooring (ie put themselves on the waiting list).
Yes	It's fair, but boat people should only be moved if they fail to comply with the terms of the licence, again as would be the case with Council tenants living in houses.
No	It's not fair to move people who may have lived at Riverside for long periods of time. It wouldn't be fair on those living elsewhere on the river to overcrowd their areas.
No	It's too far from the well-established homes near the centre. It might require evicting other boaters who moor further from the city centre, to create space. I wouldn't want to see that either. Manage the process by allowing Riverside moorings to continue.
No	Just leave them alone
No	Keep boats on Riverside
No	KEEP RIVERSIDE
No	Keep riverside a mooring zone
No	Keep status quo.
No	Keep the boats at Riverside. Why change something that is lovely?
No	Keep the moorings - increase revenue make it safe if necessary - improve Cambridge
No	Keep the moorings on riverside
No	Keep things as they are.
No	Leave as is!
No	Leave boats where they are - its part of the diversity of lifestyles in Cambridge.
No	Leave it as it is
No	Leave people alone
No	Leave Riverside moorings in place, no change. By "moving" boats to alternative sites requires magical powers to create space where this is none elsewhere. Preposterous nonsense to suggest otherwise. Where do the council dream up this rubbish!
No	leave the boats on Riverside and put in amenities for H&S
No	Leave the boats on Riverside.
No	Leave the boats where they are and stop expensive attempts to create a designer river
No	Leave the boats where they are.
No	Leave them be
No	Leave them in peace.
No	Leave them where they are
No	Leave them where they are.
No	Leave things as they are.
No	Leave well alone
No	Make riverside a regular mooring place for those already living there.
No	Moorings at riverside is safe, people have lived there for many years - it's their home. I don't believe alternative moorings would be suitable.
Yes	More than fair.
No	Moving boats would not be fair on other river users as it would overcrowd the Commons.
No	Much better for them to remain on riverside where they wish to be and where they make local users safe
No	No because there is a waiting list. Some have been for years. Weekend livers should be moved. Yes old timers should get priority.
No	No detail of alternatives is given
No	No one should be rewarded for mooring on Riverside without permission (whilst others have waited for years on the waiting list for a legitimate mooring).
No	No see above
No	No! There is no need for this proposal, the boats on riverside are part of what makes Cambridge Cambridge! It is targeting people who do not live on the conventional housing market, and is unfairly aligned with the greed of housing developers - a blight, let us not forget, that is damaging the ability of many people to live in Cambridge, effecting rent levels for the worse (empty property held by overseas and other asset firms), and depriving the city centre of the lived-in community that it deserves. The boats at riverside are exactly the community the council should be trying to support.
No	No, this is not a fair proposal. Families, couples and single people who have legally made their homes here (some for many years) do not want to be moved to alternative areas. The council should just make simple changes to the railings to make the entrance/ exit to their homes safer.
No	No. For the reasons in my answer to 4.1, and there isn't enough room to avoid great overcrowding elsewhere.
No	No. They should be left to moor here and pay the new fees like everyone else.
No	Not all liveaboards have a mooring licence
No	Not fair
No	not fair to the people being moved- it amounts to forced eviction nor to the people living in bricks and mortar homes alongside the river - it would be like bulldozing the homes of your street neighbours on the other side of the road.
No	Not fair, but may make it possible
No	Not necessary, as Mooring can be maintained at Riverside and no cogent case has been presented to the contrary
No	Not on the commons, the waiting list should be respected. We don't want the commons to be overcrowded so that boaters risk losing their spot if they move
No	Not really. Usually "offer" means mandatory. Why not have sensible meeting to decide range of options for boaters?
No	Not unless you can specify where the alternative moorings are and they need to be as close as possible like for lake. Are you planning on moving peoples home from the centre of town to ??? The reeks of "clean up". While some boats on river side are eye sores and the area would look better without this is a very slippery slope
No	Not unless you're going to build a Marina e.g. up at Chesterton. Not really alternative mooring available elsewhere.
No	Once again my answer is WHERE? The commons are almost full. Also as a single woman living aboard I feel a sense of security to be overlooked by my neighbours in houses as I look out for them.
No	Others have waited a long time, why should those who have moored illegally "jump the queue"
No	Overcrowding at other areas!
No	Partly remove not every vessel
No	patently unfair, unreasonable - and frankly, unbelievable that all these people could be accommodated elsewhere 'in cambridge'
No	People do not want to leave or move so why force them? Where did the CL contributions from riverside developments (including new accommodation and boat houses) go? Why couldn't this money be spent on building a permanent jetty along riverside much like quayside or a similar solution?
No	People have been living there for at least thirty years, peacefully and legally, and causing no trouble (I'm a rover and have friends who live on Riverside). I see no reason to destroy a small part of our community, especially over risible "health-and-safety" concerns. And where are these 30 or so extra moorings? Are you going to have people double moored outside the boathouses?
No	People have chosen to be there and have done their own risk assessment.
No	People have lived on Riverside for many years and do not want to move. The alternative moorings on the common side will be overcrowded, not fair to boat owners currently there. Increasing mooring on common side will unfairly restrict access to river for public
No	People may moor at Riverside because that's the particular place they want to moor.
No	People should continue to moor here and moving them will create overcrowding in other places.
No	people who are currently on the waiting list should not be shafted in this way for the sake of freeloaders.
Yes	Please see above response
No	provide safe moorings instead of re-homing to an unknown place. Else be specific as to where "elsewhere" is.
Yes	Provided that the boat is registered and pays
No	Providing suitable notice is given all boat owners should be able to find alternative moorings at other locations. There are many marinas between Cambridge and Ely.
No	Question 4.2 is a repeat of 4.1
No	Remove boats that are moored illegally, if they require council accommodation they can go through the regular council process for accommodation.
No	Result: Overcrowding on the Commons, reduced public access and the unnecessary uprooting of people whose home this has been for decades.
No	Riverside has been the home for some people for decades. This is totally unfair and shows no respect
No	Riverside is an established community, and it has already been stated by the council that there are not enough moorings available to meet current demand.
No	Riverside is my home and the community with both boat and house residents is amazing.
No	riverside is no more a blight on the riverbank than the upriver liveaboards - move the lot and give the river bank to the community
No	Same as above. Manage it as now but without the over-control and constant threat of eviction. Highly stressful and damaging to the children's developing nervous systems!
No	see 4.1
No	See 4.1
No	See 6 + 7 above. Those on waiting list will lose out here as they will have to wait years, more, before being housed. Those on the railings will lose out as there aren't enough moorings in the city for all boats as you erroneously claim. Destroying moorings, rather than trying to improve them is bad for the city, bad for the community.
No	See above
No	See above, no spaces to moor on Council moorings. Leave liveboard boats on Riverside
No	See above.
No	See above. It is unnecessary, would spill the area and would cause crowding in other areas
No	See above. No issue with having boats moored at Riverside.
No	See above. Perhaps the land opposite Riverside could have mooring posts added so narrow beams can go to opposite bank.
No	See above. The City Council has many conditions on its licence arrangements which currently do not apply to people on the railings. Changes that would be forced on boat-dwellers might involve expensive and unrealistic alterations to their vessels. Instead, the City Council should undertake work to make the Riverside moorings safe for access to the boats.
No	See above. These are people's homes and they should not be forcibly moved.
No	See above. This appears to be much the same question. First address the issues that are causing the City Council to move people. Allow people to respond to a discussion rather than react to what are, quite frankly, decisions that leave rather a bad taste.
No	See answer to 4.1 above. I do think that we need more residential moorings, and that existing Riverside boat residents should be offered alternative moorings if they wish, but they should not be put under any pressure whatsoever to move.
No	See my comments to 4.1
No	See my response to 4.1 above
No	See option 4.1
No	see option 4.1
No	See option 4.1. This sounds like an excuse for "cleansing" as well as clearing.
No	See previous answer. Keep Riverside moorings, & provide gate access.
No	Since this would result in overcrowding in areas where mooring is currently allowed, and may result in families being moved far away from local schools and those without alternative transport becoming situated far away from city amenities such as shops. The increased distance from the waste disposal location on Jesus green may also result in an increase of illegal disposal of waste on the commons.
Yes	so long as the moorings offered don't make trips to school etc much longer, i.e. the moorings offered should be nearby.
No	Status quo.
No	Strongly oppose. There would be too much overcrowding elsewhere.
No	Surely, this would result in overcrowding in the areas around the commons and be restrictive to others who want access to the river.
Yes	Temporary Moorings should be moved. I have no idea where you are moving them too but I don't see where this would be possible on the city side of Baits Bite Lock
No	The boat owners are an essential part of the local community
No	The boats at Riverside are homes of City Residents that are settled within distance of work, family and friends as on-shore homes would be and it would be unthinkable that anyone can be moved from their house or indeed their house moved under such circumstances as has been cited by the council
No	The boats moored at Riverside are people's homes and form a community that is unique to the area. What are the reasons for this suggestion?
No	The boats moored at Riverside should be allowed to remain whether registered or not.
No	The boats there are doing no harm.
No	The conclusion from the previous consultation about Riverside was that the Council would regularise the moorings at Riverside. The Council should uphold this commitment. The decision was a rational one at the time and the passage of time does not make this decision any less rational.
No	The current seems fine.
No	The current situation does not need changing or fixing. This proposal will only make another area over crowded for no good reason.
No	The introduction already states that demand exceeds availability of moorings and so I don't see where extra moorings can be introduced.
No	The issue is where they would go as it would likely result in overcrowding of areas such as the commons
No	The other areas where boats are moored seem fully occupied already. Why should those areas be crowded when there is space along Riverside?
No	The proposal is not fair as it will effect house boat dwellers carrying out their daily lives/getting to work or school if people have disabilities alternative moorings will need to be accessible.
No	the proposal is word-for-word identical to that of 4.1, so this has the same answer
No	The proposal isn't fair. It would result in overcrowding on the Commons, which would not be fair on the boats that are already there, and on the members of the public who like access to the river too. It's not fair on those who prefer to live on Riverside and who have done so for decades - for them Riverside is home.
No	The proposal isn't fair. It would result in overcrowding on the Commons, which would not be fair on the boats that are already there, and on the members of the public who like access to the river too. It's not fair on those who prefer to live on Riverside and who have done so for decades - for them Riverside is home.
No	The proposal isn't fair. It would result in overcrowding on the Commons, which would not be fair on the boats that are already there, and on the members of the public who like access to the river too. It's not fair on those who prefer to live on Riverside and who have done so for decades - for them Riverside is home.
No	The proposal isn't fair. It would result in overcrowding on the Commons, which would not be fair on the boats that are already there, and on the members of the public who like access to the river too. It's not fair on those who prefer to live on Riverside and who have done so for decades - for them Riverside is home.
No	The proposal isn't fair. It would result in overcrowding on the Commons, which would not be fair on the boats that are already there, and on the members of the public who like access to the river too. It's not fair on those who prefer to live on Riverside and who have done so for decades - for them Riverside is home.
No	The proposal isn't fair. It would result in overcrowding on the Commons, which would not be fair on the boats that are already there, and on the members of the public who like access to the river too. It's not fair on those who prefer to live on Riverside and who have done so for decades - for them Riverside is home.
No	The proposal to move the moorings is both unfair and unnecessary. The arguments used to support the action arise from a pre-conceived desire at Council level to remove moorings and is not evidence based or responsive to the majority of the community opinion.
Yes	The proposal to offer alternative moorings is fair, however this may well concentrate the issue of noise pollution and air quality pollution related to generator use and solid fuel use in a way that is unfair to residents in the vicinity.
No	The social impacts on the current and future boat residents on these moorings is unacceptable.
No	The waiting list for moorings is long, and those who have legally waited should not suffer at the expense of those who have obeyed mooring rules.
No	The waiting list system is the fairest way of giving moorings. The boats on riverside should stay where they are and given a mooring it its turn on the waiting list
No	There are 500 boats on the waiting list. Do these boats now precedence? End temporary permissions by all means to the empty boats - maybe think about where people can moor 'day' boats. If you do go ahead then yes it is definitely your responsibility to find them alternative moorings. But where?
No	there are already too many boats moored along the river, relocating them would only relocate the problem, not actually resolve it
No	There are no alternative moorings and there is no space to add any. Essentially what has occurred is squatting, for which if this was a house, there would not be an alternative found.
No	There are no alternative moorings in town.
No	There are no equivalent moorings to offer.
No	There are not enough moorings available elsewhere.
No	There are not other gaps for mooring in the city. Where are the alternative moorings going to be placed?
No	There are not sufficient mooring sites for this to be feasible, it would cause overcrowding elsewhere, and does not address the issue of long term residents of Riverside being moved
No	There aren't more moorings, and one should just make these legal. Nobody is being harmed here.
No	There aren't sufficient places for all the boats.
No	There does not appear to be a good reason why those boats should move and no visibility. Also it is impossible to answer the question without knowing where the alternative moorings would be. If it is far from the work places, schools and facilities that riverside boaters rely on then the answer is an obvious no!
No	There is an existing community of boat-dwellers which will be destroyed by the relocation.
No	there is sufficient information here about where an alternative site might be for me to agree that moving boat from this area would be acceptable
No	There is no detail of where these moorings might be, so I cannot agree with this, after all they cannot be pulled out of the air. The council should state exactly where this will be. After all they will be breaking up a community of people who have been neighbours for years.

No	There is no evidence the moorings are unsafe. It would create crowding where there currently is none. There appears to be very little evidence of demand for this move and obvious support for it not going ahead.
No	There is no good reason to force the people to move from the location in which they are currently happily living. Doing so will break apart a community. If alternative moorings are available then they should be maintained to increase the number of moorings available.
No	There is no need for this process: the Riverside moorings should remain as they are.
No	There is no practicable location to offer alternative moorings elsewhere in Cambridge without causing overcrowding and reducing the already limited amenities available to boaters.
No	There is no reason to move them from Riverside And there isn't enough room elsewhere that wouldn't cause an obstruction
No	There is no room for all these boats elsewhere
No	There is no room on other parts of the River
No	There is not sufficient room elsewhere, and Riverside provides a sufficient mooring location to those that use it. The process would be best managed by the council leaving it as it is and not meddling with things that are functioning perfectly well.
No	There is not sufficient room on the commons for the boats to be moved from Riverside. Many Riverside boaters have been there for decades - it would be a disgrace to move them on when simple alterations to access could be made to permit them to stay.
No	there isn't space
No	There isn't the space for them on the commons, and Riverside is a good place for boats - safer than the commons in flood or icy conditions by far. It's a community that has been there a long time. I think you should keep them there, unlock the locked gates, and if you prefer, increase the number of mooring rings that are already there. Include them in the mooring licence that requires safety schemes and insurance, and the area should naturally smarten itself up. Be more proactive against boats that have no intention of paying. Most do I believe, and would be glad to.
No	There need to be additional moorings. It would be a shame to get rid of the Riverside moorings, they add to the character of the area and I love to see the boats there.
No	There seems no need to remove permissions to moor at Riverside. Relocation will clearly reduce the total number of moorings, and therefore on-water residences in Cambridge, at a time when the city is already under population pressure.
No	There seems to be no grounds or mandate to do such a thing.
No	There seems to be no pressing reason to change the current status of the boats
No	There should be a notice period and after which the mooring must be vacated. Offers of yet more moorings just moves the problem elsewhere
No	There should not be a requirement to live on the boats that are moored there. If you remove the moorings then the boats housed there should ALL be re-moored. Not all boats are house boats; the right to moor by the riverside vessels needs to be upheld for all boats.
No	There will be overcrowding elsewhere
No	There's already a shortage of moorings, and it would be difficult to relocate all the boats from Riverside.
No	There's no space for them on Commons. Would take even more amenity away from public on commons. Temporary measure only to allow shuffling while improving riverside docks.
No	These are homes, not an inconvenience to people living in the nearby expensive flats.
No	These are squatter boats and have made no effort to comply with any bylaws regarding mooring fees, waiting list, foul water pollution, noise pollution, air pollution, disgustingly unmaintained boats, etc. They are entirely freeloaders and should absolutely NOT be given any mooring in Cambridge. I suggest that they may obtain a license by the following means: 1) pay reparations for years of not paying mooring fees, and for years of fouling the river with sewage. 2) take their place at the bottom of the waiting list as per everyone else. The squatters could be offered moorings near Uxwell or somewhere similarly distant. Certainly not in Cambridge. Giving permanent moorings to these people will just encourage others to flout the rules. They have demonstrated themselves to be plainly willing to flout any rules to do whatever they want. This is certainly not the type of people the city should pander to.
No	These moorings are a hazard, an eyesore and many of the boats are not river worthy. A lot of them dump waste in the river and they have reduced the navigable width of the river to a dangerous size. If you simply relocate the current dwellers to another part of the river and offer them a mooring licence - what does that say to all those that have been waiting on the list for years? That's a very poor show. A lot of the moorings on the wall have been there for a very short time. I am someone on the waiting list - I should simply go and buy a boat now and moor on the wall - then I'd be given a mooring spot straight away. I would suggest you think this decision through very carefully.
No	They currently have a community. Fix the wall and railing if those are the problem. Don't uproot them.
No	They have been there for years so why move them
No	They should be allowed to remain
No	they should have the right to remain in their homes
No	this fall the PACE regulations, is unfair and unreasonable
No	This is an unnecessary step that would overcrowd the commons
No	This is simply uprooting families with little regard for the logistics of their lifestyles. The riverside mooring make it convenient for people to access the city.
No	This is the same as option 4.1 - has something gone wrong with the survey?
No	This option is identical to the previous one? My objections are the same.
No	This process does not need to be undertaken.
No	This proposal is not fair to current boaters moored at Riverside who have chosen this as their long term home for a wide variety of reasons, to boaters elsewhere on the Cam who will suffer from over-crowding and reduced flexibility, to other river users or to the land-based Riverside community who will suffer from removal of their neighbours and environmental loss
No	This proposal is not fair. It would result in overcrowding on the commons. Its not fair on those who prefer to live on Riverside and who have done so for Decades - for them riverside is home
No	This proposal is unfair - it would result in overcrowding on the commons.
No	This question is silly. "If you're against this, how can we do it anyway?". Makes it sound like this isn't a real consultation. The case hasn't been made satisfactorily that there is a need to move the boats at all.
No	This situation has been allowed to fester for too long. There is a proper waiting list in place and the riverside boats are simply jumping the list which is not fair to those who apply properly.
No	This would best be managed by not moving people.
No	This would create overcrowding and prevent people on the waiting list from securing moorings. Vastly reducing the number of moorings would be hugely problematic when they are under demand.
No	This would most likely lead to overcrowding at the commons. Maintain permissions to moor at riverside and you wouldn't have this issue.
No	This would overcrowd the Commons
No	This would overcrowd the current moorings, which is unfair on those residents. I support asking those who wish to remain at Riverside to become council tenants and follow the same rules as other residents.
No	This would result in overcrowding on the Commons, unfair both on boats that are already there and also on the public.
No	This would still disrupt peoples lives and I don't think there's a good reason for people to have to move.
No	This wouldn't be fair on people like me who enjoy going to the river as well as the people living on the boats
No	To be supportable, you would need to propose alternative locations in Cambridge, and give assurances about how long these arrangements would last.
No	To those people who live permanently on them, this is home. how would you like being asked to move somewhere to live because the council wanted to clear a long used street to them let nothing happen on it.
No	Unsure. Where will the boats go. I am unsure there is enough room in cambridge city. Boating residents are city residents - not south couths or elseware.
No	Waste of money and time that will inevitably lead to overcrowding
No	We do not see how there are adequate numbers of comparable moorings. If there were some reassurance or explanation of where these would be or even if they exist, perhaps this question would be more meaningful.
No	Were space available in the town, this would be fair. But there is clearly no space. Moreover, there is no good reason to end mooring at riverside
No	What is being proposed is an unfair and unnecessary imposition upon a vulnerable section of society - why? - authority should respect society.
No	What is the difference in the options? Moving boats elsewhere simply limits overall capacity, increasing pressure on the system and shooting yourself in the foot deftly at the same time.
No	What's wrong with them being there.?
No	Where are the alternative moorings going to be? (This does not seem to have been made clear.)
No	Where are the alternative moorings?
No	Where are these alternatives?
No	Where could they go? There is no marina to be plucked out of the air and planted as you like. Economic cleansing
No	Where else is there space? I would propose building of some kind of marina, which doesn't need to provide expensive facilities, just the basics of running water? But where would it go, and the charges for it would be prohibitive.
No	Where exactly do you intend to move people to?
No	Where in Cambridge? Is there going to be room for them? What about those boats which have not registered? They will be made homeless. Have these boat owners been informed of the need to register?
No	Where is the proposed alternative? People have chosen to live here due to personal reasons, work commitments, family connections. Moorings away from the area is not a viable alternative
No	Where would they go?
No	Where would they go? It's unfair to others as well.
No	Where would you move them to? You've already stated the moorings are overcrowded all along the river.
No	Where would you move them to?
No	Who would want to be forced to move home after they've lived somewhere for decades?
No	Why is this now an issue after many years of mooring there?
No	Why move them? I disagree with the reasons to evict these people.
No	Why move them? Why overcrowd already busy areas? Why make life so difficult for people who are leading lives committed to a community?
No	Why not leave the current arrangements in place and accept that not everyone fits into a handy pigeon hole
No	Why not put gates in the railings?
No	Why should boats on the railings be moved to other cambridge moorings when they are happy where they are. This would also mean they take places that others have waited for, on the mooring list for years.
No	Why should public resources be spent providing alternatives for moorings occupied without permission or authority?
No	Why should the tax payer provide moorings?
No	Why to force people to move from a place where they live happily?
No	Why would you move them out in the first place? The health and safety argument seems ridiculous. And so my cynical assumption is that the idea to kick them out is from pressure from people who've moved into the expensive riverside flats, who basically oppose having poorer people living nearby. If that's at all the case then the boats have been there way longer than them, and frankly they can deal with it.
No	Will make other areas more crowded, and still don't see why the Riverside people need to be moved.
No	Would result in overcrowding elsewhere - leave them where they are.
No	would result in overcrowding on the Commons, which would not be fair on the boats that are already there, and on the members of the public who like access to the river too. It's not fair on those who prefer to live on Riverside
Yes	Yes, if they are still city moorings.
No	You are screwing people around. Do nothing, you are proposing social cleansing as part of an obviously spurious health-and-safety ass-covering exercise.
No	You don't have enough alternative moorings to enable for children living in those boats to not have their lives disrupted
No	You have not been at all clear about where these alternatives would be. I suggest installing gates and ladders on to the railings and leaving the residents where they are happy.
No	You have not previously identified any alternative location, nor made it available for people to assess whether they would be safer there or could even afford to be there. You must firstly build a suitable alternative.
No	You haven't specified where these moorings will be
No	You need to be more specific regarding the location.
No	You want be removing them. KEEP MOORING ON RIVERSIDE
No	You would just congest other parts of the river.
No	You're moving some of the poorest residences from there known area. #gentrification

Option 4.3 or 4.2 (in earlier survey) Designate Riverside Wall as a 'no mooring zone' through the powers of the Cam Conservator. Do you support this proposal?

IP Address	Response	Comment
No	See above	
No	#BoatLivesMatter	
No	Again the boats are part of the reason I walk down there and love the view from the bridges.	
No	Again, because it seems unnecessary to prevent mooring when the so-called "health and safety" issues sound like they could be relatively easily fixed	
Yes	Again, it is not clear what problems would be solved by such an action. The council has no power or mandate to make such a request. The Cam Conservators are under no obligation to accede to any such request.	
No	Again, moving people on who have been living their safety for years on the grounds of health and safety is sophistry	
No	Again, people moor there at their own risk.	
No	An absurd measure designed to achieve aims by stealth.	
Yes	and enforce it. It is kind of degrading to the scenic river.	
No	Another example of social cleansing in Cambridge.	
No	As above - boats have moored there for many years without causing a problem.	
No	As above, the moorings at Riverside wall do not present any impediment to other river users, or health and safety concerns. I see no need for this proposal.	
No	As above. Leave moorings on Riverside alone.	
No	As above. The moorings here do not cause a problem and have never done so.	
No	As above: I don't think there are any problems.	
No	As above: the closure of mooring here is not necessary.	
No	As far as I am aware, the Conservancy deals with issues regarding navigation. The boats do not impede navigation, even for rowers - I am one myself. The trees on the far bank, and shallow water, do impede navigation, and should be addressed by the Cam Con.	
No	As it is already a mooring area I don't believe this is a fully legal option.	
No	As mentioned above, it offers a home to many residence of the city, and they should not be treated any differently to those living on land.	
No	As part of the final report on this, I hope the Council will have the courage + transparency to provide figures re i) Costs incurred by Council as a result of boat owners embarking/disearking and /or reported incidents of same ii) instances of damage to wall arising from mooring. Boat dwellers are likely to struggle to find elsewhere to live at comparable cost - they add to diversity of Cambridge population	
No	Bearing in mind that these boats have been moored there for twenty years, why have they suddenly become an obstruction?	
No	because I'd rather boats were moored along that ugly wall rather than beautiful river-bank that only boaters can appreciate.	
No	Because it appears as social cleansing. The boats are not a problem.	
No	Because it is a functioning, reasonable and VERY popular with boaters and the public, mooring zone already and there is no reason WHATSOEVER to interfere with this!!!	
No	because it's evil	
No	Because it's fine as it is... are you going to improve facilities for the boats? No! Leave it alone.	
No	Because it's unnecessary.	
No	because people have their homes there and have done so for many years	
No	Because the boats are part of Cambridge and people's homes. Stop being university led swine and gentrifying one of the few beautiful parts of the city we have left!	
No	because the Cam Conservators have no such powers, the boats not being a danger to navigation.	
No	because the Conservator is an independent body to the Council, and not under Council instruction.	
No	Because there is not enough space along the river to create new moorings for those that live on board at Riverside.	
No	Because there is people living there	
No	Because they chose to moor a boat and its up to them to access their boats. The boats are part of cambridge	
No	Because why should the cam conservators do the councils dirty work. They are there to conserve the river not in force council policy's.	
No	Boat moored there for over 20 years with out the camcon considering it a hazard to navigation.	
No	Boats add to Riverside. I do not own a boat and support them being there.	
No	Boats are a part of Cambridge life. They should stay where they are.	
No	Boats currently there cause few problems. Removing all moorings is overkill for the issues that do exist.	
No	Boats have been moored on the railings for many years without causing any navigation issues. As I understand it the cam con can only ban mooring on navigational grounds.	
No	Boats have been moored there for decades.	
No	Boats have been moored there for 20 years without being considered an obstruction	
No	Boats have been there for years.	
No	Boats have moored there for many years and it has been fine!	
No	Boats on Riverside are part of the local atmosphere and community.	
No	Boats should be able to moor at any point of the river for a day or 2	
No	Boats should be allowed to stay at riverside wall.	
No	Boats should stay moored on Riverside	
No	By all means designate it as a no mooring zone with the City Councils authority as landlord. This can be enforced through use of possession orders. However, the City Council have no power to make the Cam Conservancy designate it as a no mooring zone. For the Cam Conservancy it is a matter of navigation and part of the stretch is quite wide.	
No	Cam Conservators aims include working to "strike a balance between the needs of all the river users and riverside landowners and residents" and would not be acting in the interests of the riverside boat residents. They should not be coerced into acting as henchmen for the council's eviction work.	
No	Cam Conservators are in charge of the navigation. Unless they demonstrate that navigation is impeded by the boats there is no reasons for the Riverside wall to be a "no mooring zone"	
No	Cam conservators aren't really able to do this	
No	Cambridge City Council can't tell the Cam Conservator what to do	
No	Cambridge residents have made their homes here legally for many years. They must be able to stay.	
No	Can you not put up a better support / barrier rail?	
No	Can't be done. Navigation is already acceptable along riverside for 2 vessels; passing, even widebeams and the biggest things on river - rowing 8s.	
No	Can't see why and the boats are pretty there.	
No	Can't see why it is necessary	
No	Community. Kindness. Fix the wall if the wall is the problem.	
No	conservators have limited powers on this and could be challenged in court wasting more of my money	
No	Council does not have authority over Cam Conservators and they can only ban mooring because of obstruction to navigation, which is clearly not the case.	
No	Cruel displacement	
No	do not see the necessity	
No	Do something about the too many rowers	
No	Does the Conservator have the power to do this?	
No	Doesn't make any sense!	
No	Don't see that there's any substantive and justifiable reason to do so given the upheaval it would cause.	

No	don't see the issue with mooring
No	draconian and heavy handed. Cam conservators and the council should be working with boat owners in this area to improve the situation not simply to try to solve a problem off elsewhere.
No	Entirely unnecessary
No	Firstly the Council can't tell the Conservators of the River Cam - an independent body - what to do. Secondly, the Conservancy have only very limited powers, and can usually only ban mooring on the grounds of obstruction to navigation. As boats have been moored there for 20 years without being considered obstructions, any such ban would almost certainly be challenged and thrown out of court.
No	Firstly the Council can't tell the Conservators of the River Cam - an independent body - what to do. Secondly, the Conservancy have only very limited powers, and can usually only ban mooring on the grounds of obstruction to navigation. As boats have been moored there for 20 years without being considered obstructions, any such ban would almost certainly be challenged and thrown out of court.
No	For most people, these boats are their homes
No	For the reason mentioned in 4.1
No	For the reasons already outlined
No	For the reasons outlined above, these are people's homes. People who are part of the community.
No	For those here and who do not want to move, I think that they should be given 5yrs to move... in order to make suitable alternative arrangements.
No	forget it unless you wish incredibly bad publicity backlash and I will be the first to report on international radio thankyou
No	Health and safety appears to be being used as an excuse to move these people on.
No	How could this be enforced?
No	I am happy for this to be an official mooring zone where appropriate but not a temporary one.
No	I am not aware of any accidents - if there is evidence of actual harm then please publish it. Advise rowers that this is a no overtaking zone or overtake with care.
No	I can't see what would be gained.
No	I do not support the idea that boats should be restricted from mooring there, and the Cam Conservancy do not have the powers to ban mooring there anyway, as they are not an impediment to navigation.
No	I do not support the idea that there is any reason to designate the Riverside as a no mooring zone.
No	I do not support the presumption that mooring at Riverside must be ended
No	I don't believe the council can instruct an independent body what to do.
No	I don't even understand why you'd want them to move? It's part of Cambridge life, and the tourists love it.
No	I don't know how this differs from 7 and 8 above. If you mean no mooring without offering a reasonable alternative, then that would be unacceptable as you would literally be casting people adrift.
No	I don't see them polluting any more than anything else in the city especially cars.
No	I don't think this is a good idea clearly, boats have been moored there for 20 years without being considered obstructions and therefore conservators would find it difficult to argue that they suddenly are...
No	I doubt it would 1. be listened to the council have no power over the Conservators of the river Cam) 2. Be upheld in court since the only grounds for restriction of mooring are navigation, and boats have been there for years without issue.
No	I just don't see what harm they're doing there, and so why they can't be allowed to stay?
No	I like walking past the boats here. They are an important part of Cambridge culture, and are doing no harm.
No	I only support 4.1 and 4.2 because the Council operates full responsibility for accidents and compensation demands. Personally, I believe all occupants should be permitted to stay and sign away city responsibilities for them and their guests, so making the person responsible.
No	I really like seeing boats on Riverside. The boating people are friendly and community minded. They are a great addition to our city.
No	I support mooring at Riverside
No	I think this should be done once the mooring issues there have been resolved. I would be happy for the area to be designated "no mooring" for new arrivals and derelict and unoccupied boats to be removed immediately.
No	I want people living on boats to be able to moor there.
No	I would favour - after displacement of the existing craft - a mixture of zones - see 4.4.
No	I would like my neighbourhood to remain as it is. I do not want to see my neighbours evicted. Cambridge is badly in need of affordable housing and alternative housing.
No	I would rather Cam conservators deal with the destructive rowers and their effect on the local wildlife.
No	I would say yes, if you would have been clear on where and how in previous points
No	I'm not convinced that the HRS concerns justify the proposal.
No	If everyone were moved then it should be designated as a "no mooring zone". See my answer to 4.1 for reasons of concern.
No	If people are desperate enough to moor there with all the access problems it gives them then let them.
Yes	If the problems are real then go ahead, but has anyone been injured by mooring here?
No	If yes why?
No	If yes, why?
No	If you want to move the boats because of H & S, how many incidents have taken place there? The council just seems intent on believing they will 'pretty up' the area and get lots more money.
No	I'm not sure I have enough information to answer this question knowledgeable. To augment my above response, this question relates to whether the Cam Conservator feels that Riverside should not be considered a suitable mooring site due to competing interests with rowers; at least that is my impression. If it's true that there isn't enough room for rowers in that area (for example, can two boats fit side-by-side whilst boats are moored?), then appreciate that both activities must be fairly accommodated, and would in that case defer to rowers as their options are more limited than river moorings. But if there is room for everyone comfortably then I would not support this measure.
No	In the end yes, but in a phased manner.
No	It hasn't needed to be this before, why now?
No	It is a reasonable place to moor.
Yes	It is already a narrow section of river and it is a corner so having boats moor there makes huge issues for other river users
No	It is entirely appropriate to moor at Riverside Wall. It is not a problem
No	It is entirely unnecessary. The council should concentrate on the plight of the many homeless people on the streets of Cambridge rather than removing existing homes, be they boats or houses.
No	It is not reasonable
No	It is unnecessary. Disciplined use of the river by rowers and other vessels does not lead to problems and it is only potentially an issue at high peak times for rowing; something which clubs ought to manage by other means among themselves - although it is tighter there the queuing issues would still apply anyway all along the river due to the volume of use. Many rowers are also river dwellers and harmonious relations on the river are better fostered by an inclusive and diverse approach.
No	It massively reduce the number of available moorings.
No	It reduces the Riverside community. Its a real asset having these boats in the city.
No	It seems excessive and unnecessary.
No	It should be the rowing clubs that have to foot the extra costs as they have increased heavily over the years to the point that the sea cadets don't use the river for boating anymore
No	It sounds daft
No	It would appear that this is a legally absurd proposal
No	It would be awful to see the wall empty. The boats/boaters are part of our community and provide more health and safety for the local people and passers by than no boats/boaters.
No	It would be strange for the boats not to be there. The fact that there are people living on them make the river bank feel safer to walk/cycle along.
No	It would make a great visitor mooring and is a useful space for all boats. I can't see the evidence to back up a no mooring zone
No	It would make people homeless
No	It's against Cambridge life and culture and discriminates against people who have called Riverside their home for years
No	It's absolutely wrong in a time where moorings are in demand and available, as they are here, to remove them. This is a huge amount of the available mooring space in Cambridge, and to enforce artificial scarcity based on the claims of safety is disingenuous. I've spoken to rowers (one of whom was my brother, a Trinity 1st and 3rd rower) and these genuine river-users say that there's plenty of space and apparently have actively campaigned for Riverside moorings to be left alone in the past. This still stands.
No	It's brenda boat wharf for generations.
No	It's not a fair or realistic proposal. The moored boats cause no obstruction and residential mooring adds to the safety of pedestrians on Riverside.
No	It's worked for as long as I've been in Cambridge.
No	leave people on the railings, over time don't renew moorings
No	less effect on the environment than alternative Common locations
No	Like a said, they're not bothering anyone. Let them stay but charge them the same as other residential boats.
No	Mooring should continue on Riverside - boats have moored there for decades without trouble.
No	Mooring spaces are obviously in high demand and so none should be removed. As the council your job is to accommodate the demand. There appears to be no problem that I am aware of through having these boats moored. As a canoeist, I enjoy the present Riverside scene.
No	more places are needed
No	My understanding of the powers of Cam Conservator is that the council cannot order them to do anything so I don't understand why this proposal is even in this consultation.
No	No further boats apart from those already registered can be there
No	no mooring anywhere up to the weir other than 'visitors'
No	No need for it to be
No	No need to do this nothing wrong with the status quo
No	No need to.
No	No problem with navigation.
No	No restriction to navigation.
No	no sound reasons for this proposal have been put forward
No	No valid as CCON can only designate 'no mooring' due to navigation & boat have been navigating there fine for years
No	No! There is no need for this proposal, the boats on Riverside are part of what makes Cambridge Cambridge! It is targeting people who do not live on the conventional housing market, and is unfairly aligned with the greed of housing developers - a blight, let us not forget, that is damaging the ability of many people to live in Cambridge, affecting rent levels for the worse (empty property held by overseas and other asset firms), and depriving the city centre of the 'red-in-community that it deserves. The boats at Riverside are exactly the community the council should be trying to support.
No	No. The Cam Conservators are not a democratically accountable body like the City Council and their views and opinions must always be subservient to the needs of the residents and visitors to this town
No	Not a safety issue for cam con. Navigation is not restricted.
No	Not enough moorings. Those boaters will be homeless.
No	Not necessary
No	Not needed. Could you reduce health and safety risks by cutting back the overhanging trees and dredging Riverside bank to free up navigational space?
No	Not seen any good reason for this. Does the Cam Conservator have the power to do this? Is the Cam Conservator accountable to the local authority in respect of this issue?
No	Not sure the Council can actually tell the Cam Con to do this.
No	Not sure you can plant there is no need to
No	Nothing to do with cam con
Yes	on the grounds that you have set out above
No	only a problem on the bends
No	Only if alternatives are available that cater for the needs of the people who have been moved.
No	Only if boats are re-housed
No	Only once the current situation has been resolved. A possible introduction of a No Mooring Zone - exceptions are made for those in receipt of temporary permission to moor.
No	Other than the health and safety issues, which can be addressed separately, I don't see a problem with them being there.
No	People currently live there and there is no valid reason to move them
No	People have been mooring there for years. It would be a wasted space.
No	People live there now
No	People would lose their homes
No	please refer to my reply to Option 4.1
No	provide safe moorings instead
Yes	Provided the safety argument can be properly and independently demonstrated.
No	Removing moorings cannot be argued to be necessary from a navigation perspective I have been both a boat dweller and rower, and now live in a house along Riverside. There are a couple of short stretches where preventing mooring would benefit rowing and power craft navigation but for the majority of the length of the Riverside wall there is ample room for traffic in both directions. Traffic flows well when rowing crews are competent, and the Riverside houseboat community should not be penalised for the times that rowing crews prove not to be competent and cause congestion, particularly as this is unlikely to be mitigated significantly by removing the moored boats.
No	Riverside mooring should stay as boats have always been there. Why change this.
No	Riverside wall is a far and safe place for people to live
No	Riverside Wall is home to many boaters who are not a problem.
No	s boats have been moored there for 20 years without being considered obstructions, any such ban would almost certainly be challenged and thrown out of court.
No	Safe mooring solutions are preferable and fairer.
No	Same as above
No	Same as the answer to 4.1
No	Same reasons stated above.
No	See 4.1
No	See 4.1
No	see 7. 4.1
No	See above - but also bear in mind that this is a hideous piece of blank concrete and at present greatly improved by having human life acted out against it - human life also enjoyed by those walking Riverside which would otherwise be a very dreary section of the river walk.
No	see above responses
No	See above. Having spent two years living on the Riverside Wall, I really see no reason why mooring should be banned there.
No	See above. The boats are strongly visual and provide a counterpoint and supplement to what could otherwise be a boring and suburbanised area.
No	See above. The reasons given are not strong enough.
No	See answer 4.1 above.
No	See answer to option 4.1. It's not in the interests of the City generally nor the residents. The City have let this length of Riverside become poorly managed, but that is the City's fault, not only the fault of boaters. The Riverside wall moorings are an asset - why extinguish a valuable asset?
No	See answer to Q7. I don't see the need for this at all.
No	See comment about destroying an existing community
No	See comments above.
No	See comments above.
No	See my answers to 4.1 and 4.2 above.
No	see my notes above. It is a pity for responsible boat owners
No	See Option 7.1
No	See replies passim
No	See responses above. Enforcing an ongoing no moorings policy would be more difficult and expensive, and less desirable, than having the Riverside wall occupied by an established group of long-term boat residents, who see themselves as part of the local community.
No	Should be practical and resultative
No	So the council would consider just evicting people. Maybe destroying the boats as well. Nice!
No	Solutions should be sought to enable mooring. See answers above. The boats add to the visual appeal of what could be a fairly bleak looking road. The boats are existing homes that should not be 'slum cleared'
No	Start understanding your own legal system first?
No	Stop trying to suggest Cam Conservators has the power! It may influence the council but it is a badly managed quango. 1Two wrongs do not make a right
No	Surely if the Cam Conservators had thought there was a problem with moorings along Riverside they would have done something about it before. Since they have not, presumably they accept the current situation.
No	that part to the cam is an important element of life on the river
No	The arguments you present are specious. There are no obstacles and no danger that has increased in recent years.
No	The boats are a colourful community and a refreshing change to the obnoxious gated communities that otherwise inhabit the area
No	The boats are an important part of the river side community.
No	The boats are integral to the fabric of Cambridge life.
No	The boats are part of its character
No	The boats are people's homes
No	The boats have been there for a long time and enhance the character of the area which has become sterile looking since new developments have been built in the area. The boats provide affordable housing in a city where housing is expensive. Please let the boats remain.
No	The boats make the area safer and more friendly. I also can't see any reason the boats shouldn't be there. Finally, people have lived here for years without there being a problem and they shouldn't have to move if they don't want to.
No	The boats there are doing no harm.
No	The Cam Con is, or should be, an independent body, not a council sock puppet. If they are concerned that boats on Riverside are a navigation hazard, they have had 20+ years to say so. They haven't.
No	The Cam Con regulate Navigation and there is no issue with Navigation with the boats currently moored on the widest parts of Riverside.
No	The Cam Con surveyed the Riverside area for the purposes of navigation and found the was no reason to move the boats
No	The Cam Conservancy is a navigation authority, not a police force whose job it is to enforce council policy. Such a role would bring the Conservancy into conflict with river users, and that is in no-one's interest.
No	The Cam Conservators are an independent body.
No	The cam conservators are not the appropriate body
No	The Cam Conservators have by neglect allowed this situation to develop. They have been utterly incompetent failing to regulate vessels, preferring instead to increase numbers to maximise revenue. As councillors are represented on the board the Council should accept they are to blame for allowing this situation to spiral to this level. Adequate regulations should have been in place for decades to obviate this 'tree-jerk' reaction.
No	The City Council cannot use the powers of the Cam Conservators. Although there are City Councillors who are also Conservators, they are NOT ALLOWED to vote on proposals at Conservancy meetings in which they have an interest. Also, at least two of the City Council appointed Conservators- Amy Tilson and Lyn Golliday- would almost certainly NOT SUPPORT this proposal. To even suggest it shows how little you understand about how the river works.
No	The conclusion from the previous consultation about Riverside was that the Council would regularise the moorings at Riverside. The Council should uphold this commitment. The decision was a rational one at the time and the passage of time does not make this decision any less rational.
No	The costs outweigh the benefits.

No	the Council can't tell the Conservators of the River Cam - an independent body - what to do. Also, the Conservancy have only very limited powers, and can usually only ban mooring on the grounds of obstruction to navigation. As boats have been moored on Riverside for 20 years without being considered obstructive, any such ban is almost certain to be challenged and thrown out of court.
No	The Council is not the Cam Conservator. I would want to hear the independent arguments of this body regarding the proposal.
No	The health and safety case has not been adequately presented.
No	The moorings are no more a problem now than they have been for decades.
No	The moorings are required by the people who live there.
No	The navigation in the area is not currently the issue raised here, so why would the Cam conservator ban mooring?
No	The presence of boats and the community living in them contributes to the community of Riverside.
No	The river is easily wide enough to permit navigation when boats are moored here, so I don't see any issue with moorings here.
No	The river is wide enough there
No	The Riverside Wall is a long length of river (assuming you are referring to the full length where the railings are), it would be a great shame if no boats were located here. The boats and the boating community in this location are part of the Riverside character.
No	There are not sufficient alternative sites.
No	There have been no major health and safety problems with the railings on Riverside, and there is no other reasonable reason to move boats from that area.
No	There is a clear need for additional mooring
No	There is no good reason why.
No	There is no honest and fair need so to do.
No	There is no justification - people will still moor there irrespective, which will incur costs to police and enforce
No	There is no obstruction to navigation.
No	There is no problem with the boats on Riverside, many visitors enjoy them and see them as part of the charm of Cambridge. The boat owners provide safety for those walking up and down a part of Cambridge that would otherwise be dark and deserted at night.
No	There is no reason to even propose this step.
No	There is no reasonable justification for such a designation.
No	There is no valid reason for this. My family enjoy walking along the river with the houseboats moored along Riverside. It would be a very dull stretch of pathway without it. The Cambridge University rowing clubs are more of an annoyance than any of the houseboats. They pump out loud music in the early hours, cause congestion on the river, are inconsiderate to pedestrians, cyclists and dog walkers when coaching teams on their using bicycles. They also disturb the wildlife and often kill cygnets causing major distress to adult swans. The boat dwellers blend harmoniously with the landscape and can often be seen using renewable energy such as windmills and solar panels as well as the coal and petrol that any normal household would use.
No	There is simply no reason to do so. Moorings have been there for years without issue.
No	There isn't a navigation risk at the moment, so why would the Cam Conservators want to be involved.
No	There's not enough space for boats in Cambridge as it is.
No	These are homes, not an inconvenience to people living in the nearby expensive flats. The Cam Conservators do not speak for all of us, in fact they have the interests of a few at heart.
No	They are a useless and defunct organisation who would not enforce it even if it were introduced
No	They are fine: the boatowners are currently happily able to moor to the railings and safely climb over them; having the boats moored along Riverside enhances the area; mooring along Riverside should continue to be allowed.
No	They do not hinder other river users so there is no reason to move them.
No	They're doing no harm.
No	This depends on the outcome of 4.1. If mooring at Riverside is ended then it makes sense to designate this as a 'no mooring zone'.
No	This is a longterm home for the boat dwellers and contributes positively to the character of the area. I cannot see any good reason to prohibit mooring.
No	This is a suitable mooring site
No	This is a vibrant, contributing society. We want them to stay on the riverside wall
No	This is not the responsibility of the Cam conservator
No	This is the same question as 4.1 and 4.2 and the answers are also similar. It is just an angle to increase the
Yes	This is unfair on those living there and the cam conservators do not reasonably have this power
No	This seems irrelevant if the Council is the owner.
No	This seems unfair to the current mooring users, and you have offered no convincing arguments to make it seem necessary.
No	This space accommodates people's homes - rowers have managed to work around them so far and they should continue to do so or find another place to maintain their hobby.
No	This whole H and S issue wasn't an issue at all until people started looking for a problem. I like to see the boats where they are, and if they are happy to climb over the railings, it should be their choice. Ditto some of the arguments from Riverside residents about smoke and so on. It just isn't a problem except to the mean-spirited.
No	This will reduce the total number of moorings in the city, and therefore on-water residences in Cambridge, at a time when the city is already under population pressure.
No	Those living there are living a very low impact lifestyle. The reality is that if evicted, many would end up needing social housing of which there is a severe shortage in Cambridge.
No	To be frank I just don't like rowers.
No	Too draconian. Not needed.
No	Too restrictive.
No	Unless more bank is available.
No	unnecessary
No	Use for temporary moorings only
No	Well if the council own the wall (sic) how is it anything to do with Cam Con. They do an excellent service with no government funding and only have jurisdiction over navigable stuff so its a bit of a no brainer. I would also like to take this opportunity to mention that the statistics quoted by Cam Con in the council literature is incorrect as I have lived on the river for 28 years - not just 20 - and I can name a dozen or more people who lived on the river then.
No	What does it add to the area? The boats have been there agggggg. People are used to them. Nothing is lost by them being there, but stuff is lost by taking them away.
No	What is this, 1984??
No	Where are these boats going to be moved to? In the absence of that information, how can I know if I am in favour or not?
No	Why does one always have to argue for the maintenance of the status quo when it is not obvious that there is any problem.
No	Why institute it?
No	Why would we do that when there is a thriving community there who have / create no problems. It is evident from the display of ducks that the immediate house neighbours of the riverside boats support the boats being there.
No	Why would you want to do that? They probably don't have the power to do that anyway in these circumstances. Why don't you just make the moorings safe?
No	Why? There is no evidence that Cam Conservator has even used its existing powers to remove unlicensed boats. Where would they remove them to?
No	You are not the Cam Con so its nothing to do with you. Also this is just getting the Cam Con to act a your henchmen. Just leave people alone.
No	You cant make boaters homeless
No	You have no powers to do so, as far as I can tell.
No	You're just asking the same question over and over again and so I'm giving the same answer: People have been living there for at least thirty years, peacefully and legally, and causing no trouble (I'm a rower and have friends who live on Riverside). I see no reason to destroy a small part of our community, especially over risible "health-and-safety" concerns.

Option 4.4 Do you have any additional solutions you would like us to consider?

IP Address	Response	Comment
Yes		retaining moorings on Riverside, and improving access by installing gates at road level in the railings, with ladders for access to boats and mooring rings set into the concrete.
Yes		(1) use some of the existing roadway to provide access to boats, with safety ladders down the river wall (2) fence to be taken back by 2-3 metres (3) access provided to riverside via gates, to which only those with boats (who have paid mooring fee) have the key (4) bollards provided within the 2-3 metre area to which boats could be moored (5) boats that are junk to be removed, no matter what fee has been paid (6) preferably also those boats that are used only for weekends or holidays to be removed from Riverside. Cambridge is an expensive place to live. There is no reason why the rule on the river should be simply that those who turn up and tether their boats to the railings jump the queue on those who have sat on the waiting list for a mooring for ages. It is an attractive addition to the Cambridge riverside for boats to be moored. If the Council is responsible for Health and Safety, it has to provide moorings that are safe. I'd be surprised if this were not possible with a little more imagination than exercised by the Cam Conservators. Boats are tethered to the sides of canals in Amsterdam without an intervening pontoon, but perhaps this is UK Health and Safety run berserk, as is unfortunately all too common.
Yes		1. Keep things as they are and ask users to sign a disclaimer re their health and safety. Or 2. Use space from the street that is currently under utilised eggs the pay and display parking
Yes		48 hour visitor mooring by Jesus lock
Yes		a constructive engagement with boat owners and a recognition by the council that by providing better facilities at designated areas would provide a more attractive mooring option.
Yes		A consultation that involves the actual residents opinions more strongly. A simple solution would be to add ladders and mooring rings, and gates to the railings, why has this option not been discussed?
Yes		A small section of the wall (away from the bridge) could be re-designed to enable em/disbarking. My concern is on environmental grounds (smoke pollution and sometimes smog in the vicinity of Riverside Bridge) but I am concerned about the impact on residents with a long history and association with the area. It could be seen as a form of 'ethnic cleansing'.
Yes		Access improvement includes gates in the railings, ladder access to boats
Yes		Add access gates and ladders at points of minimal danger to car accidents. The railings are far more dangerous to small children as they are able to get through the gaps. The railings need to be replaced with this in mind, and gates, access points, ladders and rungs for mooring attached to the concrete could be added.
Yes		Add gates, ladders and mooring rings to riverside
Yes		Additionally impose a mandatory annual review when renewal of licenses in respect to any potential complaints lodged against occupants of the moorings
Yes		Address the three problems outlined above by installing mooring rings, ladders and access gates.
Yes		Adopt Riverside moorings into the existing scheme. Allow residential boats to stay. Make access "safer" in your opinion by providing gates (although the exemplary safety record along Riverside doesn't require this) and re-install mooring rings in the concrete coping. Several are provided already, so it is obvious that the wall is strong enough and has been designed to take this strain. Use the existing mooring contracts to help reduce any anti-social behaviour, e.g. by setting hours at which generators can be run.
Yes		Aiming for no moorings at Riverside for safety reasons, but doing this in a phased manner. Maybe not allowing new boats to moor once people leave.
Yes		All boats should be lived on and not left empty for long periods.
Yes		All presently there to remain, no new moorings.
Yes		Allow continued moorings at Riverside Wall, keep charges low, & avoid further homelessness.
Yes		Allow mooring along the Riverside wall to continue, charge the appropriate fees, and provide proper mooring points in the wall so that boats are not tied to the railings.
Yes		Allow mooring at Riverside and build ladders for easy access of boats
Yes		Allow more moorings at Stourbridge Common and Ditton Meadows.
Yes		Allow people to continue living here.
Yes		Allow people to register a boat to be moored in the area, but include a disclaimer that they are responsible for boarding and alighting the boat safely and that the council has no liability, as well as clauses that allow charges to be made for damage to the wall or railings that require repairs.
Yes		Allow the boats to continue to moor unmolested at Riverside.
Yes		Allow to continue mooring at riverside, just do not increase moorings over the years if a problem, moving all moorings to a different area is not solving any of the situation
Yes		Alternative mooring if offered to the boats moved from riverside should come with a minimum condition that the boats are safe to moor. Over the years we have seen many boats in such bad state of repair that they have capsized.
Yes		Although I stand strongly that the riverside wall should be free from moorings, I do feel that some would be left with no where to go. However, a lot of the boats along that wall are no river worthy, some are, to all extents and purposes - a poverty stricken boat shell. There is no proper waste disposal, some have no power, some are pumped out regularly. However some vessels are in a decent state and are not in such a state. I believe that if the boat is river worthy and can be moved under it's own power then there should be some consideration. What you do not want is dilapidated cruiser style boats clogging the river with no separation between them
Yes		Although I understand why the boats on the river do not come into the council's social housing policy it is obvious that the proposals if passed will be very destructive to a community which lives on the river and which is valued by the majority of local residents. I have seen a Freedom of Information request response in which it is clear that the very few complaints made about them over the years are not sufficient to motivate the council to take such punitive action against this community. At a time when there are increasing numbers of homeless people and when the council has increased its duty to help them: "The council has a statutory duty to house families with children and vulnerable people who are homeless through no fault of their own, and to provide advice and assistance to those threatened with homelessness." (Homelessness Review 2015) It is appalling that the council is not working WITH the boat-dwelling community to help them to stay in their homes. Please scrap this proposal and instead start to work with the community to ensure their longevity in their homes.
Yes		An increase in fees lower than the rate of interest in order to not mess up people's lives.
Yes		An increase in fees that reflects investment in the river and banks and facilities for boats. Secure tenancies for license holders. A fair waiting list that takes into consideration circumstances. A better policy on empty boats and sub letted boats(my boat was burgled twice due to having empty boats both sides making for very little security).
Yes		As above - a slow system of adding mooring rings, gates and ladders to riverside would seem a much more logical and reasonable solution, if the issue actually is health and safety. That could even be funded by some kind of one off boat tax, or paid for voluntarily by the community / boaters who live there - I think they would be very happy to pay for that, if the alternative is having to leave riverside. Though I imagine relative to for example building a pontoon it would be inexpensive and could be rolled out slowly, so not a huge investment at once.
Yes		As above. It has been mooted that any health and safety issues could be agreeably solved through the installation of gates and ladders. In any case it should be acknowledged that the residents here have been using the railings successfully (ie without injury) for decades.
Yes		As boatowners here are clearly the only real 'victims' the Council must guarantee to ensure that all effort is taken to act in the most sympathetic and caring manner in easing the stress and likely trauma of these relocated residents
No		As far as I can see there is no problem that needs a solution.
Yes		Ask rowers to pay a little more, each, to raise extra funds - rather than lose homes. Introduce a licence system to those on riverside so that money could be generated that way. Improve safety by installing gates at road level in the railings, with ladders for access to boats and mooring rings set into the concrete.
Yes		Assist by allowing or providing safe access ladders
Yes		band mooring on the bends at riverside
Yes		boat owners must prove that they are able to move their vessels to the approved waste disposal sites and this needs to be monitored. I have seen dumping into the river from boats.
Yes		Boats moored at Riverside have a no generators after say 18.00. Burn fuel that is not toxic. Break rules fine. ?
Yes		Boats that are clearing sinking or falling apart should be removed by the council if their owners compelled to repair them
Yes		Boats with people living on board, should be moored further out of town. City centre along the river, only allow to stay temporarily for no more than one week, no permanent stay, Tourist boat only.
Yes		Bring in an effective licensing system within a designated area of Riverside and enforce the system effectively.
Yes		Bring riverside into the residential mooring scheme
Yes		Bring the moorings into the main Council scheme. Install gates in the railings to access fixed ladders, with either mooring rings in the wall or on pilings if the wall is not strong enough.
Yes		Build a marina in Cambridge
Yes		Build a marina!
Yes		Build a marina, not posh expensive housing or boat houses, this could have been done then they would not be an issue
Yes		Build a marina?
Yes		Build a mariner in front of the flats on the old Phillips site, vie developed
Yes		Build a permanent jetty along riverside much like quayside or a similar. Increase mooring space (similar to Browns Field near the pub in Fen Ditton). Create a Marina perhaps off Fen Road where all the illegal travellers have managed to become rich from illegal development proposals from the council?
Yes		Buying or allowing a developer to acquire some land downriver and create a marina.
Yes		Cam Conservators use their existing powers to remove the several derelict boats that locals seem to think of as an eyesore. The City council could even suggest using public money to facilitate this. Then review.
Yes		Can you just let the boats stay. Gates in railings, ladders. This would make sense.
Yes		charge rowers a small amount more to use river + increase number of legal moorings along riverside and use these funds to improve moorings.
Yes		Charge the boats that are there include them in the moorings.
Yes		Claim back years worth of mooring fees from these freeboarders
Yes		Close all the university boat houses ban rowing boats from the river cam
Yes		Communicate fully and honestly with the residents in homes by the river and with residents on the boats. Communication and a good attitude costs nothing and will go a very long way to solving this.
Yes		Consider developing more moorings facilities on the southern cam between Fen Causeway and Granchester. Manage the housing market in cambridge so that affordable accommodation is available to help ease the number of people looking for alternative to massive rents. Cam down on boat owners who have residential mooring licences for craft that they do NOT live on.
Yes		Consider moving all boats from where they are and mooring them perpendicular to the river 50 metres upstream and downstream of Jesus lock
Yes		Consider retaining Riverside moorings. If safety is a concern, improve access to boats.
Yes		Consider small and effective changes as opposed to undefined grand plans. Note that the rail does not hold the 'weight' of the boat, it only restrains the motion of a floating vessel. There is a huge difference. Safety measures can be simple and access can be improved without drastic changes. The boating community should be engaged and the process and related finances made transparent. Boaters are not shy of fundraising and working as a community and the council should collaborate as opposed to enforce plans that can be expensive and ineffective
Yes		Consider solutions to congestion on the Cam that don't seem to put the onus for change entirely on those living on the river. Maybe take steps to reduce the number of rowers and pleasure craft - accepting that these are probably a considerable source of income and prestige.. Is the City Council so desperate for money, and so lacking in imagination with respect to finding other sources, that they have to resort to chiselling a community containing some vulnerable members of society.
Yes		Continue the great work the council has undertaken on the public realm improvements in Riverside, it is this that would make the biggest difference to all Riverside residents.
Yes		Continue to explore ways to improve the infrastructure / access provision in this area, thereby increasing the number of safe available moorings in the city, to meet the increasing demand.
Yes		Continue to let people moor there and provide simple and safe access (gates/ladders)
Yes		Could adjustments be made to the railings to solve health and safety concerns?
Yes		Could the boats on the common side of the river (opposite the old Pike and Eel Pub) be moved to the other side of the river going away from town. There is less river bank on that side and would seem much more suitable for boat mooring.
Yes		Create gates and ladders for entry to boats

Yes	Create more mooring spaces by dredging and bank improvements at Stourbridge Common near fen Ditton. This will be an income stream for the Council / Conservators and will be seen as a positive response to reasonable demand and a housing crisis. Vast sums are spent on cycleways with no resultant income but boats are an equally environmentally friendly and sustainable way of living. You could provide 50 housing units for minimal cost and remedy / prevent erosion of the banks resulting from increased rowing activity. It's win - win!
Yes	Create purpose built marina style moorings between the railway bridge and Marleys Holt for all but visitor moorings which should be greatly reduced - while seats are provided for the public to sit and watch the activity and wildlife on the water all we get to see is the side of a moored boat and suffocated by cannabis fumes.
Yes	Creating better access for the boats on Riverside
Yes	Creation of safe moorings along this and other areas of the river
No	Creative ways have been found to invest in the infrastructure of Riverside in the recent past. Similar initiatives should be targeted to provide gates and steps/ladders for access.
Yes	Designate it as mooring & charge folks. Stop using h&as as excuse. Publish accident figures alongside your claims in your report. I would be happy to reconsider my response if people are being hurt. I doubt this. It's great to see the boats along the river.
Yes	Develop Riverside. Invest in it. Make it an even more vibrant feature of the city. Council could generate a lot of revenue if done right, and respect was given to the fact that these are people's long standing homes. Pricing could be increased fairly then.
Yes	Dissallow almost all mooring in narrow parts of the river. Designate a minimum width. River narrowness is a real problem along some stretches between Jesus lock and the green dragon bridge.
Yes	Don't allow permanent moorings anywhere in the city. Access to the river bank in the city is highly prized and is limited, and should not be occupied by private boat owners or home dwellers (rich or poor). When there is a houseboat moored, the public do not use the bank as it feels like you're 'on someone's doorstep', and the river itself is occupied by the boat. It prevents picnickers, anglers, artists, bathers, outdoor readers etc etc from using the bank. This is unfair. Perhaps allow temporary moorings, as this gives a variety of people access to the spot, but only in strictly limited areas. Moorings outside the city centre, eg on Stourbridge Common, might be more acceptable and fair.
Yes	don't turn this into a money maker. majority of people living in boats moored in Cambridge could not afford off river housing.
Yes	Dredge the far bank and cut the trees back, as the Cam Con are supposed to do. Include the Riverside in the mooring scheme and charge accordingly. The revenue you are looking for will be generated. Spend the revenue wisely - not into a general pot of riverfront stuff for the whole public, or on vastly expensive consultations. Talk to the boaters and residents and rowers and public instead. What did we do before the internet?!
Yes	Drop it and focus on stuff that matters. Paving in much of Cambridge town centre seems to be a real safety move. (Regents Street, Bridge Street).
Yes	Eliminate moorings entirely
Yes	Ensure that the boaters at riverside have gated access.
Yes	Finger moorings below Jesus lock
Yes	Further explore ways of making the moorings safe, such as installing gates and ladders to the moorings.
Yes	Care access would be greatly appreciated
Yes	Gates in railings, ladders on the wall and mooring rings to tie boats to
Yes	Gates in the barrier, ladders and mooring rings
Yes	Gates in the railing might just solve the whole situation.
Yes	Gates in the railings seems a simple approach. If the railing are so weak how have the held the boats for 20 years with no incident? This is the cam conservators (in the university pocket) wanting more space for their rowing boats.
Yes	Gates in the railings. Ladders for access.
Yes	Gates, ladders, mooring rings.
Yes	Get in touch with the Environment Agency
Yes	Get rid of the squatters who refuse to pay for their moorings. They are the main trouble makers and their removal is years overdue. How can you justify asking anyone to pay fees, if no action is taken if you refuse to pay?
Yes	Get rid of the stinking lot of noise and air polluters. Oh, and stop their benefits if they refuse to work
Yes	Give the boats reasonable access from Riverside
Yes	Give the rowers their 'training lake' so that they can stop complaining that the river is too crowded.
Yes	Give them all a years notice which is more than adequate and only offer moorings to boats that can be proved to have been fully legit and occupied there for at least 10 years. The rest of the free loaders and Johnny come lately's that are hoping to score a million years waiting list wide berth mooring can jopj on down the road. That is of course if any of those boats actually run...
Yes	Given concern over safe access/moorings, improving the safety of the site seems a better course of action than a blanket ban.
Yes	Hard enforcement of the rules about use of commons and Riverside &c. There's only 2 or 3 boats which are a nuisance and make a mess of the land near where they moor, need to be rid of them.
Yes	Have the boats insured that are lived on and boat safety scheme checked, then if you need better access just install gates in the railings (some already exist)
Yes	Help to improve access to moored vessels in Riverside area.
Yes	How about the unused moorings under Elizabeth Way bridge by the exclusive apartments - these are hardly used by apartment residents and would increase the mooring capacity. Decrease the rower numbers would improve the river no end and give wildlife in this important green corridor a better chance of survival. Many times I have witnessed outrageous behaviour by rowers towards swans, ducks etc with no regard for these creatures. Also blocking occurs when too many new rowers are out on the river together - usually at the start of the academic year. These students are only here for a short time whereas the boat residents are local residents with a long term interest in respecting the local environment. What happened to the rowing lake proposal made several years ago? This should be revisited and developed as soon as is possible to remove some of the burden on the river Cam.
Yes	I have ticked "Yes" to options 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 as I believe each is sound and fair, both for people living on boats alongside Riverside Wall and to neighbouring residents. However, I see another possible option for the stretch of Riverside Wall between River Lane and Abbey Road where the river is relatively wide and the wide pedestrian area on the embankment could allow space for a compromise thus: create set and numbered mooring spaces for boats of standard length and adapt existing railing to allow access to fixed ladders through secure gates (boys provided to licensed moorers); add a second secure railing (say 1.2m from and parallel to existing) fixed to bankside paving with, say 6, secure access gates along its length using same access keys as proposed for 'inner' gates.
	I suggest retaining moorings on Riverside, and improving access by installing gates at road level in the railings, with ladders for access to boats and mooring rings set into the concrete.
Yes	I suggest retaining moorings on Riverside, and improving access by installing gates at road level in the railings, with ladders for access to boats and mooring rings set into the concrete.
Yes	I suggest retaining moorings on Riverside, and improving access by installing gates at road level in the railings, with ladders for access to boats and mooring rings set into the concrete.
Yes	I suspect this health and safety argument is due to a fear of legal action in the event of an injury sustained by a boat user. If this is considered a realistic possibility, it should be possible to get boat owners to sign a waiver with their registration exonerating the Council from any injuries received by themselves, or their visitors, when accessing the boats.
Yes	I think it's imperative to retain moorings on Riverside, and if anything improve access by installing gates at road level in the railings, with ladders for access to boats and mooring rings set into the concrete.
Yes	I think part of the Riverside wall could be designated "No Mooring" as indicated, but part (where the height is less) could also be offered as additional Visitor Mooring, with gates and a ladder to facilitate access. We should encourage more tourist visitors. These could be seasonal, and be advertised for summer use when the volume of rowing is much reduced July-Sept.
Yes	I think that as you would expect near someone's house, dogs should be in an enclosed area or on a lead as I am worried to walk my children near some of the boats as they have large dogs wandering near the boat/path... They are perfectly entitled to have dogs, but it would be nice to have the dogs limited in how far they can go
Yes	I think the move can be done slowly - there is no space on the rest of the river currently, so as people move out shift them to the vacated mooring spots, and remove their current one. Also suspend the visitor mooring spots until this is resolved. Alternatively, put them at the top of the waiting list, but remove them from Cambridge for the time being. I would extend the no mooring beyond the riverside wall towards Babsbite lock, as the boats down there make the river too narrow until Green Dragon Bridge.
Yes	I think there is no problem with the wall itself or the railings, and suggest the best solution is to provide each mooring with a ladder.
Yes	If safety is the issue: how many accidents have there been from those using the railings. Maybe just weld on some ladders at key points. If environmental then insist on the use of low smoke coal, and a sound attenuating structure for any generators. Some of the boats are not a pretty site I agree but eviction is not an answer.
Yes	If the boarding over railings is genuinely insurmountable, it can't be beyond the wit of man to insert lockable entry points through the railings. That said I think this whole idea of not allowing people to decide whether they are capable of want to climb over this railings snacks of nanny state. Keep moorings. Charge a reduced rate + bank part of income against possible (albeit unlikely) future damage
Yes	If the boaters have alternative accommodation then they should not be allowed to remain there
Yes	If the concern is genuinely a safety one then minor improvements to the fence etc would be sufficient
Yes	If the council feels the moorings are truly unsafe, then make them safe. Since none of the current users seem to feel they are currently particularly unsafe, it shouldn't be an expensive exercise
Yes	If the issue is health and safety why cannot the moorings be made safe by the provision of mooring rings set into the concrete beside the road, and ladders with gates to allow safe access for the boat people.
Yes	If the wall and railing are the problem, fix them. Don't uproot a community.
Yes	If there is no proven risk them leave well alone
Yes	If you really need them gone, a reasonable way is to legitimize the moorings already present, but to not reissue mooring licenses as current occupants leave
Yes	Improve access by installing gates and ladders.
Yes	improve access by installing gates at road level on the railings and ladders for access to boats
Yes	Improve access by installing gates at the road level and ladders for access, moorings rings could be set into the concrete
Yes	Improve access to boats at present moorings
Yes	Improve access to mooring and install more suitable mooring rings.
Yes	Improve access to the boats through things like mooring rings, ladders and gates.
Yes	Improve access to the boats. Many cities and towns, with rivers going through them, support the boating community and help them; I think Cambridge city council should be helping rather than making things difficult.
Yes	Improve conditions for those mooring on riverside - install gates and ladders to improve access to boats, and make this something nice for people to look at - everyone like walking along the river and seeing the boats there. So celebrate it!
Yes	Improve riverside and charge mooring fees to boats currently moored there
Yes	Improve riverside moorings and change for mooring
Yes	Improve the access to moorings on Riverside.
Yes	Improve the boaters access via the railings
Yes	Improved access to boats. Gates - styles. Chains. allow use of gangways and provide anchor points. provide mooring rings
Yes	Incorporate existing residential boats on riverside into the council mooring scheme. Improve access. The council would then get more income from boaters.
Yes	Increase the number of moorings along the Cam in Cambridge. They are an important part of the city.
Yes	Increase the safety and amenity for boats.
Yes	Initiate and support the creation of a residents' committee and work with them to achieve a mutually acceptable way forward.
Yes	Install gates at road level in the railings with ladders to get to the boats
Yes	Install gates in the railings and ladders on the wall - it would be cheap, straightforward and appropriate.
Yes	Install gates in the railings and ladders on the wall beneath these gates. Install mooring rings. If a review of the structural strength of the wall finds that it cannot support the load, find alternative solutions for anchoring the mooring rings (e.g. ground anchors).
Yes	Install gates in the railings to help access. Cheaper than enforcing the movement of all the boats surely?
Yes	Install gates in the railings to make access to boats on riverside safer.
Yes	Install gates on Riverside to permit easy access to moored boats.
Yes	Install gates, ladders and rings to make mooring easier and safer. Pontooners are not necessary.
Yes	Install ladders and gates if possible and if not, leave the situation as it is and let the boat residents decide for themselves if they are happy to risk climbing over a fence. If the council is so concerned about health and safety, I would suggest that it focuses on the health and safety of the numerous people currently sleeping outside in freezing cold conditions, which I imagine poses a far greater risk than climbing over a fence.
Yes	Install ladders and mooring rings for riverside moorings.
Yes	Install mooring rings and a couple of gates in the railing to ease access
Yes	Install safety fencing for vehicle containment at the bottom of River Lane & Stanley Road on the roadside so the footways are protected. Treble the width the footways & reposition the pedestrian fencing back from the edge of the retaining wall. Restrict vehicular movement along Riverside to a single carriageway with passing places & a 10mph speed limit. Remove half the width of the footway adjacent to properties between Saxon Rd & River Lane & move the parking spaces inward accordingly. Instruct moored vessels to comply with H&S by providing their own mooring access ladders. Provide mooring rings attached to the retaining wall. Remove litter & debris from the river on a regular and timely basis.
Yes	Installation of mooring rings and ladders to access boats, and gates in the railings to access mooring.
Yes	Invest in some proper moorings along Riverside
Yes	is their any option for development of a small marina in the immediate cambridge area in conjunction with the private sector?
Yes	It doesn't look like the council wants to find a solution to this problem if the only one suggested was as ludicrous as the pontoons. There is a very simple solution to safe access on Riverside: gates in the railings, ladders on the wall, and mooring rings to tie the boats to. In fact these are already in place along some parts of Riverside!
Yes	It must be possible to overcome the stated problems with mooring on the railings. For a start you have to be fairly nimble to live on a boat anyway - those railings are no obstruction really, but I suppose gates could be installed with keys funded through the license fee (you already do this for allotments). The railings seem in fairly good condition considering that boats have been mooring there for decades. I feel you have overstated the problems caused.
Yes	It should be possible for gates to be installed into the current rail and short ladders fixed to the wall comparatively safely. I do not accept an expensive pontoon system is at all necessary. Also is there any evidence that there have been any incidents that occurred as a result of the present practice of climbing over the railing? Or of any part of the railing being compromised? Assertion of a perceived problem is insufficient and gates and ladders would address the problem of access easily and cheaply.
Yes	It would be very simple and cheap for the council to add gates and ladders for the residents to enter/ exit their homes through the railings. Then the area would evolve into an attractive residential boat area. This could even be developed into a tourist attraction as a tourist attraction as I know that tourists love to take photos of the boats and their dwellers.
Yes	It would not be hugely expensive to create gates and steps and that would not obstruct the traffic on the river in the way that the proposed pontoons would.
Yes	Just leave everything as it is. There's no problem you need to fix here. You're going to wreck people's lives for no reason.
Yes	Just leave it all alone, it has worked well for countless years and doesn't cause any problems.
Yes	Just leave it as it is
Yes	Keep moorings at Riverside and make them more accessible and safe.
Yes	Keep moorings in place at Riverside, and install minimal improvements to access. These could include gated access to moorings, and mounting points set in the sides of the river channel. You have provided no evidence of a proven risk to health or safety. The incidence rate of accidents over the 20 years or so this mooring has been in place would be useful.
Yes	Keep moorings on Riverside. But improve access and add mooring rings.
Yes	Keep riverside a mooring zone
Yes	Keep the moorings and add gates where possible, and additional ladders and mooring rings.
Yes	Keep the moorings at the riverside, they have been there happily for years long before new riverside apartments. Gates or ladders could easily be installed if there were genuine concerns about safely getting on and off boats, although I have never known of any problems.
Yes	Keep the moorings on Riverside and improve access by installing gates at road level in the railings, with ladders for access to boats and mooring rings set into the concrete. This is done in other places and is not too costly.
Yes	Keep the moorings on Riverside and improve access with gates and ladders and mooring rings set into the concrete
Yes	Keep the moorings on Riverside and improve the access for boats
Yes	Keep the moorings on riverside for residents who moor their homes there. Improve access by installing gates and ladders at the road level
Yes	Keep the moorings, add gates and ladders and mooring rings, and apologise to boaters for this debacle.
Yes	Keep the moorings, improve access
Yes	Keep the moorings. Improve safety with gates 7 ladders, as previously.
Yes	Keep the riverside moorings, install gates if you are worried about safety.
No	Keep things how they are
Yes	Keeping the existing moorings, and working alongside the residents to improve access and services that reflect the needs of all parties involved.
Yes	Leave everything as it is apart from improving access Riverside I have wondered for years why there are no gates and ladders.
Yes	Leave it as is. It has worked perfectly well for a long time.
Yes	Leave it as it is.
Yes	Leave it exactly as it is and stop trying to cash in on the boats.
Yes	Leave our community as it is. We are a happy community.
Yes	Leave people and their homes alone. They provide an essential part of community life in Cambridge, living in a far more sustainable way than is embedded in the city's current housing policy. They enrich city life - perhaps not in the way the council consider the right way, but they add to the city's diversity. Cambridge is for long term residents too, not just students and tourists.
Yes	Leave the boats alone and maybe improve access if that is the main concern. The fact it's a "highway barrier" doesn't prevent ladders and / or gates being installed.
Yes	Leave the boats on Riverside be!
Yes	leave the boats at Riverside where they have been no trouble for decades.
Yes	Leave the current boats/residents alone.
Yes	Leave the current fees alone. The council has for many years tried to licence fees in spite of the government freezing council tax for several years. This is another cynical move by some members of Cambs City Council to exploit easy targets.
Yes	Leave the mooring arrangements as they are.
Yes	Leave the riverside area as it is but improve the facilities. Provision of gates to access the mooring area would be a benefit as would mooring rings and ladders to provide easier access to the moorings.
Yes	Leave the status quo
Yes	Leave the vessels where they are, do not raise mooring fees, do not ban mooring against riverside wall and let people remain living in their own homes!
Yes	leave them alone
Yes	Leave them as they are. Nothing needs to be done. For issues to be Health and Safety Issues, they need to have some kind of concrete connection to health or to safety. The experience of decades suggests that there are few to no such connections. The risk is clearly very low. If the railings are damaged, fix them. It's not unknown, after decades of being installed, for a railing to be damaged.
Yes	Leave things as they are. There are no compelling reasons to change the conditions under which boats are moored on this stretch of river. Any concerns about H&S could be addressed by the fitting of access gates in the railings and mooring rings in the quay wall. Again I speak as a regular rower on this stretch of river.
Yes	Leave things as they are. There is not a problem.
Yes	leave things as they are. However current boats need to be kept in a good state of repair and not look a mess
Yes	leave well alone
Yes	Leave well alone - be respectful of others.
Yes	Leaving the situation substantially as it is, with only those changes that are absolutely necessary.
Yes	limit the number of licences for mooring

Yes	The moorings at Riverside could be vacated through a combination of natural attrition and prevention of new arrivals. Established legitimate long term residents could be added to the waiting list and left alone in the meantime.
Yes	The number of moorings should be reduced dramatically and all permitted moorings along Jesus Green and Midsummer Common removed entirely, or at the very least restricted to short term visitors only. The number of houseboats has increased to a ridiculous level over the last 10 or 20 years and most of them are terrible rotting/rusted eyesores that produce horrendous amounts of noise and air pollution when they run their engines/heaters/stoves/etc. What used to be a pleasant stroll along the riverside is now no better than a walk along Madingley Road during rush hour.
	The only boats that are a problem are the ones which are in very bad condition. They should be removed.
Yes	The proposals of the boating community, retaining moorings on Riverside, and improving access by installing gates at road level in the railings, with ladders for access to boats and mooring rings set into the concrete.
Yes	The road is very wide and is not used heavily by cars and vehicles (rather being a primarily cycle through-route). Potential to move vehicle safety barriers inland by 0.5m then have a separate mooring feature on the bank for boats? Use of ladders to access boats. While it is not "accessible" it is practical for users to get onto boats.
Yes	There are issues along riverside, particularly smoke at street level. Attempting to assess the impact of smoke, generator noise, and dumping of waste would be good. The council listed issues are overstated and the ones listed here are not strong enough to support a wholesale clearance.
Yes	There is a very simple solution to safe access on Riverside: gates in the railings, ladders on the wall, and mooring rings to tie the boats to.
	There is no need to change any policies which are in place. They should be carried out more efficiently and effectively, especially the waiting list and not renewing licences to those who do not live on their boats and/or rent them out.
Yes	There seems to be a quite broad consensus among the inhabitants, which I support. Retain mooring on Riverside, and offer some genuine improvements to access gates at road level in the railings, ladders for access to boats and mooring rings set into the concrete.
Yes	To avoid damage to railings and improve safety simply install some gates, ladders and something to tie up the boats to.
Yes	Upgrade the moorings with additional services to generate more income as well as widen the river along the city and shire owned lands to provide better mooring space and or a riverside marina for long term residence.
Yes	Uphold the commitment from the previous consultation about Riverside ie that the Council should regularise the moorings at Riverside.
Yes	Voluntary replacements of mooring locations should be offered to existing tenants, but an enforced removal seems wholly unnecessary.
Yes	We believe the council has allocated some funds for work on the riverside area a few years ago we noted the railings were painted at that time but did not notice any other work. Perhaps some explanation of whether these funds were ever used to address some of the health and safety concerns described above, or some commitment to address these concerns in the future, would remove the primary motivation to evict those resident in the area. It would be interesting to know the specifications of the barrier on riverside and how much stronger it would need to be to be suitable for boat mooring given that it is, as you say, a traffic barrier it must already be reasonably structurally strong. The views of the residents themselves on these safety concerns does not seem to have been given value here and is probably the most important thing seeing as they're the one who face any risk.
Yes	We suggest retaining moorings on Riverside, and improving access by installing gates at road level in the railings, with ladders for access to boats and mooring rings set into the concrete.
Yes	We suggest retaining moorings on Riverside, and improving access by installing gates at road level in the railings, with ladders for access to boats and mooring rings set into the concrete.
Yes	We suggest retaining moorings on Riverside, and improving access by installing gates at road level in the railings, with ladders for access to boats and mooring rings set into the concrete. Evict anyone who doesn't follow council mooring rules.
Yes	What are the rates of accidents by climbing the railings? Provide safety measures, if this is indeed a major concern.
Yes	When shorter boats take up a mooring space review the space left and shift boats along a bit. Look at provision for a local marina or pontoon further upstream. What about Jesus Green marina? I know there is no way this would even be contemplated but it could look good!
Yes	Where there is a will there is a way and most the issues raised can be overcome with some common sense being applied. The health & safety issues in particular are simply a ruse to get the boat owners moved on by the push house owners nearby. If the moorings were that unsafe boats would have floated away long ago and if the boat users are happy to climb over the railings who are the Council to tell them otherwise - they are adults not children and it is at their risk.
Yes	Whilst I am generally in favour of removing the moorings along riverside, Camboaters proposal to investigate 'gates in the railings, ladders on the wall, and mooring rings to tie the boats to' does seem pretty sensible if moorings are to remain. It would also increase the council's mooring revenues. I am interested to know more about the feasibility of their proposal.
Yes	Whilst retaining moorings at Riverside improve access, install gates at road level, apply ladders for access to boats and apply mooring rings.
Yes	Why are the changes needed?
Yes	Why not focus on, for example, buy to let in the town centre, second houses, empty properties? Why pick on the poor?
Yes	Why not improve the moorings already there? Fit bollards or rings to tie up to, and gates and ladders to access the moorings.
Yes	Why not install proper gates and ladders as was the plan I believe in 2012 when money was set aside for this very purpose? If moorings attached to the railings are risk damage to the railings, surely some rings embedded into the wall below the railings or onto the land on the kirk on the road side of the railings could be fitted? How about instead of yet more rowing club sheds all along the North bank of the Cam, some land was acquired to create a proper residents' marina?
Yes	Why not just provide gates and ladders?
Yes	Wind down the occupancy gradually, remove unlicensed unoccupied and derelict boats, prevent the arrival of new boats and encourage those on the waiting list to find alternative moorings. If they're on the waiting list let them take their place in turn with other applicants. It's taken decades for this situation to develop, it needs to be handled with sensitivity and not haste. For any boats moored with no applications on the waiting list, they can be given 12 months' notice to move.
Yes	Work with Camboaters, Riverside boat residents and land-based residents to improve the facilities at Riverside, and have an affordable Cambridge-wide mooring strategy that works for everyone. Ensure that Riverside boat residents are aware of and if necessary supported in claiming any benefits or other services that they are entitled to.

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?

IP Address	Response	Comment
	No	"Delegating powers to council officers" raises alarm bells. It needs to be made clear what arbitration is available before the view of an officer prevails in any particular case. I would be very concerned if the "enforcement policy" can be applied without (or before) a means of appeal to someone independent of the council.
	Yes	A cautious Yes for efficiency and consistency. But needs to be proportionate to the seriousness of any issues arising.
	No	Apply the same enforcement powers that exist for traffic parking offences.
		As a former executive in a PLC, I hated the waffle that we had to produce. But believe me, I fell asleep after the first two paragraphs.
	Yes	As a resident neighbour living on the land side of the riverbank, I value and enjoy the atmosphere created by the boats, boat people and their families. I look forward to improved management and note that this should in future include quick and effective action to deal with anti-social behaviour by people on boats or passing by.
	Yes	As long as it's not used as a back door for getting rid of the moorings anyway.
	Yes	As stated above, you have to start enforcing your policies or they are irrelevant! Its long overdue!
	No	As previous.
	No	Based on the way parking is enforced currently.
	No	Because any decision to remove any right from people should require a vote in a public forum. Please see recent high-court decision on article 50.
	No	Because Council likely to pay excessive charges to an outside agency. Bring back team of river bailiffs who can engage with the community & work to prevent any enforcement being necessary.
	Yes	because currently there is to all intents and purposes no enforcement going on
	No	Because everything is fine as it is. Stop halting.
	No	Because I don't understand it well enough to advise for or against it.
	No	Because I should be agreeing to something which is very vaguely set out and must be firmly defined before a decision can be made.
	No	Because it is totally unnecessary.
	No	Because it seems it will cost additional money for little benefit.
	No	Because it will probably cost more to police than any benefits gained also from my own experience this is hardly a major problem, what one or two a year??
	No	Because the current situation is working well, and there are no problems worth worrying about.
	No	Because they understand little of how people live, and are simply following an agenda I've already explained I think is arbitrary and wrong.
	No	Boat owners should be able to sort out matters among themselves without resorting to court action.
	No	Boaters cars all easy targets for councillors what you should do is stop rowing on river causing damage from wake and oars
		Bureaucracy
	Yes	But depending on what will be in the policy
	Yes	But note that there should be a mechanism for appeal during the process prior to Court action and that the criteria for any appeal be clearly laid down and published to all boat owners.
	Yes	But only if its fair. Sinking wrecks don't help the boat owners who do the right thing, or the general perception of boat owners. However, if the enforcement were to be used to make people trying to do the right thing homeless then obviously that would be undesirable.
	Yes	But really, you need to spend less time writing policies, which is easy, and more time enforcing them, which is hard.
	Yes	But with agreement of boaters
	Yes	Clearly there are some non compliant boat owners who spoil the river for the boat dwellers and other users of the river
	No	Clicked No - but in fact am not sure
	No	Could you do all this without spending a huge amount of money?
	No	Council cannot be trusted to administer such a policy without external oversight
	No	Council officers don't currently seem to completely understand the mooring license agreement as it stands. Actually I think it is illegal as currently written - having to inform the council of absence and not allowing other people to stay on board if you are away. This is our private residences, not council housing agreements. These stipulations should not apply to us, it contravenes human rights for migration and travel and the ability to capitalise on private assets of housing.
	No	Council officers should not have sole enforcement powers.
	No	Council officers, in my experience, are untrustworthy
	No	Current enforcement works. You have used moorings fees to fund additional enforcement officers whose duties are not exclusive to moorings management
	No	current policy effective and commensurate
	No	Current policy is working its just not been given enough time.
	No	Current policy works for the boat dwellers and for the residents
	No	delegated powers are more likely to be incorrectly and/or inconsistently applied.
	No	Democratic control
	No	do not see the necessity
	No	Doesn't seem cost-effective. Put the staffing money into creating solutions.
	No	dont see why its necessary, seems like a waste of time and money.
	No	Don't understand
	No	Don't waste money on producing it.
	No	Dictated councillors need to retain decision-making powers over this area, as it is complex and sensitive.
	No	Enforcement costs the Council money.
	Yes	Enforcement policy should be simple, effective and fair
		Er, don't really understand.
	No	Expensive, pompous way of bullying people to do things one specific way. Learn the art of fair compromise and stop wasting time and money
	No	First ensure that enforcement is NOT subject to arbitrary Penalty Notices and the like without full knowledge of the circumstances in each case. And ensure that the system is not susceptible to abuse of process as an underhand way of removing vessels without just cause
	No	Give the power to the cam conservators. They already know the situation.
	No	Giving the council more draconian powers over free land is NOT good for the common people
	No	Good to enforce illegally moored boats
	Yes	Having the resources to keep up with current moorings would be needed before you think about more enforcement
	No	Honestly after the amount of bad decisions this Council has made in the last couple of years, I don't trust you to put the concerns of the people of Cambridge first. You seem to be growing the city beyond what it's capable of coping with and pushing out the lovely variety of people who live/work here.
	No	I am generally not in favour of increased enforcement measures that reduce quality of life for residents (including boat owners in this case), increase stress and financial burden, and ultimately contribute to community resentment for local authorities.
	No	I can see it becoming just like The Galis Jungle clearances
	No	I do not believe the council or cam can has the facilities to implement this policy. A middle ground must be reached as currently there is little or no enforcement and no communication, boaters don't know where they stand on these issues so cannot act as a community to prevent them.
	No	I do not perceive a need for the measure or additional bureaucracy.
	No	I don't know what the previous policy was like so can't comment.
	No	I don't think it is needed.
	No	I don't think this is particularly important.
	No	I fear that people of limited means will suffer more by revision.
	Yes	I have no strong feelings either way.
	No	I see no reason for any changes, and am deeply suspicious of the motives behind these proposals
	Yes	I think enforcement should be apolitical so there is no need for committee involvement
	No	I think it will end up costing you more than removing the occasional abandoned boat does.
	No	I think it would probably be more trouble than it's worth and it sounds very complex.
	No	I would like know whether this kind of enforcement would also apply to other river users, most pertinently, the rowers. Members of this group of river users break the bylaws on a daily basis. So until I see this in the consultation I cannot approve of this
	No	I would want to read and understand it first.
	Yes	If a fair policy is devised then rigorous enforcement is desirable. If an unfair policy (as seems to be being proposed) is enacted then the more loopholes and the weaker the enforcement the better
	No	if properly managed now and in the past this would not be an issue moving forward and punishing boaters for past council failures seem a tad unreasonable. this policy would be in effect 'socio political ethnic cleansing'
	No	If something needs to be done quickly then it isn't going to be done by the council. Make the Cam Conservators speed up their act - they already have the necessary powers.
	No	If the Council are unable to communicate on relatively small matters then how are they going to be able to implement a revised enforcement policy without creating a level of tension and bad feeling. It all feels rather nasty.
	Yes	If the council officers have full knowledge and act with the values of the council to support people before policies
	Yes	If you have loads of time and extra budget you don't know what to do with then yes, hire somebody and give people jobs to do....
	No	In principle a revised enforcement policy sounds good. Setting out clearly the process and giving powers to tackle rule breakers all sounds positive. However it also sounds as though the city council costs would be increased, to tackle a problem which does not appear to be too severe to me.
	No	Individuals living in unregistered boats are probably there as a last resort and the council will spend a large amount of time and money prosecuting people who probably can't pay the fine. It is a waste of resources.
	No	Introduction of a similar policy in Oxford, where I used to live, has been extremely divisive between the council and the boating community and has led to council officers targeting particular groups of vulnerable boaters.
	No	Is drawing this up really the best use of time and resources?
	No	Is there a genuine need for this or is it simply red tape?
	No	It first has to be explained what's wrong with the current enforcement policy.
	No	It is a waste of time and public money. It isn't necessary. Laws are adequate now. spend the money on helping fellow humans.
	No	It seems a waste of a council resources
	No	It seems disproportionate
	No	It will only be used to clear the sites, which I do not agree with
	No	It's a river why are you capitalising on it?
	No	It's almost impossible to write such a policy that covers all eventualities. It's better to let council officers apply their experience to make a common sense judgement according to individual circumstances.
	Yes	Its been unfair for years. Something needs to change to make the system fairer. The current bailiff post is not around when needed
	No	Its just not worth the time or the effort regulations are just a load of waffle and only to cause hardship to those less well of in society.
	No	I've read the above twice, and I still don't understand what the revised policy "is". There's lots of text talking about how it will be implemented, but I still don't see anything about its terms.
	No	Just don't think you have the resources to do it. Have you properly engaged with the boating community on this? What would they like to see happen?
	No	Just follow through the enforcement policy that the council currently has. Writing a new document is not going to make the enforcement any better.
	No	Just work with people nicely - even CART are rebranding their 'enforcement' officers! It is also worth noting that CART enforcement officers tend to have a lot of time off sick with stress. It's a horrible job!
	No	Leave the boat owners alone, you interfering busybodies! They aren't bothering you and if people don't like looking at them, they shouldn't buy homes in that area.
	No	Meddling where it's not needed for revenue purposes.
	Yes	No strong opinions on this one, granted a new policy does not undermine the current inhabitants' situation.
	No	No strong opinions on this proposal
	No	Not if it doesn't include the opinion of the Boating Community
	No	Not necessary
	No	Not needed
	No	Not needed.
	No	Not sure it'll make a change.
		not sure what this would involve
	Yes	One can only hope it is more effective than your policies to prevent littering and subsequent clearance. With no attempt whatsoever to prosecute people for dropping litter, Cambridge looks a disgrace these days.
	Yes	Only if it is a fair and transparent process, and not one used to harass and alienate those living on boats
	No	only if you actually make the resources available to do this. Otherwise the dangers will continue and the Council will be a laughing stock
	No	Our Council should have other priorities for spending its money and time. This situation does not require urgent action.
	No	parking penalties for homes is a ridiculous insulting idea
	No	Perhaps you should enforce the current policy efficiently. I know people who have their boats moored through the council but do not live on the. These are the real problem. I guess you don't care as long as the continue to pay
	Yes	please deal with illegal moorers
	Yes	possibly, this would need to depend on the small print. use of the courts seems a very last resort.
	Yes	Provided all timescales are realistic and actually trialled.
	Yes	Provided voluntary processes had been pursued and the timescales are reasonable.
	No	Really answer is I don't know. I don't know what the current policy is, how well it works, whether it is necessary, or what would be gained by introducing a new one. Would it be cost effective?
	No	Save money on the dedicated staff for this and then you would be able to remove the library reservation charges.

No	Seems like a waste of council resources.
No	Seems unnecessary at this stage
Yes	So long as what is being enforced is fair and reasonable and not a mean spirited exercise in pinching the lives of our river community folk.
No	Sounds expensive and not worth it. How many violators are expected? What penalties can be expected? Not enough to make the described activity worthwhile I imagine.
No	Sounds like a sledgehammer to crack a nut.
No	Sounds like a textbook case of too much power being concentrated in the hands of the kind of people who seek out such power and should, therefore, never be allowed anywhere near it. Very doubtful that enough Executive oversight will be present.
No	Surely there is sufficient power within current licencing and Boat Safety Certification. Money would be better spent improving the moorings by putting in mooring rings or posts, gates and ladders.
No	Surely this should be handled in exactly the same way as if people started living out of their campervan parked on market square. I don't see how it is much different. i.e. After one or two penalty notices, the vehicle gets towed and impounded. I think that involving the courts will cause illegal moorers to just move around to flout the rules as long as they can. A 7 day public phone number is needed to allow reporting of transgressions.
No	System isn't broken as is. Why mess with it.
Yes	The boaters should have the same rights as people who live in houses on the land.
No	The cost of enforcing the scheme needs to be properly considered and not funded by for example council tax receipts.
No	The council officers don't live on boats so have a flawed point of view.
Yes	The current enforcement policy is not working properly.
No	The long description of why you need one is verging on incomprehensible (and I have written many a policy so have tried hard to follow your reasoning). It sounds as if it is cost and staff intensive. If it wasn't tax payers money, I wouldn't mind. Otherwise is it really necessary?
No	The revised policy seems cumbersome and expensive. I would rather support improving current powers.
No	The waterways are mostly controlled by the Canal and river trust or on the Cam by the Cam conservators. They are responsible for the safety and enforcement of the waterway regulations, not the council.
No	There already is one...and the Cam Conservancy officers have been managing the riverside and boating problems for many years with appropriate expertise, policies and resources...there is no coherent reason to double up on or change the current system!
No	There is a mooring policy in place the council should start to use them instead of trying to have more powers that will not be used
Yes	There is absolutely no point in moving all the boats etc as previously suggested if there is no power to do anything if (as they will) people return illegally.
No	There is no compelling evidence that the current process is defective, or that significant problems arise due to the lack of a policy. A change of policy sounds like a waste of time and council-tax payers' money.
No	There is not mention here, at any point, of what (if any) efforts will be made to explain the policy to those it affects. The description above is (it seems to us) almost intentionally verbose and would be difficult for many people to understand. We have little faith that the policy would be even close to transparent to those mooring on riverside. Clarification of roles and responsibilities is good, even essential, but an important part of this will be clear communication, which seems to be lacking from the above, at least. We have no doubt that it will lay out the council's rights very clearly indeed, however, and can't help but think it would make the eviction process easier and any appeals process (if it exists) fairly opaque. We also wonder how much it will cost of this will be, although we suspect the council anticipates covering these costs with the proceeds from fines, it would be useful to get some numbers.
Yes	There seems to have been a history of inconsistent rulings and advice given to people by word of mouth, with records of conversations frequently being misplaced. I think a revised policy could be helpful if it gives people a sense that there is a magna carta for the river instead of a patchwork of historical anecdotes. There must be a way for people affected by the update to feed into the policy though and have a fair hearing if they are affected by it. I would not support the introduction of such a policy to be used as a way of clearing the railings more expediently though. I see this as being mainly of use to discourage subletting of boats and people leaving boats unoccupied for very long periods.
No	These are people's homes.
No	This approach, where undertaken in other areas, has resulted in vulnerable people being put at risk of homelessness. There should be a policy put in place that involves support from agencies such as social services for anyone at risk of losing their home, illegally moored or not.
No	This is a river people live there it is not a car park people who live here can manage them selves as a community
No	This is NOT a fascist state!
No	This question cannot be answered without knowledge of what a 'trigger event' entails.
Yes	This seems like a very long winded way of achieving something that a simple bit of effective police work could achieve....
No	This seems to be how you intend to spend the extra money from the revenue. It's not necessary, the current situation works well. No I don't live on a boat!
No	This seems very heavy handed
No	This sounds like too much power would be concentrated in the hands of too few. I think it would be better, and would probably seem less authoritarian (especially combined with the other proposals) if these were treated similarly to planning, and whilst officers could make a recommendation, councillors would have the final say.
No	This would doubtless cost money, and as the council maintains it is strapped for cash, I believe that money would be better spent elsewhere as it seems that things are working just fine at the moment. I think it would only rile up the boating community if the council tried to enforce more policies, and probably wouldn't be effective anyway.
No	To answer this question we would have to be equipped with further information on what a 'trigger event' would be and as stated the timeline and level of force that would be used after the 'trigger event'.
No	To be convinced this is worthwhile, I would want to be given a full account of existing enforcement practices and workload, including where it falls short. This is not road traffic / parking management and solutions need to be proportionate.
No	Too heavy-handed, complicated, and expensive to enforce.
No	Unnecessary.
Yes	Using an enforcement policy in line with that of the Canal & River Trust, or similar private bodies, will improve consistency and best practice across the UK for boaters.
No	Vessels are not illegally moored. The public right of navigation on natural rivers includes the right to moor temporarily for a reasonable time. Reasonable cannot be determined in advance but has to be decided on a case by case basis taking into account all the facts.
No	Waste of council taxpayers money.
No	Waste of time and money
No	Waste of time/people are dying and you waste your and our time with rubbish like this
No	We do not need an enforcement policy if the CCC agrees to establish mooring licences for the riverside dwellers. This will create a terms and condition relationship and will protect the rights and duties of the residents at both side of the Riverside, in houses and boats
No	We should leave things as they are. It works for boaters and reasonable residents
No	well it just doesn't seem a problem worth pushing up the priority list to me.
Yes	Whatever it takes to allow prompt enforcement action. Better still it's a cul-de-sac. Police it at the entry point and don't let boats/owners back onto the river who transgress
No	When it comes to homes much care is needed
Yes	Where there are problems they should be dealt with more quickly
No	While reasonable in theory I can see that it will descend into a draconian system of authoritarian faceless bureaucratic dogma.
No	Who writes this stuff? I would welcome a re-wording of this item in plain English. It's hard enough to engage with local government!
No	Why is it necessary?
No	Why would you?
No	With current economic climate and government reduction in spending, there are more important things to worry about. Spend the money on improving street conditions?
Yes	Yes as long as it is fair
No	yes, but with caveats. What if a licence holder has happily and compliantly paid his licence fee for that past several years, but suddenly the fees go up hugely and he cannot afford it. What then? Eviction, on your agreed "timescales"? It seems that in the last few years nothing has been done to deal with those who don't pay, or rent out their boats, or pay the wrong kind of licence fee, but those who do pay and follow the rules are easily targeted (because of their desire to do the right thing) by rent hikes to pay for the rest. how is this fair?
No	Yet another layer of bureaucracy, adding stress and anxiety to an already marginalised community that will develop into an income stream financed by incentivised enforcement. No good can come of it.
No	You can't start scraping peoples homes even if they do owe money.
No	You haven't explained in sufficient detail what the revised enforcement policy would be.

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?

IP Address	Response	Comment
No	100 reg moorings, 10 visitor between riverside and Jesus green	
No	120 mooring berths on the Commons and on Riverside would be an appropriate number.	
Yes	70 licensed mooring boats each of 70 ft equates to 4900 ft of bank. I support the area allocated so if the council are looking at introducing fees based on length then the number of licence moorings could increase. The same area would accommodate 98 50ft boats so the number depends on the range of boats licensed at a given time. There is an obvious complication and added administration in managing the rights of licensees who want to upgrade their homes at some point.	
No	70 seems too many for the size of the river and city	
No	A waiting list this length is clearly punitive to existing boat owners as shown by Riverside and this consultation. More moorings are needed.	
Yes	adding more berths to the common land is not the right solution, these are already densely packed with boats and more would restrict others use of the riparian environment. the mention of temporary berths on common land highlights that resettling people from Riverside in this area (as mentioned earlier) would be little more than a staggered eviction.	
Yes	Apart from as said before, some tidying up of riverside	
Yes	As above - provision of affordable housing without high costs to the council	
No	As Cambridge is clearly a growing community moorings numbers should also increase	
Yes	As long as this is the current levels, this includes Commons and Riverside moorings.	
No	As many moorings as possible should be offered. Cambridge is unique and should not be measured against the wider East Anglia. This could be a tourist attraction like the middle of Birmingham	
No	As more people choose to live afloat, you (the authority) should respond by increasing berth numbers, not decreasing them.	
No	As the city grows the moorings can too	
No	As usual the wrong question is being asked. What is the demand for these moorings and how can they be increased? If as residents we decide we need more moorings then the Council should instruct the Cam Conservators to find them and sort it out.	
No	because as far as I can see it is a reduction by stealth. Elsewhere you give the number of current moorings as 120 so 70 is a huge reduction. It is also completely random to say that when "the number of regulated vessels moored at Riverside is added to the permitted visitor and licensed moorings, this exceeds the total level which the City Council and Cam Conservators consider that the river can reasonably accommodate". You are just choosing a number that suits you.	
No	Because it is based on every boat owner having a 70ft boat and that is not the case. There is enough space to fit another 5 boats on Stourbridge common near the railway bridge but it is too over grown and needs dredging out by cam conservators so boats don't bottom out.	
No	Because it isn't enough to provide moors for those people who may be moved from Riverside. I also think the commercial moorings aren't used effectively. I often see four boats travelling upriver with only a few people on the boat	
No	because there are many more boats than that already safely moored	
No	Because you have omitted the moorings on Riverside from your calculations. If you include those, making the number of licensed moorings around 100 boats, then I would support that number.	
No	Because your numbers above imply removing the 30+ Riverside moorings. These are peoples' homes for heaven's sake.	
Yes	Berths on riverside should stay	
No	Boats with people living on board should be moored further out of town. City centre along the river, only allow to stay temporarily for no more than one week, no permanent stay. Tourist boat only.	
Yes	But I understand that there are in fact about 40 residential moorings than you have stated. All current residential moorings should be retained to avoid making people homeless or forcing them to move to somewhere they don't want to live.	
Yes	But leaving Riverside separate and adding to this number when CCC take over control of the mooring on Riverside	
Yes	But would include retention of riverside moorings.	
No	Clearly it's not enough if you are going to move people from the railings, and there is such a waiting list	
Yes	Comment. The proposal (Q7) to prohibit mooring at Riverside is bracketed by an offer to find alternative moorings. This question (Q12) seeks to condone the reduction of the number of moorings available in the city. This implies there will be evictions.	
No	Crippling accommodation prices in the city should be forcing the council to look at ways of increasing moorings at affordable alternatives	
No	Cruel displacement	
Yes	Current number of boats on the Commons and Riverside is appropriate	
No	Does not reflect current and future demand.	
No	Don't Know	
Yes	Even if you move the riverside boats to the commons there will still be the same potential for "accidents" as there is now because the river is approx. the same width up and down. Another point I would like to raise is the fact that only a small percentage of boats on riverside actually move from one end of the year to the next. At least half of them do not have a working engine. Same as me. FACT.	
Yes	everyone should have access to the river not trying to get to a part someone's crappy dog infested boat.	
No	Except - if riverside was opened for moorings, this would add upto 30 (7) moorings.	
No	First resolve the issue of the riverside moorings honestly and openly. Then there can be a conversation about further moorings.	
No	For the reasons outlined above including environmental (noise and air pollution), ecology, biodiversity, view point opportunities, other riverbank pursuits, the current number of moorings are obstructive and unsustainable.	
No	For the sake of tourism gradually increase number of visitor moorings and decrease the number of permanent moorings, say: visitor moorings: 19 licensed moorings: 60	
Yes	Generally it does not appear to be overcrowded and the current number (where occupied and in good condition) adds to the character of the city	
No	Given the cost of housing, we need more moorings, not less - and should not be expecting people who are living long-term on the river to have insecure temporary moorings.	
No	have not got a firm view at the moment, insufficient info on forward possibilities	
No	I believe number of permanent moorings should be reduced. I appreciate that people's homes are involved but boats are often poorly maintained and are an eyesore. I suspect that they represent an alternative lifestyle rather than one of need. I fear that they are being subsidised by the Local authority at the expense of others.	
No	I believe the figures are inaccurate. So you cannot base policy on them. 30-40 boats are at Riverside, these are also residential, so in effect you are proposing a cut of minimum 30%, maximum 36% in residential moorings. Many people cannot afford the extortionate rates for land based accommodation in Cambridge, why force them out?	
Yes	I count more boats: your numbers are excluding riverside I think. Keep them all	
No	I do support the current number of moorings but extra funding could be generated by increasing safe moorings along riverside.	
Yes	I don't know enough to comment here.	
No	I don't see why Ditton Fields isn't made a mooring. The side with the path seems to be the most practical. The river is wider here.	
No	I don't see why it can't support the Riverside Wall berths, since it already does.	
No	I feel more could be made of visitor mooring to attract people into Cambridge. having different length of stay visitor mooring might also be promising	
No	I feel that the numbers are far too high now and out of step with the need to reduce pollution and provide clean unobstructed access to the river side for all.	
Yes	I have observed these at their current level for twenty years, without any problems.	
Yes	I support keeping existing numbers of mooring berths on the Commons and riverside	
No	I support keeping the existing number of berths on the commons AND the existing numbers of berths on Riverside. Total is 100+ berths, we should keep them all.	
Yes	I support keeping the existing numbers of mooring berths on the commons & on Riverside	
Yes	I support keeping the existing numbers of mooring berths on the commons and on Riverside	
Yes	I support keeping the existing numbers of mooring berths on the Commons and on Riverside.	
Yes	I support keeping the existing numbers of mooring berths on the Commons and on Riverside.	
No	I support keeping the existing numbers of mooring berths on the Commons and on Riverside.	
Yes	I support keeping the existing numbers of mooring berths on the Commons and on Riverside.	
Yes	I support keeping the existing numbers of mooring berths on the Commons and on Riverside.	
Yes	I support the current residents keeping their moorings including those on Riverside.	
Yes	I support the existing location number and type of mooring berths including the mooring on riverside.	
Yes	I support the existing numbers of berths on the Commons and on Riverside.	
Yes	I support the retaining of all the existing mooring arrangements, including those on Riverside.	
Yes	I support the set up - including the boats at Riverside.	
Yes	I support this if it includes Riverside.	
Yes	I think it would be appropriate to keep the current number at around 100 as it currently is.	
No	I think there are too many moored boats on Jesus Green and Midsummer common. They block the views and stop other people enjoying the river by sitting or standing on the bank. If you sit on benches on the towpath it is not a pleasant experience as you are usually looking into a private boat window which feels awkward. I would rather enjoy a view of the river and nature.	
No	I think there is room on the commons for a couple of more boats, if you need to raise money	
No	I think there should be a reduction in these numbers to ensure that there is more public access to the river	
No	I think with Riverside being vacated if Item 4 leads to the decision to ban mooring there, there needs to be a reduction of Licensed Moorings. But I would favour a relative and absolute increase in Visitor Moorings.	
No	I would favour increasing this number by incorporating riverside moorings in to the scheme. Further, I would suggest that the number of moorings should be governed by length of river bank taken up by the moored boats (total length of boats) rather than an arbitrary number.	
No	I would like more sites to be considered for mooring potential	
No	I would like the moorings on Riverside to also be included	
No	I would like to see an increased number of moorings in Cambridge.	
No	I would support a reduction.	
Yes	I would support keeping the existing numbers of mooring berths on the Commons and also on Riverside. The council's consultation is very misleading in its talk of maintaining the numbers of moorings when you only are counting the number of moorings on the commons and leading riverside out of the numbers. It is essentially saying that you should reduce the number but being very misleading about keeping it the same.	
No	I would support the current location numbers and type of mooring berths on the Commons, with the addition of the 30+ mooring berths on Riverside.	
Yes	If by "current location numbers" the present 70 permanent mooring licences is meant, then yes, I am wholeheartedly in support of retaining this number. Any change in this regard appears to be trying to find a solution where no problem even exists: the fee-paying community of licence holders adjoining common land cause no disruption whatsoever in my experience as a local resident living near Midsummer Common, and indeed form a valuable element of what makes Cambridge such an interesting town in which to live.	
No	If riverside is taken away there will need to be more mooring berths.	
No	If you're going to remove registered boats from Riverside (and it appears you are dead set on this idea) then you will need to provide these boat owners permanent (rather than temporary) mooring nearby.	
No	In some areas there are some horrible looking boats ruining the appearance of an otherwise beautiful area.	
No	Include moorings on Riverside in totals. Make regulated moorings part of Residential moorings.	

No	Include riverside so that the number of boats on the river currently stays the same, (With the exception of those who have not been included in the registered scheme egTrio - who does not deserve to jump the waiting list, or the guy on the red boat that stops the rowing races)
Yes	Including Riverside
Yes	Including Riverside moorings.
Yes	Including Riverside.
Yes	Including the Riverside moorings.
Yes	Including those on Riverside
No	Incorporation of the majority of the Riverside wall and provision of, for example, an additional 20 licences would be fairer and represent a better use of the resources and space available to the Council for revenue generation through fees into the future.
No	Increased demand for housing means that people could use boats as residences provided their licence and mooring fees are used to improve services and moorings. Numbers of moored boats have stayed fairly consistent whereas rowers have doubled. Why not increase their fees? And more commercial licenses!More money for the council and adding to the riverside charm of Cambridge.
No	It does not look like your numbers add up, because you don't seem to include the Riverside moorings in your figures. I would support broadly maintaining the status quo provided the Riverside moorings are actually included.
No	It is not clear from the above that if the Council was to go ahead with its wish to have no moorings along Riverside that the current boats and their residents would have an alternative mooring provided as close by as possible.
No	It is too many, and makes the river difficult to navigate down. There should be far fewer, especially when you consider that before 15 years ago, none of these places had any house boats whatsoever.
Yes	It leaves a little room for changes in the area for roaming licences
No	It would be better to have more visitor moorings, perhaps permitting visitors to go through Jesus lock and moor as far up as Magdalen Bridge.
Yes	It's just right at the moment.
No	It's not enough
Yes	Keep current levels of mooring on Riverside and on Commons. I.e. remain 100-110 places
Yes	Keep existing number of boats on the Common and Riverside
No	Perhaps increase the number of licensed moorings permanently to encompass those at riverside who have licenses.
Yes	Keep Riverside and include them in the number of moorings.
Yes	Keep the numbers the same on the Commons and on Riverside
No	Licensed moorings should include those at Riverside
No	Licensed moorings should include those at Riverside
Yes	Maintain current numbers and retain riverside
No	Manifestly not enough. The clue is in the waiting list.
No	Moorings on the Riverside wall should be allowed to continue
No	More are needed.
No	More are needed - forgive pun
No	More are needed, either through licensing at Riverside or providing moorings within a similar distance of the City Centre at another location.
No	More permanent moorings need to be made available. Generally there will only ever be one visitor mooring free as permanent residents rotate around the others
No	Need more licenses, not fewer
No	Need more moorings. Expand.
No	no more moorings about 70 as temporary increase will become permanent.
No	No, or fewer permanent moorings, in the city. See comments above.
No	not enough
Yes	not including the 36 riverside moorings
No	Number of licensed moorings should be increased to include Riverside Wall
No	Number of licensed moorings should be increased to include Riverside Wall
No	Number of residential mooring licences should be permanently increased once Riverside Wall has been made fit for permanent moorings.
No	Only support this proposal if it accurately reflects the number of moorings across all sites.
No	perhaps increase the number of licensed moorings permanently to encompass those at riverside who have licenses.
No	Question sounds like an understatement of enforcing an absolute number on the residential boats allowed. Surely leisure activities should take second place to residential requirements. Deeply resentful of how this Consultation seems to be manufacturing the 'truth' that a problem exists. Leave things as they are and accept that not everything or everyone fits into the seemingly increasing view that Cambridge should become a cross between Ye Olde Academick templepark and Aldous Huxley's worst nightmare.
No	Retain numbers on commons, city and Riverside, eg 100 moorings, to retain the size of the river community.
No	Riverside should be brought into scheme
No	Riverside should be included as permanent moorings, which they to all intents and purposes already are, and have been for many years, so that would bring the licensed moorings, I believe, up to ~100.
No	Riverside should be recognised along with them.
No	Riverside should become a regular mooring space.
No	Seems quite a high number for such a narrow river.
No	Should be less than 70. There are too many boats.
No	Should be more
No	Should be more
No	Should be reduced as noted in intro.
No	Should include mooring on riverside. It happens and they aren't doing any harm. Why waste a resource?
No	Should stay as they currently are on the Commons and in Riverside.
No	Some boats are moored at appropriate points on the river. It is not to do with residents (most of this is snobbery) but to do with river traffic.
No	Some increase would be good.
No	Some visitor boats present a danger to other boats and to rowers, as they dint understand the special peculiarities, rules, and crowded nature of the cam. This was seen by examples during strawberry fair and summer fair events in 2015 - there were some examples of reckless driving in front of rowers.
No	Taking into account the other usage of the river and its potential I would prefer to gradually reduce the mooring berths after the temporary increase has been solved
No	The 'current location numbers' are not 70, as claimed above, but closer to 110, and should stay like that.
No	The 22 lived-aboard boats from Riverside will be unlikely to become uninhabited, even if moved off- so it is completely unrealistic to expect numbers of moorings to stay at the same level. There is also a great deal of pressure on existing visitor moorings, so additional sites (eg Jesus Green above Jesus Lock, by the rollers at the mill pool in winter months) should be considered
No	The council should work harder to create more mooring spots. I believe there is scope to create a bigger boating community in Cambridge, that would offer more berths and also more services to those currently residing on the river.
No	The evicted riverside moorings need to be moored. How long is the temporary site envisaged lasting.
No	The levels of mooring on the commons are fine. The moorings on Riverside should also be brought into the managed mooring berths.
No	The moorings along riverside but particularly along Coldhams common are a disgrace to our beautiful city. Not only are the boats unkempt, the banks and areas around are becoming like a composte, verging on to the pathways. Campfires, bikes old bikes and piles of wood, not to mention old sofas etc, loud music and drinking, makes passing way of them and their uncontrolled dogs. I have seen people urinating against the trees when walking, as I often do, with young children. They MAY have a licence for h vessel but NOT for the bank. It has become a gathering place for vagrants, or so it would appear! The people from those large, lived-in vans which are permanently parked at the end of riverside by Coldhams Common, and all the tethered mobile buggy's, just run the whole area down, in my opinion. If boat owners/dwellers looked after the vessels, it would not be quite so bad, but they are generally filthy and at this time of the year, belching out foul smoke. Of course they need somewhere to go, but not in such a lovely part of town. I also think it should be compulsory to have on display, their up to date license!
No	The moorings are not up to standard and need to be made safe with better bank access and permanent mooring posts.
No	The moorings offer very little to Cambridge as a whole. Other activities, especially rowing and punting bring international renown to the city and should be supported wherever possible. Therefore, moorings should be reduced wherever possible
No	The moorings on riverside should be retained 106 not 70
No	The number above does not include the boats on Riverside.
No	The number does not include those moorings along Riverside.
No	The number of licensed moorings is too low
No	The number of moorings is so high that you cannot use the riverside. Some boats are completely in the wrong place and prevent sensible usage.
No	The number of moorings is too high. The river is a narrow, active waterway which is constricted by moored boats which never move. I would prefer a higher number of visitor moorings and reduced licences to encourage more people to enjoy the river.
No	The numbers should include the full number of boats lived in on Riverside.
No	The river is too crowded for the number of boats to be considered suitable. Especially with the high residential and high (very high during university term time) recreational use of the water stretch.
No	The Riverside boaters should have mooring licences too. This will increase the revenue perceived by the CCC
No	The total number of moorings should include both the existing ones, as detailed above, and the moorings in the Riverside area.
No	There are closer to 100 boats currently permanently moored and the proposals are seeking to reduce this number, but only offering a temporary mooring solution for some boats. Long term plans need to be considered for the boats that are affecting the temporary moorings.
No	There are far too many boats permanently moored along the river. They are an eyesore and produce horrendous noise and air pollution. The number of permanent moorings should be reduced dramatically such that there are no permanent moorings along Jesus Green or Midsummer common.
No	There are far too many moored boats on this stretch of river.
No	There are far too many, particularly in Jesus Green area. This is an area of outstanding amenity, and is spoilt by the slum-like nature of some of the vessels. We wouldn't allow caravans to park on streets permanently in the town centre. We should not allow residential boats either in the town centre amenity area.
Yes	there are insufficient homes in the city as it is. The boats are not a problem. we need to INCREASE spaces for boats.
No	There are insufficient moorings to meet demand.
No	there are more like 100 boats that are homes.
No	There are more residential boat numbers than this, so don't want a reduction
No	There are too many.
No	There are too many already
No	There are too many boats - 62 is best option.
No	There are too many boats considering the current congestion problem.
No	There are too many boats moored in narrow locations and it is making the river gradually more difficult to navigate.
No	There are too many boats which impedes river navigation and is a hazard for unmotorsed craft (e.g. rowers)
No	There are too many leaseboats
No	There are too many moored boats on the commons. Some are well looked after and attractive, but many are not. Excessive numbers of boats restrict the use of the river and block the river bank. The boats on Riverside are a nuisance and a pollution hazard in a residential area.
No	There are too many moored boats. Many of them are very scruffy and do not do Cambridge any credit and nobody else can get near the riverbank. It will be even worse when Riverside boats are moved. The council needs to aim for fewer boats over time.
No	There are too many. Huge amounts of the river are virtually inaccessible
No	there clearly is lack of space on the commons for more boats? there are only 3 boats on Stourbridge common!!!!
No	There is a growing demand for affordable places to live, so look to increase number of mooring places.
No	There is a huge demand for additional moorings for people not able to afford a house to live in, in Cambridge.
No	There is available riverside available for mooring and this should be utilised to keep the center of Cambridge a vibrant and diverse community
No	There is no comparison figure
No	There is room on the river for more boats
No	There need to be more mooring berths made available.
No	There should be fewer commercial mooring and second 'home/boat' owners.
No	There should be more!
No	There should be more. Keeping the riverside moorings and making them a little safer is the best option.
No	These numbers are fewer than the actual numbers that the river supports now. Where are the extras to go?
Yes	These numbers were arrived at through negotiation between the Council and boaters several years ago as being appropriate. Nothing has changed.
No	They don't include Riverside moorings
No	They need to be reduced more. There isn't enough space on the river.
No	This depends on what you mean by the question. You should keep the 100+ that include the riverside moorings.
No	This number doesn't include the unlicensed moorings on Riverside. Where would those boats go?
No	This question is too vague. If I say "Yes" it might be interpreted as supporting the proposals for the "temporary" berths dealt with in the previous section, which I do not.
Yes	Though I am surprised to discover that the council does not consider the Riverside moorings to be permanent.
Yes	To include the riverside moorings as well as the residential boats on the common.
No	Too many
No	Too many abandoned boats.
No	too many already
No	Too many and damaging to the amenity for other users.
No	too many licensed moorings relative to number of visitor moorings.
No	Too many moorings.
No	Too many permanent, not enough commercial
No	Too many residential licenses. The river becoming difficult to access for others
No	Waiting list already very long. Would it be possible to consider turning the temporary mooring sites into permanent ones?
No	We need MORE moorings, keep the Riverside moorings and add them into the scheme
Yes	We support keeping the existing numbers of mooring berths on the Commons and on Riverside.
Yes	We support keeping the existing numbers of mooring berths on the Commons and on Riverside.
No	Where? On the riverside overall or on the common land or on the railings?
No	Will lead to people losing their mooring
Yes	Yes - INCLUDING RIVERSIDE. Don't decimate the boating community please.
Yes	Yes includes all moorings - ie. incl riverside
Yes	Yes, I believe that the numbers of moorings at Riverside and on the commons should not be reduced
No	You have missed out counting the boats on Riverside on this part of the consultation. We support keeping the existing numbers of mooring berths on the Commons 'and also on Riverside.
No	You have not included the Riverside moorings in your calculations above - you need to factor for over 100 boats, not 70
Yes	You have omitted the 30 residential moorers at Riverside, whose numbers should be maintained.
No	you should have more considering the demand
No	Your data appear misleading, as if you have already evicted residents from Riverside. Moorings should remain available on the Commons and on Riverside, permanently.
No	Your figures are misleading as you omit to mention the approximately 40 permanent Riverside residents. The moorings on the commons should be kept at the present levels, but the permanent Riverside residents should be allowed to keep their current mooring sites too.

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

IP Address	Response	Comment
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. I don't think there should be a reduction in the number of moorings in Cambridge.	
No	As marina needs to be built to provide more mooring not less	
No	additional strain on already long waiting list	
No	Affordable, lowest cost housing in a city that is already notoriously expensive. Why would you want to reduce it?	
No	Again I think they look pretty and can't see there's a problem worth fixing.	
No	Again, I don't understand why you would? The Cam should be used by a variety of people: it's a living thing, and it's great people live on it.	
No	apart from riverside the existing provision seems reasonable	
No	As above - the number of people living in Cambridge, and the existence of a large waiting list, shows the demand is high. It is obviously stupid to reduce this supply, and the revenue from them, for no real reason.	
No	As above. A change would be adding to the number of people needing housing in Cambridge, when there is already a housing shortage and high private rents.	
No	As mentioned above.	
No	As noted in some of my answers above, this would make many people homeless.	
No	As said in this document the current level is accepted by CCC and Cam Conservers. I quote 'this is considered optimum'	
No	At present it seems to work - will the number of rowing on the river at the same time be similarly controlled?	
No	Because as a nation we are growing and as affordable housing in Cambridge is decreasing we need more place's not less.If the council didn't allow so many student accommodation blocks to be built, more affordable housing could be built.	
No	Because boats are so central to the charm and appeal of Cambridge. It would be a real shame to reduce the overall length of the riverbank provided for mooring. I would rather support the opposite - allow mooring in the city centre	
No	Because Cambridge needs more moorings, not a reduction	
No	because Cambridge residents (not to mention the country) wouldn't like it if an overall decision had been made to reduce the number of houses in Cambridge by knocking down the uglier ones and throwing the people out onto the streets. This is identical.	
No	Because I answered this in the previous question. It's fine as it therefore: no reduction needed	
No	Because I feel that the number and type of moorings is at present appropriate	
No	because I support the current numbers	
No	Because I suspect, this would result in effective eviction.	
No	Because it implies removing the 30+ Riverside moorings and more elsewhere. These are peoples' homes for heaven's sake.	
No	Because it will involve hurting people for no reason.	
No	Because it's unnecessary and unfair.	
No	Because people choose to live on boats for many reasons which are more important than leisure activities.	
No	Because the boats are a colourful addition to cambridge housing, providing some of the only low-cost accommodation, adding to diversity, etc. Just get on with something more important and leave people to enjoy it, and being a strong community. What the hell is a Labour council doing hounding the boating community like this?	
No	Because the current length seems fine and I can see no reason to reduce it.	
No	because the current number of boats has provided no visible problems in the 6 years I've been here, nor any detriment to my use of the cycle path. Many are used residentially, and regardless of your Social Housing Policy they are still a source of relatively affordable housing if you do not mind boats.	
No	Because the introduction states that demand already exceeds availability and because reasonable cost housing is in short supply around central Cambridge. I think it's important that Cambridge has a diverse community and that people who have made a choice to live on a boat to reduce costs are not penalised for taking this action. I seem to remember that there has been talk of a boating lake being built for the rowers. As many of the rowing teams are part of Colleges and Colleges have more ample funds than boatowners or the Council then I would propose that they are the ones to find alternatives if th Council feels the river is overused. Boat living can also be a very sustainable low-impact way of life.	
No	Because the moorings provide a very useful and diverse alternative for affordable housing in the city centre.	

No	because there are more than 70 boats on council land already so reducing the number of mooring berths will effectively make a lot of the boater community homeless. We should be supporting houseboat living as a lifestyle that is environmentally low impact, and the community that lives on the Cam as culturally diverse and contributing to the character and landscape of our city.
No	Because there are not enough moorings for all of the people who need them as it is.
No	Because there's no massive need to change, and change is expensive with hidden costs.
No	Because these boats and their owners do a lot of good and no harm.
No	Because these moorings are homes!
No	Because they provide a great low impact way of life
No	Because this would reduce the number of moorings available and act unfairly on those who have been patiently waiting on the mooring waiting list with little or no feedback on the waiting lists progress for the past 2 years.
No	Because you're going to make innocent people homeless by doing this, and that's wrong.
No	Because you've not made a convincing argument that they should be reduced. Knocking down a few houses and moving people into caravans would also provide extra viewpoints, angling opportunities, and ecological niches along the rivers, it would also improve the transport situation along the riverbank. Put like this doesn't your argument seem a little ridiculous, and as if you're just picking on these people because you don't approve of their lifestyle, and because you can't?
No	Because, by your own admission, there's a shortage of berths, so it doesn't make sense to reduce the number available still further.
No	Boat mooring on the Cam are part of the character of our city and are low impact on the environment. The current level works well in my opinion.
No	boat moorings are part of Cambridge.
No	Boaters have a low-impact sustainable lifestyle and should be a valued part of the community.
No	Boats add character to the city and provide homes for people who can't afford the million pound houses!
No	Boats are a welcome sight and with the right amenities they add rather than detract from the overall character of the area
No	Boats are affordable homes in Cambridge do not reduce this option.
No	Boats are homes - I'm not keen on moving people on when they actually add so much character and community to the city. Keep it as it is and focus on trying to provide affordable homes instead of removing them.
No	Boats are part of Cambridge life and they should stay where they are
No	Boats are peoples' homes and make traveling along the river safer.
No	Boats provide a low-cost, low-impact form of housing in a city that desperately needs it.
No	Boats provide affordable accommodation for those that can't afford housing
No	Boats provide characterful affordable housing
No	Boats, especially narrowboats enhance the character of the river and provide affordable housing in a sustainable way.
No	Cambridge doesn't need less affordable housing!
No	Cambridge is one of the most expensive places to live in the country. The council should not be removing homes, especially homes that are low-cost and have little environmental impact such as boats.
No	Cambridge needs affordable places to live.
No	Cambridge needs all the homes it can support
No	Cambridge should have more boats not less. It gives people a chance to own their homes
No	Cambridge is already struggling to provide affordable and sustainable housing for its growing population. Any reduction in mooring space is aggravating this problem instead of using the river space proactively for the sustainable development of the city.
No	Can see no problem with current situation
No	Can so no problem with current situation
No	Can't see a reason to reduce the numbers. Why displace people? And my argument above about the character of the riverboats
No	Clearly more moorings are needed.
No	Clipping accommodation prices in the city should be forcing the council to look at ways of increasing moorings at affordable alternatives
No	Current arrangements are fine.
No	Currently it works well and the riverboats add character and life to the river. Those that are licensed and have been moored permanently, are by & large a great addition to the community and I would be sorry to see that number diminished - particularly if the boats along the Wall are removed. The river is a shared facility and I believe the numbers (once the Wall boats are gone) would work well.
No	Definitely not - getting rid of moored boats by stealth! Illegal!! The river is for everyone.
No	Demand.
No	Despite being wholly unfair, how would it be implemented? Lottery for a call, waiting for people to leave, price people out deliberately, cut services to destroy quality of life. Why not just let the pump out break down, not bother to repair it, and let the boaters die of disease.
No	do not see the necessity
No	Don't think cramming people in on the Commons would meet the needs of those currently on Riverside.
No	Due to demand for mooring sites already being so great that there is a 10-year waiting list for some boat types. Reducing the number of mooring sites would be extremely counterintuitive in combating this problem, and reinforces the feeling that the council doesn't care for the lives of boat dwellers.
No	effective policing and appropriate facilities for existing berths should be provided to prevent negative impacts. Otherwise the council should focus on providing more low cost living spaces in and around Cambridge not reducing them.
No	Essential, affordable way of life for people in a housing shortage area.
Yes	everyone should have access to the river!
Yes	Excluding the boats moored along riverside, I do not see any need to reduce boater numbers. If the council deemed it necessary to reduce numbers I would possibly be in favour, but any final decision would be based on the reasoning behind any reduction in the community size.
No	Families would be homeless.
No	Fewer people would be able to moor.
No	Fine as it is
No	For reasons stated above.
No	For the reasons given above. The river and the river dwellers are a tourist attraction.
No	Houseboats are essentially affordable housing. Reducing the amount of affordable housing in Cambridge is contrary to the stated aims of the Council. I would however support a reduction in the number of rowing craft permitted on the river - they are the cause of much more ecological disturbance, and disturbance to anglers than the moored houseboats.
No	Houseboats on the Cam are not a luxury lifestyle choice or a second home but an affordable housing option in a town with prohibitively expensive property prices.
Yes	How much space do the boat houses need?
No	I am content with things as they are.
No	I am not an angler and therefore cannot see any benefits
No	I can see no problem
No	I can see no problem
No	I cannot see the need for reducing the numbers of moorings.
No	I can't see any problem with current numbers.
No	I can't see who they are troubling and they add an interesting alternative aspect to Cambridge
No	I do not feel that the riverbank is currently overcrowded
No	I do not perceive any insurmountable problem with the current situation. Boat dwelling in fact offers a very green (ecologically sound) option in housing. The Council should support this! In addition, while the introduction to this survey is at pains to point out that moorings do not offer "social housing" it must be acknowledged that they offer an affordable alternative to social housing; one not dependent on the state. So to decrease the opportunities for this alternative, and evict many individuals who can currently make ends meet, the pressure on the council's social housing stock would increase massively in a very short space of time. With long waiting lists already an issue this will inevitably lead to at least some homelessness. Where does the duty of care come into this? There are solutions that do not make people homeless. They need to be explored properly.
No	I do not see the need for a reduction.
No	I do not understand why you would want to reduce the number of moorings
No	I don't find the boats obtrusive, and the presented reasons for the reduction are vague, frivolous, or unconvincing
No	I don't see a problem with the number of boats there currently. Reduction would mean people having to move.
No	I feel the current number and extent of berths is appropriate.
No	I like seeing the boats - I would actually support an increase in the overall length of riverbank for moorings. I think many people feel as I do - the boats are beautiful, and it's lovely seeing people living such a different way of life in our midst.
No	I like that there are boats on the cam
No	I love what the boats add to the river for interest & diversity.
No	I prefer to see the river as a living space, and feel people's homes should take priority over leisure pursuits. I find the increased number of rowers substantially more problematic than the moored boats. I live close to the river, and cross it daily. At some times of the year, when many colleges are teaching novice rowers, the river and the bankside is very crowded.
No	I see no problem with them remaining
No	I see no reason to reduce the length of riverbank available for mooring. The current provisions have worked adequately for many years (at least 20 to my knowledge) and the river use has not changed to a degree to make this necessary.
No	I think it is about right as it is.
No	I think that the boat community is an important part of our community
No	I think the balance is right. There are places for anglers opposite riverside and along the nature reserve.
No	I think the boats enhance the visual amenity of the river.
No	I would not support a reduction in the permanent mooring spaces. Temporary ones - yes definitely
No	I would not trust the council or other relevant body to regulate angling along any freed-up stretches. People already catch fish for eating which I gather is not allowed.
No	If anything - I think if the bank was better kept, there could be more moorings and not fewer.
No	If it is optimal now, why reduce it in future?
No	In a town with a massive cost of housing crisis and a aim of being green, why would the council act to eliminate low cost, low impact housing? I honestly think a proposal to reduce moorings amounts to social cleansing.
No	In the current times of housing and energy crisis we should be supporting alternative low impact dwellings.
No	It appears these berths are in demand and I'm not convinced by your arguments about removing boats from Riverside.
No	It does not currently seem overcrowded.
No	It has the effect of evicting people who may need that location for work. Would not support this unless the boat owners themselves wanted to be moved.
No	It has worked for years and is fine as it is. It's a community, where peoples homes are and it's a place many locals enjoy visiting.
No	It is not clear for what purpose and benefit a reduction in the moorings is seeking.
No	It is not necessary
No	It is not reasonable
No	It is part of the beauty of Cambridge. What should be done is to tidy up some of the boats
No	It is unfair to people living there currently. There are already not enough moorings available or any other affordable housing so you're planning to make people homeless, well done!
No	It is unnecessary.
No	It should be increased instead.
No	It will squeeze boats together, causing congestion crowding and could be dangerous.
No	It works fine as it is, community is thriving. Manage what there is properly before making changes
No	It would look bare
No	It's a low cost way of living in Cambridge not many can afford the high rent prices and buying your own home isn't an option for most people.
No	It's a way of life, when you walk along the river it's enjoyable to see the boats.
No	It's been fine for the last 20 years!
No	It's fine as it is
No	It's fine as it is.
No	It's nice to have a community living on the river.
No	I've lived in Cambridge for 12 years and never felt that the number of moorings seemed excessive and in need of reduction.
No	I've never seen the houseboats as being anything other than picturesque, for one thing.
No	Lack of cheap housing
Yes	less the better - no need to be up river or near to Jesus green playground -
No	Limiting supply in this way may accord with increasing charges but it will ensure that some members of the community are effectively priced out of their homes. Anything which jeopardises the coherence of this thriving community is likely to be detrimental - the presence of such residential moorings makes the riverbank a safer and more welcoming place. Increasing visitor numbers would not have the same effect.
No	Livesboard boats provide a sustainable lifestyle which has a low economic and environmental impact, in addition to being people's settled homes. Reducing the length of riverbank or number of berths is an unacceptable infringement on this way of life.
No	Living on a boat is an alternative, cheaper way of life. It brings a lot of character to the city, it is a dynamic community and we need this in Cambridge. We should encourage and support them instead of making their life more difficult.
No	Living on boats is an eco friendly way of life that the Council would be unwise to be seen to be disapproving of.
No	Loss of community, increased pressure on housing services due to people being unable to afford costs
No	Low impact and sustainable ways of life should be encouraged not harried.
No	Mooring adds diversity to town
No	Mooring offer a safe and non intrusive alternative way of life. More people across the country are taking up this option and I believe it would be detrimental for the City to reduce this
No	Moorings on the Cam adds to the diversity and cultural quality of life in Cambridge.
No	Moorings provide a historic, affordable and environmentally low-impact way of life. This community should be protected, not removed.
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. We don't think there should be a reduction in the number of moorings in Cambridge
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable low-impact way of life. There should not be a reduction the number of moorings in Cmsbridge
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. keep them as they are or this part of the city will become a playground for the rich - we have enough of this in station area already!
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life, and fit in well with Cambridge culture.
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life.
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life.
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life.
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. I can't for think why in times of a housing crisis and environmental concerns that there should be a reduction in the number of moorings in Cambridge
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. I don't think there should be a reduction in the number of moorings in Cambridge
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. I don't think there should be a reduction in the number of moorings in Cambridge
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. In Cambridge there is an acute lack of affordable homes and given this and the increase in people wanting to live aboard boats it seems a terrible idea to reduce the number of mooring berths
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. Please do not damage something so valuable to our city.
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. The boats with a few exceptions add greatly to the aesthetics of the river. I don't think there should be a reduction in the number of moorings in Cambridge.
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. There should be a reduction in the number of moorings in Cambridge.
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. We don't think there should be a reduction in the number of moorings in Cambridge.
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. We don't think there should be a reduction in the number of moorings in Cambridge.
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. We don't think there should be a reduction in the number of moorings in Cambridge.
No	Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. We don't think there should be a reduction in the number of moorings in Cambridge.
No	Moorings provide an affordable and low impact way of life and should not be reduced
No	Moorings provide an affordable, low-impact way of life which does not harm anyone.
No	Moorings should increase
No	More bots can be accommodated in the Fen Road/ Stourbridge Common stretch of the river
No	more not less
No	Need more moorings. Expand
No	No case for this being a net good to the area has been proven.
No	No cogent argument for this proposal has been put forward
No	No need
No	No need for reduction.
No	No need to do so and doing so would be damaging to people and local character
No	No need. At a good level now.
No	No reason this is required
No	No way! The boaters are a huge asset to the Cambridge Community, who have developed a community here. They do not obstruct navigation - what would possibly be the reason to do that?
No	No, we need more moorings not fewer!
No	No? People live there
No	Non-boat user, but the boats provide part of the "colour" of the river. To reduce their numbers for the alternative considerations stated seems to be to be a poor balance. The boats enhance the views rather than detract from them, and many other locations are available for angling. In particular, the section along Midsomer Common would be poorly suited to fishing with a rod and line due to proximity of the heavily used cycle/footpath.
No	nonsense with such a long waiting list
No	Not necessary
No	Not needed. Would unnecessarily squeeze a longstanding and relatively poor community.
No	not necessary
No	Only if the number of visitor moorings does not decrease - the current number is the bare minimum Cambridge needs
No	People do want to live there
No	People need somewhere to live, and I don't think the boats should be moved to the commons
No	people need all the moorings for their boats because houses are too expensive in Cambridge
No	People need homes and options. Not a reduction
No	People need their homes
No	People need to live on boats as Cambridge is so expensive. Provides low impact housing & doesn't drain resources. Income is useful to the Council
No	People's need for homes must be a principal consideration.
No	Powered Boats have reduced in number, its rowing that has increased with little mangment of the sports numbers using the cam.
No	Provide more not less
No	Provided the type and condition of vessels is kept equal to or above current levels, the status quo seems tolerable and equitable.
No	Reducing numbers of moored boats along Riverside is the main priority
No	reducing the river as a source of accommodation seems inappropriate at present.
No	Residential boaters are an asset to the city, live a low-impact lifestyle ecologically and are a valuable, life-enhancing social community.

No	Residential boats improve riverside safety by having people around the river day and night, and provide low environmental impact affordable housing. They are an asset to the community that should not be reduced.
No	Ridiculous question ignoring the needs and demands of moorings required
No	River dwellers are (typically) among the poorer members of society. Reducing the availability of moorings hits an already struggling sector of society, so that those with higher incomes can enjoy their leisure time.
No	River living is affordable and low impact and adds to the diversity and charm of Cambridge. I do not want to see boat residents made homeless.
No	Riverside is my home and we all would like to be included in the moorings
No	Riverside moorings are not unsafe.
No	see 2.7
No	See 6.1
No	see above
No	See answer above
No	See previous answer - why is there a problem with the current number. The City are just not managing the moorings well - and if done so, you would have additional fee income and would achieve gradual benefits.
No	See previous answers of destroying people's homes
No	See Q22
No	Seems ludicrous in a city riddled with economic divisions to further decrease affordable living options for those who are able and willing to live this way.
No	seems ungenerous -the boat provide visual interest, and needed accommodation
No	socio economic challenged individuals would become homeless drug addicts. I dont want to be tripping over poor homeless people, give the poor somewhere to live, so no reduction at all
No	Stop harassing the boat-dwellers who are living a more low-impact, law-abiding and commendable lifestyle than most.
No	Support option 1
No	Tackling climate change is one of Cambridge City Council's key policy priorities. Your Climate Change Strategy has been developed to help you address the causes and consequences of climate change as you work to become a more sustainable city. I think you should consider the implications of removing this extremely low-impact housing for your carbon management plans.
No	The berths (= homes) are far more important than, say, angling for which there is any amount of suitable riverbank elsewhere.
No	The boat community is important, diverse and vibrant. It should be increased rather than reduced.
No	the boaters are part of our community and should not be gradually squeezed out.
No	The boating community is a valuable asset to the city, and helps provide an affordable way to live in what's otherwise a very expensive location.
No	The boats actually support a great deal of the economy system of the river and speaking as a licensed fisherman on the Cam I can tell you there is no issue here. From a fairness stance there has been a rise in the number of punts and rowers but why should boaters then have to suffer as a result? Surely people's homes should be a priority in this city if anything. From a security point of view it is well known by all locals that due to the lack of policing and cameras a great deal of good deeds have been carried out by the boating community and a reduction would certainly increase danger along the river at night and a rise in crime.
No	The boats add character as well currently being the only remotely affordable housing in the city
No	The boats and their community are an important part of the city
No	The boats and their inhabitants are a crucial part of the area's community. Many serve valuable social and community functions and contribute to the prosperity of the whole city. Further, they provide life and interest to the river and improve the ambience, character and recreational value of the river and its environs, in addition to providing additional safety and human presence for nighttime joggers and so forth along the towpath which would otherwise have the potential to become a quiet and dangerous route, particularly for women. The loss of the towpath as a fitness resource would result in poorer health in the city and greater medical costs.
No	the boats are a city asset
No	The boats are part of the charm of the river.
No	The current level seems quite pleasant and the community adds a lot to the local area. It would be unnecessary to move people.
No	The current local community are happy, the boat residents are happy, why cause upheaval and remove people's homes?
No	The current moorings do provide a way for people to live reasonably economically in Cambridge, which is a rarity, so it seems wrong to reduce the number of people who can benefit from this option.
No	The current number is about right (but see comment to 6.1 above).
No	The current number is acceptable, there seems to be no overcrowding, and boats provide valuable homes to those who cannot afford otherwise to live in Cambridge
No	The current number of moorings along the Cam doesn't make it look overcrowded with residents to me
No	The current situation provides a good balance between the many competing interests.
No	The existing number serves the community well
No	The far end of Stourbridge Common is currently empty, bar one lived on vessel!
No	The hackneyed environmental excuses used here to try and justify a reduction are completely spurious.
No	The inhabitants and leisure activities of the existing moorings needs to be maintained. These have grown over the years and cannot now be changed with out hardship to those involved.
No	The levels should be kept as they are, these are peoples homes and lives you are dealing with. Moorings are a unique and affordable way of life and have been in use for decades alongside other activities on the Cam
No	The moorings are a characteristic feature of the Cam and the city, and provide a novel and apparently much in demand solution to some people's housing needs.
No	the moorings are part of the charm of the Cam. It is not a river just for the often anti social rowing community it is for all. We are often woken at 06.30 by bellowing rowers coming past.
No	The moorings fill an important role in that they provide affordable living.
No	The moorings provide a unique and affordable way of living in this city and the community of boaters is crucial to keep the commons and Riverside safe. They add colour and life to the river scene and enhance North East Cambridge riverbank. There should be no reduction and the Riverside boaters should be allowed to stay
No	The number of boats is not overcrowded and should remain the same.
No	the number of boats should be sustainable according to the navigation requirements, the preservation of the natural area in Stourbridge park and the needs for mooring spaces
No	The number of craft should be reviewed after changes are introduced related to length. The policy may reduce the length of riverbank occupied by moored craft.
No	The number of moorings we have is fine, no need to reduce them.
No	The number should have been regulated for decades removing the need to make people homeless.
No	The reason I disagree with this is a, I have never seen fishermen fighting over a portion of riverbank because there hasn't been enough room or there not being enough room for people to feed the swans and the ducks. If you move boats from riverside there definitely won't be room for either of the above and b, I have yet to see any evidence of "unsafe mooring" along riverside and c, ONCE AGAIN WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO PUT THE RIVERSIDE MOORERS. Against popular misconception most boaters work and in keeping with their 'low carbon footprint' cycle to work and have their children in local schools. So Where??
No	The river boats and their inhabitants add to the character and ambience of Cambridge life.
No	The river is not just for the privileged
No	The river isn't just for rowers to enjoy
No	the riverboat community has shown that it is a vibrant part of the community and should be expanded not contracted.
No	The riverboat community is already quite small and doesn't need to be further eroded.
No	The status-quo seems reasonable. I don't see any need to reduce the number of boats.
No	There are already insufficient moorings to meet demand. Plenty of areas of the riverbank are entirely free of residential moorings. The necessity for a reduction is not made out.
No	There are at least 100 rowers for every moored residential boat on the Cam. Overcrowding and congestion is caused by the sheer volume of rowers. The Council should tackle the power of the rowing interests of the University and related clubs and take steps to reduce the impact of rowing and the number of rowers.
No	there are insufficient affordable homes in the city as it is. The boats are not a problem. They are sustainable. we need to INCREASE spaces for boats.
No	There are many people on the waiting list and on riverside who want to be part of our community, making the community smaller creates more safety concerns along the commons at night time for residents and those using the commons and making a smaller community will make our lives even small than it already is in the competing demands of the City.
No	there are more like 100 boats that are homes.
No	There are obviously not enough permanent mooring positions at the moment as almost all visitor moorings are regularly fully occupied with permanent residents.
No	There are so few low cost, low-impact living alternatives that add such character to an environment, these should be maintained and TREASURED.
No	There are too many boats and not enough space. There is a difference between acting on a health and safety directive and systematically decimating a community.
Yes	There are too many boats moored in narrow locations and it is making the river gradually more difficult to navigate.
No	There does not appear to be any good reason to do so.
No	There has been the same amount of boats mooring for many years. Compared to the number of rowing boats that have doubled in the last five years!!
No	There have been boats moored on the Cam for as long as I can remember and I am 62. Please don't tell me when and how many there were.
No	There is a shortage of mooring anyway. Don't take away any.
No	There is a waiting list of around 400 people. Why reduce the numbers? The river is not cluttered, there is no trouble. Why change this?
No	There is limited affordable housing in Cambridge, yet the population of Cambridge is ever increasing. There need to be more mooring berths made available.
No	There is lots of non-mooring space available
No	There is no evidence of any problems associated with the length of river - including Riverside - devoted to mooring
No	There is no good reason to do so, and nothing to be gained.
No	There is no need to reduce the extent or number of mooring berths.
No	There is no reason to do this
No	There is no reason whatsoever for this...if river use is increasing...it is mostly due to the number of rowers on the Cam...often with little expertise...it is not the houseboat owners who injure swans...create constant noise along the river or damage other people's boats...perhaps these need more regulation! The riverside is one of Cambridge's unique and enduring assets and the houseboaters are a major part of the character of this city...which diminishing alarmingly...the river should be available to and usable by all in co-operation with each other...as it is at present!!!
No	There is not enough space currently for demand. I would not propose to increase numbers either
No	There is nothing wrong with this way of life and how people have lived for decades.
No	There isn't a problem
No	there isn't space
No	There should be more! This environmentally friendly way of life should be encouraged.
No	There would be no alternative in Cambridge for people to live sustainably.
No	There's already a long waiting list for licenses as it is
No	There's already good stretches of the river which don't have boats. It doesn't seem to me to be particularly excessive anywhere. I strongly object to getting rid of moored boats to make a prettier view. In my view the boats all along the river are a vibrant and exciting looking part of Cambridge
No	There's no need. You don't solve problems of conflict by removing one set of river users. You don't solve the problems of "unsafe" moorings by removing the users, but by making them safe. In any case, I am far from convinced that the moorings are really unsafe, and suspect that this is an excuse.
No	These are homes, homes in a city that a lot of people cannot afford rocketing rents. I don't feel the river needs any more commercial boats. I cycle this route every day and I've never seen a commercial boat that is full often I'll see this boats travelling with only a handful of customers. To reduce the number of homes on the river is favour of a small number of people touring and rowers would be totally unjust.
Yes	These are peoples homes and businesses
No	These are peoples homes!
No	These are people's homes.
No	These people belong there. They are part of the river like rowers. This is Cambridge. This is waterways in Britain. Don't destroy it. It's part of the flair of the river.
No	They are neither excessive nor dominating the river environment. In town it feels like there are not many, and out of town they again feel spread out.
Yes	They are not letting other people have use of the river bank
No	They aren't hurting anyone.
No	They do no harm and the majority of people support moorings
No	Things are fine as they are
No	Things are working perfectly ok as they are.
No	Things seem OK as they are at the moment.
No	This effectively amounts to evicting people from their homes, and excluding the less permanent bargee community from the city.
No	This has nothing to do with residential, /d everything to do with rowing.
No	This is a valuable part of the diversity of the area
No	This tiny community maintains some cultural diversity in a city with an exploding population and ludicrous housing costs.
No	This will involve a number of people losing the place they live. Cambridge is so unaffordable for many people now, what would the unfortunate ones whose mooring gets taken away do? I can't see a good, humane reason for this.
No	This would make many boat owners homeless and change the character of the river.
No	This would not benefit boating community
No	This would reduce homes for people trying to live eco friendly lives on the river
No	THIS would render homeless a large part of the boating community.
No	This would unfairly penalise the inhabitants of the boats.
No	Those residents who live on our river add to the diversity and character of our city.
No	Unnecessary
No	Unneeded and partial reduction in accommodation
No	Useful and attractive housing
No	Waterways are a valuable resource and provide affordable, low-impact living. The numbers of berths available should certainly not be reduced. The presence of people is part of their history and their beauty.
No	We need to support access to secure, low-impact housing, not take it away.
No	We need to utilize all available space
No	What else are you going to use the bank for? Cambridge has a housing crisis as it is!
No	Where will people live if they lose their moorings?
No	Why are you doing this? Cambridge has a chronic housing crisis and the River Cam is a source of some of the last remaining affordable housing this city has. Moorings provide a unique, affordable, low-impact way of life. We don't think there should be a reduction in the number of moorings in Cambridge.
No	Why fewer?? I've followed similar proposals in other river communities and they are usually because councils want to introduce money-making leisure schemes of which I am not in favour.
No	Why move all these people on? Where would they go? Stop trying to change a wonderful situation that appears to most people in the city to be working well!
No	Why should I, residential moorings have caused me precisely zero problems over the nearly 20 years I have been living in Cambridge. See above.
No	why take away affordable housing for no reason??
No	Why waste a resource?
No	Why would I?
No	Why would the number need to be reduced if these are at the 'optimum level'?
No	Why would you?
No	Why? What nonsense again.
No	Would reduce the character of cambridge and pushes out people on the lower end of the income ladder which is unfair.
No	Would you support a reduction of your house?
No	Yes, but not at the expense of creating extra moorings along the commons and at other sites downstream of the Green Dragon / Chesterton footbridge@
Yes	Yes. Currently moorers disproportionately benefit from the river at the expense of other users, such as rowers. Furthermore, the air and noise pollution caused by the heating and electricity systems of the moorers is causing harm to runners and walkers next to the river.
No	You cant make boaters homeless
No	You've really already indicated that you want to move the Riverside boats. You can't do that and reduce the moorings. Sadly you have asked the questions in such a way and order to deliver the answer you want or so that you can say you have listened. You need another alternative for Riverside NOT a reduction.

IP Address	Response	Comment
	No	Riverside moorings is a much better solution.
	No	"Displacement" is not acceptable.
	Yes	... but I'm still against the displacement of people from Riverside.
	Yes	70 or whatever the lower agreed number becomes.
	No	A much better solution is to retain the moorings at Riverside (see above).
	No	A number of the boats are in poor repair and do not comply with regulations about waste disposal so should not be permitted to moor.
	No	A privilege given becomes a right: it will be difficult to go back to the lower number in the future, so this is a hostage to fortune.
	No	A temporary increase would simply delay the eviction of the boat owners. There should be a permanent increase, allowing the boats moored at riverside to remain there.
	No	A temporary license is just that - temporary. It is not a permanent solution for someone who has been evicted from their home. And, ultimately, we are unsure that there are sufficient alternative moorings in any case.
	No	A temporary solution can't fix a chronic need.
	No	Any increases in residential licences should be long-term, not temporary. Riverside boat residents should be allowed to stay there if they wish.
	Yes	as above, retain the Riverside moorings
	Yes	As long as the Riverside moorings are retained, yes.
	No	As maintaining the current number of residential moorings along Riverside would be a more efficient solution. The proposed action would also lead to increased waiting times for licences overall.
	No	As said above, I dont think you should displace the people living on riverside, and that the moorings on riverside should be retained as licensed moorings.

No	As stated previously, your reasons for removing moorings from Riverside are spurious, unnecessary and will detract from the character of the area. An empty concrete retaining wall does not look sightly and the increased width of river will encourage rowing boats to race along this stretch, thereby damaging the bank particularly at the two small Nature Reserves
No	Because closing Riverside Mooring is not the right course of action
No	Because I am opposed to ending mooring at Riverside.
No	Because I do not support putting an end to mooring on the Riverside Wall nor a reduction in the number of people living on the river.
No	Because I do not support the riverside removal
No	BECAUSE I DO NOT SUPPORT THE UNDERLYING PRINCIPAL. This is a badly worded question.
No	Because I don't agree that the boats should be moved from Riverside.
No	Because I don't support a reduced length for mooring.
No	Because I don't think boats should be moved from Riverside.
No	Because I fundamentally disagree with any alleged need to move boats from Riverside
No	Because I think the number of moorings should stay at around 100 with the moorings at Riverside retained.
No	Because I'm unsure where other mooring are - I suspect outside of the pricey city limits. Just feels like you're pushing people out.
No	Because it is just delaying the problem and it's frustrating to see people get special treatment just because they had the cheek to moor illegally.
No	Because it is unfair on the people who have been on the list for up to ten years. But I think it's a good idea to provide mooring if boats get moved off riverside.
No	Because it should never happen. You should be ashamed of yourselves. Sorry but it's true.
No	Because moving people off riverside is evil, and it does not get less evil because you cause overcrowding elsewhere. Just leave well alone.
No	because boat dwellers should be displaced from Riverside. And overcrowding moorings at the Commons should not be used as an underhand way of restricting access to the river by others, in the hope that this will make boat-dwellers less popular with the local populace.
No	because of displacement, the doubling of charges for no benefit, and in other words quite frankly disgusting social exclusion that is being proposed
No	Because people on the waiting list would have to wait much longer
No	Because there is no need to move those based at Riverside who should be allowed to remain and not be displaced by a bunch of noisy new resident nibmys based nearby. The boat users were there long before the nibmys and that should be respected - they come with the territory and the view!
No	Because things should be left as they are, with the addition of ladders, as mentioned above.
Yes	because this is a brilliant solution to several problems, and the council would also receive more money in the form of license fees.
No	Because this option implies that people will be displaced from Riverside which is not on.
No	Because this presupposes I accept the 'displacement' of those living on Riverside. I do not, so there would be no need for this.
No	Because this would reduce the number of moorings available and act unfairly on those who have been patiently waiting on the mooring waiting list with little or no feedback on the waiting lists progress for the past 2 years.
No	because we all know that this is impossible to achieve, and there is absolutely no need for it.
No	Berths should remain at riverside
	Better off keeping riverside.
Yes	Better option would be to retain the number of moorings
	Better to just keep the Riverside Moorings.
	better to leave things exactly as they are
No	Boaters should not be displaced from Riverside.
	Boaters should not be removed from riverside. The area is not somewhere that riverside activities take place and I'm totally failing to see any reason why they should be moved.
No	Boats at river side should not be displaced as there is nowhere to fairly displace them too.
No	Boats should stay on riverside, should not jump the queue for mooring licenses as they have somewhere to moor - no space for the boats
No	Boats with people living on board, should be moored further out of town. City centre along the river, only allow to stay temporarily for no more than one week, no permanent stay. Tourist boat only.
Yes	But I see no good reason to stop people mooring at Riverside, any Risk/Health and Safety issues can be resolved.
Yes	But I would prefer to see no decrease in moorings
Yes	But it must strictly be temporary
Yes	But only if there is displacement from Riverside - which there should not be.
Yes	But retaining Riverside makes a great deal more sense.
Yes	But we should be retaining our current areas including riverside, not causing overcrowding at other parts of the river
No	But you already have this commitment I believe so not sure why you ask.
No	Central Cambridge is beautiful and any boats moored should be of a reasonable standard to reflect the above.
Yes	Comment. I do not support the displacement from Riverside, but if it is mandated then I would support this approach.
No	Concerned about displaced boats blighting the area downstream of Green Dragon / Chesterton footbridge
No	delay in removed from riverside
No	Displacing them from riverside doesn't sound like the right solution. There isn't much spare suitable riverbank. Sorting out riverside is a better idea.
No	Do not displace Riverside boats
No	Do not displace the registered boats on Riverside, work with them not against them at great cost to the public purse.
No	Don't displace from Riverside
No	Don't displace people to begin with
No	Don't support removing people from Riverside.
No	Don't want them moved
No	For environmental reasons this is not acceptable.
No	Full up already
No	Given paragraph 7 in the Preamble to item 7, I would be suspicious that "temporary" would be in practice anything but, and the "Riverside problem" would simply be transferred elsewhere for a significant period.
No	How much room is there really for more boats on the commons ?
Yes	However, I would prefer to see a permanent increase.
Yes	However, retaining the Riverside moorings is a much better solution.
Yes	I am happy for retaining riverside moorings
No	I am not in favour of displacing the Riverside community.
No	I am on the waiting list.
No	I disagree entirely with the proposed clearance of Riverside moorings.
No	I do not agree with displacement of currently moored boats from Riverside hence this does not apply
No	I do not agree with displacing people living on the Riverside moorings.
No	I do not approve of the removal from Riverside - see above
No	I do not see the need to reduce the Riverside moorings.
No	I do not support displacement from Riverside
No	I do not support displacing boats from riverside.
No	I don't believe the river bank from Stourbridge to central Cambridge can accommodate more boats
No	I don't believe there is any need to move the boats form Riverside, or that the additional licenses should be temporary.
No	I don't support displacing anyone from riverside
No	I don't support moving the boats from Riverside so I can't support this
No	I don't support removal from boats from Riverside so this is not a question I feel it is appropriate to answer
No	I don't think anyone should be displaced from Riverside.
No	I don't think you should displace them from Riverside.
Yes	I don't want to see anyone displaced from Riverside
No	I gather Council has already committed to this, I think retaining the Riverside moorings is a much better solution!
Yes	I have no problem with boaters moored on Riverside joining a waiting list for a licensed mooring - indeed, this has always been an option.
Yes	I however believe that it is wrong to move the houseboats from Riverside in the first place.
No	I say no only because I absolutely disagree with displacing people from Riverside Wall. I OF COURSE would agree if you do go with that terrible, terrible idea. But I don't want to say "yes" to this question in case it gets misconstrued as an implicit support of the notion of removing people from Riverside.
No	I see no reason why anyone should be displaced in the first instance
No	I still don't think moving people off riverside is necessary. Also increasing existing licenses would potentially cause friction in the boating community.
No	I strongly believe that boats should not be relocated from Riverside and in the case that they were it seems grossly unfair to impact other river users.
No	I suspect that temporary would be likely to become permanent. How long is "temporary"?
Yes	I think boats should be allowed to stay on railings and added to the total number (20)
No	I think the removal of riverside moorings is wrong. If there are issues with these boats, work constructively with the owners to resolve them rather than pretending your are concerned for their welfare with contrived H&S arguments
No	I think you have already committed to this in your proposals. Am I not correct? Retain the number of boats that are currently moored on the Cam, at all points, and do not allow any more.
No	I understand that you have already committed to this but I think that the retention of the Riverside moorings would be better
	I would only support this temporary increase if the removal of boats from Riverside went ahead. As I hope I have made clear, I do not support this proposal
Yes	I would prefer a commitment to retaining the moorings at Riverside.
No	I would prefer that we keep existing moorings at Riverside and keep existing licence numbers.
	I would prefer this not to happen as it would not be necessary if the boats were to remain on the riverside railings.
	I would prefer to see the riverside moorings retained.
No	I would suggest leaving Riverside alone and then there would be no need for this at all. Additionally it sounds a lot like phase 1 of a plan to evict boat dwellers entirely.
Yes	I would support this if they must be moved, but as stated elsewhere, I do not believe this to be the case.
No	I wouldn't displace anyone
Yes	I'd rather people weren't displaced from Riverside.
No	If given notice, all houseboats can find marina mooring elsewhere
Yes	If it turned out to be needed. Those displaced should come first.
Yes	If it were definitely temporary.
No	If licencing is necessary, then those on Riverside should be included in the licence numbers permanently.
Yes	If necessary but my preferred option would be to retain the moorings at Riverside.
Yes	If properly maintained, keeping Riverside is the better solution!
No	If Riverside is currently unlicensed and is being used for residential moorings then the licence numbers should be increased to include those boats and then maintained at that level.
Yes	If the Riverside community are to be displaced (though I hope an alternative might be found) their needs to remain in the City area should be taken into account.
No	If we allow people to remain on Riverside then this wouldn't be necessary. If you do this, then new people who come along will have to wait even longer to get a licence.
No	If you can increase the number of Residential Mooring Licences on a temporary basis, why not increase them on a permanent basis? As I said before: housing crisis.
Yes	If you must evict the poor souls from Riverside then you should provide alternative moorings for them.
No	I'm deeply torn on this. I want boats removed from Riverside Wall and I know that in some cases this could create hardship for individuals. But I don't believe it would be fair for those on the waiting list to be overtaken by people who have occupied unlicensed mooring space free of cost by complicit acceptance by the City and County Councils.
No	In favour of status quo
	Is this not the currently accepted status-quo anyway? Give a license to those on Riverside.
No	It depends on how many, and which of them (Riverside boat dwellers) are already on the waiting list and how long they have been on it. Being on that list signals the right intent. My concern is that those who have waited patiently for legitimate moorings will be disadvantaged.
No	It is entirely unnecessary.
No	It rewards people who effectively have squated on the Riverside wall area. However it will depend on the number of temporary licences. It might be a battle worth avoiding.
No	It should be a permanent increase and not involve evictions from Riverside.
No	It should be a permanent increase.
No	It will clog up the Cam. Move them up to Ely.
No	It will lead to overcrowding. There is no more space. It's a bad solution to a problem you're about to cause for no good reason. Just stop it.
No	It would be a much better solution to keep the current moorings.
No	It would be better to retain the Riverside moorings, and increase the total number of moorings slightly.
No	It would be highly unfair to someone on the waiting list who has not yet purchased a boat and brought it to Cambridge to be put effectively further down the list by someone who was lower down the list or not on at all buying a boat and bringing it to Cambridge.
No	It would be impossible to add 30 boats to the commons! Jesus Green
No	It would be much easier to have those on Riverside remain, as oppose to displacing them and increasing crowding in other areas.
No	It would be much more appropriate to retain the Riverside moorings.
No	It would be much wiser to retain the moorings. It is not a foregone conclusion that anyone will be displaced from Riverside.
No	It would be very much better to give licences to those already established at Riverside i.e. Bring them into the mooring scheme. Retaining the moorings and giving safe access would require no one to move.
No	It's fair on the people on the waiting list.
No	It's simpler for the residents to just stay at riverside
No	It's unnecessary if you retain riverside moorings.
No	Just allow boats to moor on Riverside. It's not rocket science. Don't penalise the people on the waiting list for no reason.
Yes	Just keep the moorings
No	Just keep the moorings on riverside
	Just keep the Riverside moorings
No	Just keep the riverside moorings as they are.
No	Just keep the Riverside moorings!
	Just maintain the current mooring numbers
	Just retain the riverside moorings please
No	Just retain the Riverside moorings!
	Just retain what is already in place.
No	Keep riverside as is!
No	Keep riverside moorings
	Keep riverside moorings with above mentioned amendments to avoid health and safety contraventions.
	Keep riverside.
No	Keep the mooring on the commons & on riverside
No	Keep the moorings on Riverside
	Keep the Riverside Moorings as they are please.
	Keep the Riverside moorings!!!
	Keep the riverside moorings, and increase the number of licences, and increase the total number indefinitely
Yes	Keep the Riverside moorings.
	Keeping moorings at Riverside seems a better solution
Yes	Keeping Riverside moorings would be a much less problematic solution.
No	Keeping Riverside would be a better solution.
No	Limited space for this.
	Loaded question and worthy of being reported to the Local Government Ombudsman. Don't support an increase in temporary moorings and damn visiting boaters, support an increase in the temporary moorings and give a green light to their eviction from berths on Riverside using the cover that 'no one was forced to leave the city centre'.
No	Maintaining the moorings at riverside is a much better solution
No	Maintaining the riverside moorings is a better solution
No	Many of the people on riverside have been moored without paying any fees for many years - they've fully exploited a loophole and have always run the risk of it being closed.
No	Mooring on the Riverside wall should be allowed to continue
No	move boats as far away as possible-
No	Need more moorings. Expand.
No	No need to move people from Riverside!
No	No need, as I disagree with removing the riverside moorings
No	No one should be displaced
No	Not applicable
No	not fair
No	not if it entails boats moored in current no mooring areas at the pinch point beside the pound
No	Not necessary to displace boats from Riverside
No	Not relevant - simply allow the boats moored at riverside to remain there.
No	Number of residential mooring licences should be permanently increased once Riverside Wall has been made fit for permanent moorings.
Yes	only for those displaced from Riverside
Yes	Only if Riverside is closed.
Yes	Only if the plan to displace some boats goes ahead. I would prefer that not to happen at all.
Yes	Only if they are river worthy boats which can get to the waste disposal area and do not burn toxic fuel like wood!!!
No	ONLY Yes provided Riverside boatowners as a majority are in favour!
	Or just keep the riverside boat!
No	People moored at Riverside should not be allowed to jump the waiting list. They squatted on an unregulated part of the river and they should not be given priority over those who have waited and followed the rules.
No	People on waiting list deserve to be next in line for moorings.
No	Permanently keep the Riverside moorings.
Yes	Please make Riverside a place where people can safely moor
Yes	Please see answers above.
No	Potentially dependant on location to allow boaters to not have their lives disrupted
No	prefer to retain riverside
Yes	Provided the council agrees a practicable deadline for reaching 70 once again
	Providing they are responsible people, not prone to antisocial behaviour
Yes	Rather a loaded question, yes if peoples' homes are being moved at least give them somewhere to go!
	Retaining the Riverside moorings is a much better idea
No	Removing the riverside moorings is pointless; reducing moorings numbers generally is also clearly un-necessary too. Maintaining the status-quo (better managed) would be best for both City and Boaters.

	Retain and develop riverside.
No	Retain riverside moorings.
Yes	Riverside moorings makes more sense
No	Retain Riverside moorings where they are
No	Retain the Riverside moorings
No	retain the Riverside moorings!
	Retain the Riverside moorings.
	Retaining and improving the riverside moorings would be a more satisfactory solution.
No	Retaining moorings at Riverside would be a better solution, the are currently approx 110 mooring berths in Cambridge including riverside and reducing our community to 70 boats over the coming years would mean that fewer people can access an affordable, low-impact way of living in our city.
	Retaining riverside licenses would be a better solution
No	Retaining Riverside moorings is a better solution
No	Retaining Riverside moorings is a much better idea.
No	Retaining Riverside moorings is a much better solution
No	Retaining Riverside moorings much better!
No	Retaining riverside moorings would stop any need for this
No	Retaining the Riverside moorings is a better solution.
Yes	Retaining the Riverside moorings (and charging for them) is a much better solution.
No	retaining the Riverside moorings is a much better solution.
No	Retaining the Riverside moorings is a much better solution.
	retaining the Riverside moorings is a much better solution.
No	Retaining the Riverside moorings is a much better solution.
No	Retaining the Riverside moorings is a much better solution.
No	Retaining the Riverside moorings is a much better solution.
Yes	Retaining the Riverside moorings is a much better solution.
Yes	retaining the Riverside moorings is a much better solution.
No	Retaining the Riverside moorings is a much better solution.
No	Rewarding those who had moored with permission on Riverside by jumping them to the front of the queue for mooring licences would be unfair to those who have waited and applied in the correct way. Additionally, allowing more boats these boats to remain increases the risk of harm to other stakeholder groups as detailed by the council in laying out the maximum sustainable number of boats. In particular, anglers and rowers would be harmed by the reduction in bank space and navigable river width.
No	Riverside boats have residential mooring licenses too, I'd assume so the total number would not change
No	riverside is a good place for boats to be moored, its an area where the public are not wanting to access the riverbank and therefore represents a smart use of space.
No	Riverside moorings have been blatantly free-loading for years and should not be compensated in any way. They could have joined waiting list for legal mooring at any point but haven't bothered. Get rid of them.
No	Riverside moorings need to be kept
	Riverside moorings should be kept
No	Riverside moorings should not be relocated
No	Riverside residents shouldn't be displaced. This is a loaded question
No	Riverside should be incorporated in the existing scheme, so that the increase in the number of licences (from 70 to 90) is permanent.
No	Riverside should be left alone so no alternative required
No	See 6.1
No	see above
No	See previous answers. I don't see how a temporary increase could be supported as displaced boats would always be displaced.
No	See previous question.
No	Should not displace anyone who pays and obeys the law, from Riverside.
No	Simply retain all current temp and permanent moorings. SO obviously a better solution.
No	Squatters should not be privileged over those following the official council process to receive licences.
Yes	Subject to the increase being temporary which is enforced. Otherwise merely moving any problem elsewhere
No	temporary nature of increase combined with implication of displacement - no displacement should happen
No	That's a tricky one. Seems unfair on those on the waiting list, who have abided by the rules. People on Riverside should have put themselves on the waiting list ages ago
No	The boats provide an interesting addition to riverside walks, and our children would be very sad if they were less of them
No	The boats should NOT be moved from riverside
No	The commons do not appear to have room for all the widebeam boats to moor in permitted areas. Should all stay on the railings.
	The council has already committed to this. Retaining the Riverside moorings is a much better solution.
Yes	the Council have already committed to this
No	the Council have already committed to this, so there is little point in me answering this directly. Retaining the Riverside moorings is a much better solution.
No	The increase in Residential Mooring Licences should be made permanent.
No	The licences need to be permanent!
No	The moorings at Riverside should be retained.
No	The number of licenses is not likely to reduce
No	the number of moorings is already too high
No	the number should be kept at the 70 wanted, its upto the boat owners to move if they do not have a mooring as is the case every where else
No	The people who have applied for a mooring licence and waiting appropriately would be completely put out by this. Some have been on the waiting list for years. The management of the river, illegally moored boats and the waiting list has been unbelievably bad.
No	The Riverside Moorers chose to moor their knowing that they had no right to do so. Time to get rid of the sponging wasters
No	The riverside moorings should be kept rather than cramming boats into the commons mooring site
No	The riverside residents should keep their current moorings. Why does the council object to this?
No	The whole idea of reducing the number of boats to 70 does not correlate with the number of people currently living on the river. That just simply implicate somehow forced reduction of people on the river.
Yes	There are currently around 110 boats if included the Riverside ones. Mooring Licences should be issued to the later.
No	There are spaces on the common. Leave people on the railings and charge them for it.
No	There are too many boats
No	There are too many boats moored in narrow locations and it is making the river gradually more difficult to navigate.
No	There are too many boats moored on the Cam. We all know that a temporary increase would soon become a permanent increase, and this would simply shift the problem elsewhere on the river instead of resolving it.
No	There are too many to be accommodated, even temporarily, on the commons
No	There is a queue. This basically rewards those who are not in the queue. You may as well give everyone in the queue a mooring and wait til numbers dwindle to 70. Feasible? No!
No	There is no good reason to remove the Riverside moorings, keep it and make it more convenient.
No	There is no need to displace boats from Riverside, and hence no need to increase the number of licenses elsewhere.
No	There is no need to move the boats from the riverside.
Yes	There is no need to reduce the mooring on Riverside. The health and safety argument is the last resort of the desperate.
Yes	There is no reason to get rid of riverside moorings. Leave them be and concentrate on creating not removing affordable housing- that is what I voted for at the last election, not meddling in people's established way of life
No	There is no space for them. Either wait for people to vacate, and move them on from Riverside, or just evict the people from Riverside all together.
	There will be no displaced Cambridge residents if you retain (and improve) the Riverside moorings.
No	There's no need to displace people
No	There's no need to remove the moorings from Riverside: don't do it, they're fine as they are.
No	These people have not made any effort to obtain licenses legally whilst those on the waiting list have. Giving them licenses is a slap in the face to all existing license holders and all those on the waiting list. The boats on riverside must go to the back of the waiting list queue or be banned from licenses entirely.
No	They are temporary moorings, why should they jump the queue on people who have legitimately applied and been added to the waiting list
No	This cannot be answered without addressing issues outlined above. It is a loaded question. It also feels unreasonable and draconian.
No	This contradicts earlier questions
No	This disadvantages those who have joined the waiting list and moored illegally in the meantime.
No	This is a lose-lose situation: displacing the residents at Riverside and withholding licences from the waiting list.
No	This is already happening but it would be better to keep the riverside moorings as unfair to people already in the waiting list
No	This is begging the question: it presupposes that I support the moving of boats from Riverside
No	This is condoning and rewarding illegal actions.
No	This is confusing!
No	This is not a fair policy and legitimises those who have moored illegally. What about the rights of those on the official waiting list.
No	This is not necessary if moorings are retained on Riverside.
No	This is not necessary if you keep riverside moorings
No	This makes no sense, even if I supported the idea of moving Riverside boats onto the Commons there simply isn't room for them (see detailed analysis in Cambridges River Review)
	This matter is not clear - cannot answer.
Yes	This question makes the presumption of displacement from Riverside. I do not support this presumption.
Yes	This seems to be fair in that existing holders are not excluded.
No	This seems unfair to those adhering to the law (i.e. those that are already on the waiting list) and gives an unfair advantage to those currently illegally moored at riverside
No	This stretch of the river is already overcrowded
No	This will certainly turn into a permanent increase in residential moorings.
No	This will still disrupt people's lives. Just let the Riverside people stay where they are!
	This would be essential if the Riverside moorings were to be evicted. It would not, however, solve the problems caused by the evictions. It would be far wiser to work towards the solutions that make Riverside mooring safer (as this seems to be a primary Council concern).
No	Those on Riverside should not be displaced
No	Those on riverside should stay on riverside
No	Those on the Waiting List would be disadvantaged
No	Those who tried to circumvent the rules should not be rewarded over those who obeyed them.
Yes	Though I don't support moving the Riverside boats on in the first place.
Yes	Though I think this should probably be a permanent increase
No	Too crowded and would have no timescale or guarantee of when it would be reduced.
No	Too many boats and I have witnessed dangerous driving of a riverboat amid very young rowers recently; there should be some basic requirement of competence on the water
No	Too many permanent private boats occupying the river in the city. See comments above.
No	Unfair to those waiting on the list, many on riverside would be unable to pay moorings fees but the way this is worded suggests you've already made your decision
No	Unless these boats have already provided proof of legal mooring at their current location they should not be considered for residential moorings as this would be to the detriment of those who have obeyed the legal procedures and have registered their interest but are currently placed on the waiting list.
No	Unless they can show they've been a fully legal boat and resided there for at least the last 10 consecutive years then they don't deserve to jump the huge que and other keen, responsible boaters should not suffer as a consequence of their choice to squat
No	Unlikely
No	Unsure what impact this will have
No	Well firstly it sounds like "displaced" is a foregone conclusion? so is there any point in answering this question? Keep the mooring numbers as the are for the commons and the riverside. Why bugger around with something that isn't broken?
Yes	Why displace anyone at Riverside?
No	Why displace people from Riverside?
No	Why limit the licences, and therefore need to remove some people from their dearly loved homes? Why not find ways to retain the moorings at Riverside?
No	Why not add the riverside boats to the scheme and up numbers to 100 instead? More income that way.
No	Why not just leave the moorings at Riverside then there's no one to be accommodated because they won't have been displaced! Simple solution!
No	Why not just retain Riverside?
No	Why would it only be temporary?
No	Will end up with an overall reduction of boats moored on the Cam, which seems unnecessary given that it is currently not crowded. (well, the rowers seem to have scheduling issues downstream of the city)
	Would be better not to move anyone from riverside
Yes	yes, but not temporary - permanent.
Yes	Yes, but the Riverside moorings should be kept in any case.
No	You should not displace people from Riverside.
Yes	You would have to provide some sort of alternative if you are moving people on, but my preference would be for them to stay where they are.
Yes	you've already said you will

Option 7.1 Establishment of short term licensed winter moorings. Do you support the Council's position not to establish winter mooring sites?

IP Address	Response	Comment
No		"NIMBY" nonsense - cater for boaters - many other authorities do, so why not in Cambridge.
No		Additional costs outlined above should easily be met by the additional income. It is the council's duty to provide service and provide jobs.
No		Additional income should be welcomed. Administration costs v income. Which is higher
No		All need somewhere to spend winter
No		Although I will always be in favour of any reduction of my multiple bills, I have to ask where will they go when April hoves into view? However this is tempered with my observation of these hardly being a scam for visitor places even in the summer.
No		Any options for increasing the supply of affordable housing should be explored
No		As an itinerant boater I would welcome the possibility of winter moorings
No		At a time when resources are needed elsewhere, and given that the river is already crowded this does not seem a good use of resources.
No		Back to not supporting the underlying assumptions here.
No		because it provides income and more access to places to live
No		Because it seems like a good idea and will bring in revenue.
No		Because it's common sense to use the space and churlish not to! If there was a real sense of 'essential maintenance' then I would see the point but during the winter months these are unlikely. As I walk by the river almost every weekend I don't see essential maintenance being carried out!
No		Because it's unnecessary
Yes		because you'll end up making some pathetic amount of money from it and pissing twice that away on administering the scheme.
No		Because, again, there is a case for people's housing needs to be met.
No		Boats are people's homes all year round.
Yes		But preferably not blocking the turning circle area by the lock. In summer this can be tight for larger vessels to navigate and ideally reduce visitor moorings to one side of river only?
Yes		Continuous cruisers should use a marina
No		Could generate income from winter moorings and keep fees low for permanent residents
No		Could make needed revenue by making visitor slots available for longer winter mooring
No		Current mooring arrangements are appropriate
No		Do you not want additional income? You could reduce the number of moorings and alternate them so that maintenance could be continued.
Yes		Don't greatly care either way, but you have bigger problems; solve those first.
No		Everyone needs a home you do nothing when animals are killed are all of you blind?
No		Families need homes.
No		Given the level of demand for moorings, it seems wasteful not to make some use of the visitor moorings if they would otherwise lie empty.
No		Good source of additional revenue for the Council.
Yes		Great idea
Yes		Happy with the principle of winter moorings. Not confident that the rules would be enforced and the users would play by the rules
No		I am not convinced that it would be more of an admin burden rather than a net income.
No		I am owner of a boat not presently moored in Cambridge who would certainly use such a service. I think there is a demand and it would increase Council revenue without increasing fees for the permanent moorings.
No		I do not see why this would be an issue during quieter months
		I don't feel strongly about this - it can be argued either way!
		I don't have enough information about demand to answer this.
No		I don't know enough about it
No		I don't understand why the CCC is so obstructive with the boat community
Yes		I have no strong feelings either way.
No		I quote: "Winter moorings would be a good way to increase use of the visitors moorings in the winter months. They would be a far better way for the Council to bring in more revenue than reducing numbers of boats and putting up fees for the few that remain"
No		I think a few winter moorings is a good idea for people who are cruising but not in the winter
No		I think it would be a good idea and produce revenue
No		I think it's a brilliant idea
No		I think it's a good idea
No		I think winter mooring where there is room would not be unwelcome to boat dwellers or the councils coffers
No		I think winter moorings are a great idea!
Yes		I would
No		if it generates extra revenue, why not?
No		if people live on boats they need to moor all year round
No		if people need somewhere to moor in the winter, why not? They would brighten up the river during dull months and if that also earns the council some money, that looks like win-win.
No		if the council is looking for income then this is a perfect way of achieving this without overburdening the full time residents.
No		if the council is willing to spend money worrying about enforcement they may as well spend the extra bit required to get winter moorings going. Would bring more people in with "permanent" residence in Cambridge and more money fed back into the local economy.
Yes		If their choice is to be constantly cruising then that should be there year round choice and not get to cherry pick for the best of both worlds.
No		if you need a winter licence then where are you going in the summer? I'd rather no cuts to permanent mooring spaces

No	If you need extra revenue from the houseboats this is an obvious course of action to take.
No	If you need the revenue, why not?
No	If you want to raise revenue, this is the one thing which is a win without losers: nobody much visits in the winter, so you are getting revenue from an unused asset
No	Is rowing decreased?
No	It is a waste of a resource and income possibility. It also helps people who are living a low impact lifestyle, which should be credited and rewarded if possible. This would be an easy way to do this. Having boats moored on Jesus Green does not create an environmental disturbance. If repairs needed doing then the moorings could be closed for the winter when they were being done.
No	It is just a further example of trying to clear the river of houseboats to make way for the endless stream of rowers
No	It is not practical for boat residents
No	It seems like a good idea, it provides income, it answers a need, and you are already going to pay for people to enforce the new rules, so they can do this too.
No	It would generate income!
No	It would raise money for the Council!
No	It's a good way to increase revenue
No	Its would be excellent that the county council did something for the common good and not just for business back handers and gentrification exercises show good will and re aligned it self with most of the populaces of Original Cambridge People not its transit population of students and Career Gentry.
No	Let people moor where they will during winter. It is hard enough anyway. Free of charge
No	Life on a boat can be hard enough and it may not be appropriate for someone who is ill, pregnant or otherwise vulnerable to be forced to move on. Winter moorings ensure that those who need or who want to stay in the area can do so. The proposal seems confused as on the one hand it states that "the areas occupied by visitor moorings currently are some of the most scenic areas closely bordering residential areas and greenspace" which implies that those areas are deemed suitable for visitors rather than members of the Cambridge boating community. This apparently preferential treatment of visitors is distasteful and unfair.
No	Loaded question again. Would temporary and permanent mooring licences become conflated in Council press releases when statements are made about how the numbers of moorings haven't decreased.
No	Lost revenue opportunity
No	Make it 50% and encourage long distance cruisers to winter in Cambridge. I don't think they damage the bank. cambridge need all the winter visitors it can get
No	Maybe charge more for the winter mooring sites so that there is something in it for Council. Winter mooring could be a nice asset to the council, it just needs to work out what to charge to make it worth its while. Boats are an asset to Cambridge!
No	More boats is a good thing
No	More overcrowding of the riverbank. These should remain temporary only
No	More people should be allowed to live in narrowboats in Cambridge. They provide environmentally friendly, attractive housing in a city where there is a shortage of accommodation.
No	My gut instinct is that this is a way to force more people off the river which I do not support.
No	No - only because you don't have a not sure button
No	No firm view on this
Yes	No major benefit from winter moorings and additional costs.
No	No space. No need
No	Not until the riverside boaters are in the mooring scheme
No	Only if a larger site is provided e.g. marina
No	People travel in Summer and need somewhere to moor in Winter
No	people would just dump their boat in the winter and go live somewhere warmer.
No	Potential revenue, meeting demand from elsewhere on the river where people are quite mobile for part of the year.
No	Pressure on the river in quiet periods is by definition, lower than normal. The additional traffic will not present a problem, and the total increase is likely to still be much lower than traffic at peak season. Furthermore, the presence of boats does not detract from the scenic nature of the areas where they are moored: quite the contrary.
No	Recreational winter moorings might be a good source of income
No	Residential moorings all year round
No	residential priorities
No	Revenue is very helpful.
No	See basically all my previous responses
No	Seems like a good way to get revenue
No	Seems like a good way to increase revenue.
No	Seems like a missed opportunity.
No	Seems like a nice way of allowing people who are normally on the move to have somewhere to over winter.
No	Snacks or Nimbysm
No	Some permanently cruising boats need a short winter mooring before the river is safe again to cruise in the spring.
No	The costs and disturbance outweigh the modest benefits.
No	The council could benefit financially from winter mooring sites.
No	The council could get revenue from this
Yes	The handling can be easily done by current staff.
Yes	The increased revenue would offset the impulse to penalise permanent residents.
No	the policy should be towards restoring the river bank to it's previous condition
No	The public right of navigation on rivers includes the right to moor for a reasonable time. A reasonable time would be different in winter due to flooding either in Cambridge or further afield making navigation away from the city dangerous. It is up to the boat's skipper whether it is safe to navigate. Therefore boats already have the right to moor for a longer period on visitor moorings in winter through the public right of navigation.
No	The river bank is being wasted in the winter. The price could be more than 25% to cover extra admin costs. This would be supporting boat travelers
No	There are too many boats moored in narrow locations and it is making the river gradually more difficult to navigate.
No	There is space for a limited no. maybe 10 or so
No	There should be fewer long stay moorings at stupidly low fees and more visitor moorings at sensible fees. I don't believe that more staff resources would be required than for licenced moorings, because there are year-round enforcement problems with permanent moorings.
No	There would be very few...the cost MUST be less than charging many more temporary visitors and would make no difference to the number of boats overall..a GOOD idea!!
No	These are for visitors. There is a need for visitor moorings. Residential moorers cannot dominate the river and be able to exclude visitors on boats. One of the wonderful things about canals is the ability to visit some fantastic places. Cambridge has a duty to have visitor moorings whilst the river is navigable. My family takes winter canal holidays and if there were no moorings for visitors I believe it is a dereliction of care to ALL river users.
No	These are very much needed
No	These moorings are usually vacant in winter and fees could be generated
No	they are needed
No	They would be a good idea.
No	They would be a good way to increase the use of visitor moorings in winter months, and so increase revenue.
No	This appears to be a sensible use of idle resources. "Cannot identify the benefit" is not a justification for prohibiting it.
No	This proposal would appear to be a step towards shopping year round moorings and as such i dont support it
No	This seems a good way of increasing council income and making best use of the river environment. If there is demand, and the council thinks implementation costs are too high, they could consider a larger fee to cover that!
No	This seems to be unnecessary administration for very little value for the investment needed.
No	This would be a good additional income stream for the moorings without forcing current users out with an unaffordable fee increase.
No	This would be another way for the council to make extra money rather than increasing fees for residential boaters
No	This would only exacerbate 'overpopulation' issues during summer. Where would those boats go? its not a canal
No	to provide winter mooring is another source of home in a situation of desperate shortage
No	Use the 48 hr mooring sites as you say
No	Visitor spaces are not much used in winter and winter moorings would be a good source of income.
No	visitors should be able to come and go all year on same rules 48hr keep it simple stupid
No	what is the problem
No	Whilst a formal winter mooring scheme would be hard to administer (the Council doesn't exactly have a stellar record of competence when it comes to administering waiting lists and applications) and probably cost more than it brought in, the time limit on moorings should be extended in winter, from 48 hours to 7 or 14 days, in line with the rest of the country, and to allow some respite for Continuous Cruisers.
No	Why not use summer mooring sites when empty for more revenue?
No	Why not utilise them during the winter, more income!
No	Why not? It's a ideal way of gaining additional revenue.
No	Winter mooring sites provide an excellent draw to visitors during the traditionally quieter tourist period. If no provision of services such as water or access to the Jesus green facilities is given due to many winter moorings remaining unoccupied during this period), and if the council's efficiency at managing their paperwork is improved, providing winter moorings should not result in any undue extra cost.
No	winter moorings are a good idea. could increase revenue as well.
No	Winter moorings are important, although I agree that environmental issues are also important.
No	Winter moorings are in use across the whole country and support the community who use the waterways from potential environmental dangers such as flooding and freezing. Waterway re-generation takes place during spring and summer growth times with more movement of boats affecting hatchlings during winter.
No	Winter moorings are temporary and would offer the opportunity for an increase in revenue without the need for permanent moorings.
No	Winter moorings could be a good idea but we need to determine that the Riverside moorings are safe first.
Yes	Winter moorings could be a good thing
No	Winter moorings could be provided on less used 48 hour visitor moorings during winter increasing revenue for CCC
No	Winter moorings for visitors could increase revenue for the Council.
No	Winter moorings on visitor moorings
No	Winter moorings provide a longer-stay berth during the winter months, when navigation is less attractive or more difficult due to weather conditions.
No	Winter moorings sound like a good way to increase revenue at less attractive times. If uptake is low then there is no loss and maintenance can still be carried out. If it's high then the extra income would be of good use and relocation could still take place.
No	Winter moorings would be a good source of revenue.
No	Winter moorings would be a good use of some of the visitor mooring space in the winter months, and could bring in additional revenue to the Council.
No	Winter moorings would be a good way to increase use of the visitors moorings in the winter months. They would be a far better way for the Council to bring in more revenue than reducing numbers of boats and putting up fees for the few that remain
No	Winter moorings would be a good way to increase use of the visitors moorings in the winter months. They would be a far better way for the Council to bring in more revenue than reducing numbers of boats and putting up fees for the few that remain
No	Winter moorings would be a good way to increase use of the visitors moorings in the winter months. They would be a far better way for the Council to bring in more revenue than reducing numbers of boats and putting up fees for the few that remain
No	Winter moorings would be a good way to increase use of the visitors moorings in the winter months. They would be a far better way for the Council to bring in more revenue than reducing numbers of boats and putting up fees for the few that remain
Yes	Winter moorings would be a good way to increase use of the visitors moorings in the winter months. They would be a far better way for the Council to bring in more revenue than reducing numbers of boats and putting up fees for the few that remain!
No	winter moorings would be valuable to the wider boating community and bring additional revenue
No	Winter moorings would offer additional guaranteed revenue and a safe place for continuous cruisers to moor during the winter period.
No	winter moorings sound like a good idea, the councils objections seem weak
No	Would be a good way of increasing visitor revenue.
No	Would bring in income to Cambridge and the Council. Surely not much more staff intensive than managing other licences. Would give a safer and frankly more welcome attitude to those who need to stay put due to weather conditions etc.
No	Would bring in more revenue.
No	Would it not bring in more revenue?
No	Would prefer an "I don't know" option on this proposal.
No	Would this not free up some moorings with people transferring to winter moorings
No	Wouldn't these be a benefit in terms of revenue?
Yes	Yes but only if it is financially viable
Yes	Yes, winter moorings would only increase air pollution by the heating systems of the boats.
No	You can earn more from winter moorings
No	You could make more money from winter moorings than if you reduce the number of boats on the commons and increase their fees.
No	You could offer a limited number of extra moorings that would mean maintenance could still be carried out. There would be extra mooring fees and would be acceptable due to less tourist traffic in the winter months.
No	You have not provided a breakdown of projected costs here.
No	You say the areas need to 'recover' from those mooring there. I dispute that moored vessels cannot move for maintenance and the level of disturbance. I think the presence of moored vessels along the river add to the safety of walkers with more light.

Option 8.1 Retention of closed waiting list. Do you support the waiting list remaining closed to new applicants for the foreseeable future?		
IP Address	Response	Comment
No		70 boats was deemed an acceptable and manageable number, this should continue to run as it always has
No		A closed list would disfavour younger people
No		A closed waiting list unfairly discriminates against younger people. New licences should be allocated by auction.
No		A fair alternative would be needed - the waiting list approach is entirely fit for purpose.
No		A phased increase in mooring fees, if well publicised, might well attract potential new applicants. Artificially holding down the waiting list does not allow the market to function efficiently.
No		A place on the list gives a gleam of hope, so why not have a short list & a long list?
No		A queue is a perfectly reasonable and transparent way to allocate a limited resource. Everyone in the UK understands the concept of a queue. Reopen the list.
No		A waiting list is a fair way of allocating moorings.
No		A waiting list is a fair way of granting mooring spaces.
No		A waiting list is a waiting list. No matter how many people are on it, you can inform them what number they are on the waiting list and how often moorings become available and it is up to them if they want to stay or not.
No		A waiting list is a waiting list. There is no value in closing it. Potential applicants can be told about the situation and given the choice whether or not they want their names put on.
No		a waiting list will have natural wastage.
No		allowing new names on the list seems harmless and easy, why close it?
No		As long as people are aware there is a long waiting list and that they could expect to wait a very long time, there is no problem with having a long waiting list. If you close it, there will likely be a huge rush as soon as it is reopened, and a lot of very frustrated people who may have been waiting for years to join the waiting list then finding themselves below people who had made snap decisions on the basis of sudden availability to join the list, or even worse missing out on the opportunity altogether because they didn't find out in time.
No		As long as the applicants are aware of the length of the list, it's up to them whether they sign up for it. No need to micromanage this.
No		As mentioned before. More work needs to be done to increase the number of mooring licences in Cambridge.
No		As someone who moved to Cambridge to work as a research fellow at the university, it did not feel at all welcoming to be told I could not even get on a waiting list for a mooring.
No		Because I do not support the argument that riverside moorings should be drastically reduced.
No		because I fear it will never be re-instated bringing about the eventual exclusion of all residential boats from the Cam
No		Because I'm on it
No		Because it is not like you have a limited data storage space to add people to the list. You just get a longer list.
No		Because it sets a precedent to NEVER reopen it. People WILL drop off. Just need to be honest when people apply and let them decide whether to go on. You could renew it occasionally asking people to confirm that they wish to stay on.
Yes		Because it will be necessary to solve the problem of mooring the boats currently along Riverside before new applicants can be considered.
No		Because it will just be used to gradually reduce numbers until they're gone.
No		because it won't be fair when you re-open it. People are prepared to wait, so long as it is fair. When we moved onto the river (we have since moved off) we had been on the list for 4 years. We moved on at the same time as people who had been on the list for 2. It is not managed fairly or well. Just make a spreadsheet and add people at the bottom, for heaven's sake.
No		because it works as a fair system.
No		Because it's unnecessary
No		Because others deserve the chance to moor in Cambridge.
No		Because people are on the waiting lists for good reasons
No		because people can and do give up their licenses, so places do become available.
No		Because you should know how many want to live on the river & find more spaces
No		Below
Yes		But a smallest number should be added when new applications can be accepted.
Yes		But also look at the list. Who is on it that just fancies mucking about on the water and having a second home and who is in need - already moored elsewhere? With dependants?
Yes		But to be reviewed, as at some point it will surely become manageable again.
No		By closing it the demand for new moorings would appear to be capped which is clearly not the case. We need more moorings and/or a new marina in Cambridge. The Council should undertake to find more moorings to enable more people to live on or near the river.
No		By closing the waiting list you simply hide the problem.
No		Cambridge is an extremely expensive place to live. At present, living on the river is an affordable alternative and one that it is important to keep open to as many people as possible.
No		Cambridge is growing, growth comes in many forms and the boat community should expand as well.
No		Close until its wait is 12m or less
No		Closing a waiting list makes no sense. How can people wait if they can't apply to wait?
No		Does 'foreseeable future' not possibly also mean permanent.
No		Don't care
No		Don't see why people shouldn't be able to put their names down. It doesn't cost anything.
No		Even if new moorings are not being added people should still have the ability to register interest.
No		Everyone should have a choice
No		First sort out the real wasters on the waiting list. Many will have lost the will to live
No		For the very selfish reason that I want to be on the waiting list! That is the only way I could afford to live in the city where I work!
No		Frankly, I would not trust the council not to eventually announce that the waiting list was down to zero with the inference that nobody wanted moorings in Cambridge.

No	From what I understand it was closed before this questionnaire anyway. Keeping the list open shows what a need there is for mooring spaces and that there shouldn't be a reduction of residential mooring spots - if anything more effort should be made to look at expanding space for living, eg a marina opposite Riverside
No	Hard to say when I don't know how long it is!
No	Having a waiting list that people can add or remove themselves from seems like a ridiculously simple thing to run, stating the information that licences infrequently become available in the introduction to such a list would mean those in the list are aware of the situation. I cannot understand why the waiting list was closed at all...?
No	Having an open list with a long waiting time isn't unreasonable. If there is a big cost reduction, fine. Not sure there would be, though.
No	How can you assess demand if people know that the waiting list is closed?
Yes	How else to control the number except to close to new applicants if already overwhelmed
No	I am on the list
No	I can't get onto it
No	I can't see that it hurts to maintain a list of those who wish to be considered when the opportunity finally arises.
No	I don't see the benefit of closing a waiting list. The point of a waiting list is that applicants wait. If someone is willing to wait until a licence becomes available, what is the harm? I fail to see the administrative burden involved here.
No	I don't understand why you want to close it. A waiting list is exactly that. You join it and you wait
No	I fail to understand why it was ever closed, given the high demand for moorings. Keeping it open is the fairest way to ensure the mooring goes to the most committed and responsible applicants. If the list is suddenly reopened, how will you fairly decide what order to add people in?
No	I have several friends who have successfully obtained licenses via the waiting list. It took quite a number of years, but they knew that would be the case. Those on the waiting list could be polled once a year to check that they still are interested.
No	I imagine that a lot of people on the list for a long time will in fact have sorted out other permanent arrangements, so the list is probably not really as long as it looks. But if you close it and then reopen it periodically, you would have a lot of people all applying at the same time, some of whom would have been waiting for it to re-open for ages, some of whom would have just gone on it on a whim. How would you sort them out?
No	I know people who did get allocated space through the waiting list before it was closed and the waiting time was not prohibitive.
No	I support the waiting list being re-instated immediately.
No	I support the waiting list being re-instated immediately.
No	I support the waiting list being re-instated immediately.
No	I think it should stay open because people can easily check on line where they are on the list if it is administered properly. There is very little work involved if care is taken over designing the system. If people on a narrow boat have a baby they may want to go on the waiting list for a wide-beam in the hopes that they can get one before their children are teenagers and requiring a bit more privacy. I don't see how having a waiting list open is much more work than having it closed. Providing the system puts the onus on the person on the list to renew their position annually or something similar when an automatic email is sent out.
No	I think it's fine to have a waiting list as long as it's clear to applicants that there may be a long wait and there are no guarantees of getting a place.
No	I think more moorings should be created to cater for demand.
No	I think the waiting list should not discriminate against anyone and should be open to all who wish to apply. They would apply with the knowledge that they are at the bottom of the list.
No	I want to get on it. Have been waiting for circa 2 years to get on the list
No	I would prefer to see an actively managed list which requires those on it to confirm annually that they wish to remain on it.
No	If it is already recognised as being unrealistic that the later entrants will get a place, it would be informative to open the list up and gauge ongoing interest to how many people want to be resident on the river. Certainly more than the 100 berths currently available.
No	If people are waiting they should be put on a list, regardless of how long it is, so when places are available they go to those who have been waiting the longest.
No	If people want to wait, let them wait. What harm is done by these people being on a list?
No	If Riverside is included demand should be more quickly lessened.
No	If Riverside is included, demand should be more quickly lessened
Yes	If the Council was interested in an informed response it would have been helpful to provide some basic information eg at current turnover rates the waiting time for a new applicant is ~ 25 years or 5 years or 500 years. Your preamble with holds perfectly reasonable information
No	If there is such demand then the supply should be addressed and increased, not demand artificially reduced.
No	If yes, why?
No	It cd be infinitely long if people on it are patient and happy with fact that it is v. Long
No	It costs nothing to have a list as long as it need be
No	It could be opened to new entrants as long as it was made clear they would possibly have to wait a long time. The council would know that those who did apply and waited were committed to a long term future on the river.
No	It depends whether you are contacting the people who've been on the list for years to determine whether they still want to be on the list. They may have moved away and no longer wish to be on the list, but not have informed you.
No	It is in the interests of all parties to expedite the reopening of the fair and transparent waiting list.
No	It is a fair way of allocating sites
No	It is only fair that it remain open
No	It needs to be reinstated immediately.
No	It seems pointless.
No	It seems very unfair and unnecessary
No	It should be opened so that there is visibility of the numbers of boats that require moorings.
No	It should be reinstated
No	It should be re-instated
No	It should be reinstated as a sensible way of managing a scarce resource
No	It should be reinstated immediately
Yes	It should be reopened when there is a reasonable prospect of new additions getting a mooring within five years
No	It should not have been closed in the first place.
No	It shouldn't cost any more to make a list longer. I don't understand how you decide who's first to join the list when it reopens.
No	It was a Cambridge tradition. Bring it back.
No	It's a fair system, even if demand exceeds supply.
No	It's a fair system.
No	It's a very useful way of managing the allocation of mooring.
No	It's a 'waiting list' - if it shuts, you're going to annoy people. It can be as long as your arm, there will always be people waiting and leaving. Choose your battles.
No	It's a waiting list. All you have to do is add a name on the end. It's not difficult. That's how waiting lists work.
No	It's a waiting list. It can grow and shrink. But why lock people out entirely and ask them to come back tomorrow, and the day after, and the day after that to see if they can finally get their name on. You are just causing more overhead.
No	It's a waiting list. It doesn't matter how long it is, as long as people have somewhere to register their interest.
No	It's a waiting list...it's not doing anyone any harm by adding names. Those people will understand the term 'waiting list' and can make a choice as to whether or not to put their name down. It shouldn't be for the council to decide how long anyone should wait. If the people on the list get fed up of waiting they'll remove themselves.
No	It's an important demand side measure which may well have relevance for future review and planning for the river use and options
No	It's not a FIFO queue if you stop it - when you start you'll have a scramble.
No	It's not a waiting list if it's closed. This is unfair.
No	It's not difficult to manage a longer list
No	It's not really going to make any difference
No	It's one of the only affordable ways to live in Cambridge. This seems mad!
No	Just keep it going - if it gets longer then so be it. But at least if it were then re-opened, it would be clear what the order in which applicants for mooring licences should be.
No	Keep the list going as it is a useful indicator of peoples housing aspirations, but make it clear that wait is very long
No	keeping the waiting list closed is the thin end of the wedge. It would be very easy for it never to re-open it and just let boater's numbers slowly dwindle. Plus, when they do re-open it, how would they come up with a fair system for allocating the next licences
No	Let the list grow; be honest to new applicants how slim their prospects are.
No	Loaded damned if you do, damned if you don't question. Can't help thinking that the length of the waiting list is, at least partly, due to the parlous state of the housing and rental market in the City.
No	Maintaining an open list means that everyone knows where they stand if they choose to join it - when would it be reopened otherwise.
No	May be have some kind of lottery for 2-3 licence a year to give this at the end of the list a chance
No	Moorings should be allocated on the basis of need
Yes	Need to prioritise people from Riverside as long as their boats meet the criteria. Think the closure of Riverside to mooring should be gradual to facilitate this
No	No - I support the waiting list being re-instated immediately.
No	No - only because you don't have a not sure button
No	No need to close the list just publish average turnover figures and list length and it will self regulate
No	No proposal for a more fair alternative allocation strategy has been offered. Just because the list is long, does not mean that it is not an equitable way to deal with demand.
No	No reason to do so
No	No, the waiting list should be reopened for future residents.
No	Not fair on those on the waiting list.
No	Not fair to people on the list waiting.
No	Not fair. An ongoing waiting list is appropriate.
No	Of course there should be a waiting list! There is for everything.
Yes	Once the situation is resolved I am sure it would be open again as I would like the opportunity to return :)
No	Otherwise when does it re-open? The foreseeable future is a very non-specific term, and then sounds like it could be a sneaky way of getting rid of residential boats on the river altogether (not that im accusing the current council of this, but I future council could clearly choose to do this, easily if the waiting list is never re-opened). I don't know how long the waiting list is though. Maybe maintain an estimated 10 year limit or something? And make people who are already on it renew their interest each year in order to keep their place (which sounds like work, but it could literally be an automated email saying "are you still interested? click here if so")
No	People drop out
No	People need affordable housing solutions in Cambridge more than anywhere else
No	People should apply each year. Those that renew stay on it. Those that don't are removed. A fee should be charged. Many are on the list speculatively without boats.
No	People should have the right to be on the waiting list
No	People still want to live on the river.
Yes	Publication of the size of the waiting list, the number of new licenses issued each year, how many licenses are issued (so the council can be held to account by those on the list if the full allocation of 70 is not being met) should be published to allow a realistic estimate as to when the list may be opened again.
No	Rationing by queuing is the most equitable way of allocating resources. It can't take that much to administer for goodness sake, and even if the likelihood of getting a space is low, perhaps it acts like buying a lottery ticket - providing a psychological benefit through the imagination of a favourable outcome that is greater than the real probability would suggest. Makharge to be on the waiting list if necessary.
No	Re instate the waiting list and keep Riverside moorings.
No	Reinstall immediately
No	reinstall the waiting list immediately
No	reinstated immediately
No	Reinstated it, just because it's long does not mean it's an unfair system.
No	Reinstated the waiting list as it is a fair way of giving places.
No	Reinstatement immediately is essential
No	Removes the right of participation completely
No	See all my previous comments. Favour the residents. Create more moorings.
No	Seems like the fairest system.
Yes	Seems reasonable.
Yes	Serves not purpose being closed
No	Should be open and licences should be issued as soon as mooring is left free
No	Should be re-opened immediately (and was closed without consultation)
No	Since this provides an excuse for permanent closure of the waiting list, which would lead to a decrease in the vibrancy of Cambridge's boating culture.
No	Some current licence holders are renting out boats illegally. If you revoke their licences this will create more space. That's why there is no movement.
No	Some people on the list might have moved on and no longer want a mooring.
No	Some spaces may become available
No	Start building some truly affordable housing, then we'll talk about it.
No	Support the waiting list.
No	Surely one in one out would be a better solution once numbers are stable
No	The community needs to feel safe and secure for future decades.
No	The correct solution is to set the mooring fee at a commercial level, so the waiting list will naturally resolve itself
No	The council should have a realistic picture of what the demand is. Also managing a list does not require huge resource and the size of the list does not affect the fairness or effectiveness of the system
No	The council should provide new mooring sites.
No	The houseboats on the river Cam are a important contribution to the diversity of lifestyles in Cambride. In addition, they provide affordable and sustainable housing. Thus, the city council should endeavour to make increase the number of mooring space and adapt the infrastructure accordingly.
No	The idea of a waiting list is to allow people to wait for a mooring license.
No	The list can be very long, some people may drop out of the list.
No	The system for licences works well. Why tinkers?
No	The waiting list should be reopened. There doesn't seem to be a good enough reason to have closed it.
No	the waiting list being re-instated as soon as possible
No	the waiting list being 'too long' seems like a very poor reason to close it, by all means warn people but this seems like a proxy measure to reduce the number of boats.
No	The waiting list is a fair and reasonable system, and there is no reason to close it.
No	the waiting list is a fair system and should be immediately reinstated
No	The waiting list is a fair system and should be reinstated
No	The waiting list is a fair system of allocation and should be re-opened now. A place on the list allows a future boat dweller to plan for their future needs and all applicants are aware there is no guaranteed time scale of when places may become available.
No	The waiting list is a fair system, although it is a long wait
No	The waiting list should be opened up immediately to allow people to plan ahead and to fairly allocate future moorings.
No	The waiting list should be re-instated
No	The waiting list should be re-instated as a means of establishing the true demand for moorings on the Cam
No	The waiting list should be reinstated as it is a fair way for people to get licences.
No	The waiting list should be re-instated immediately
No	The Waiting List should be reinstated. I can see no benefit to keeping the list closed.
No	The waiting list should remain open
No	The waiting list shouldn't have been closed, and should be re-instated. I don't think there should be a charge for being on it.
No	The waiting list system is fair and easy to regulate.
No	The waiting list was taken away with no consultation.
Yes	There are more berths available downstream around Hinnings
Yes	There are too many boats moored in narrow locations and it is making the river gradually more difficult to navigate.
No	There are very few options for housing in Cambridge for those on lower incomes. Why limit the waiting list for one of the few options left?
No	there is a large housing need in Cambridge
No	There is a separate list of those waiting to go on the waiting list. This is utterly stupid and a waste of time and effort. Instead, a small deposit, say £50 or £100, should be asked for from everyone on the list and when they join. If they won't cough up £50, they're unlikely to cough up £1200 when they get their place. This will move the onus of keeping details up to date to the CUSTOMER and not the council officers, saving administrative time and effort. The deposit amount can be taken off from the first licence fee payment when it is given.
No	There is clearly demand for moorings
No	there is enough river for everyone just down river = put in proper maintenance facilities = make use of the river but do not banish the people from the river bank any longer
No	There is little cost in keeping the waiting list open. A regular (every 1-2 years?) opt-out (not opt-in) request for people that no longer wish to be on the list would make it more manageable in size.
No	There is no closing of waiting lists for housing...people everywhere are having to wait due to limited supply...and waiting lists fairly secure them an option of a place in the future as they become available
No	There is no good reason for the council to keep the list closed, unless they want to get rid of boats!
No	There is no harm in reopening the list is there (but not to previous transgressors). The wait may be unacceptable but you at least know there is an order to the allocation
Yes	There seems no point in getting people's hopes up
No	There should always be this fair method of gaining a mooring.
No	This is an attempt at implementing a change that has been decided upon without consultation.
No	This is not fair to people on the waiting list
No	This should be reinstated immediately.
No	Time should not be the only factor. A monetary factor should be included. Annual fee to stay on the list, bidding for next available spot. Bid should be for annual mooring fee and would mark a target for those currently moored.
No	to gauge future needs and for planning
No	too inflexible
No	undemocratic
No	Unfair
No	Unfair: iff Riverside is cleared
No	Unfair on people who want to get a place on the river
Yes	Unless the waiting period and number of applicants is not costly to maintain in which case I would answer no
Yes	Until it reaches a reasonable amount
No	waiting list should be reinstated
No	Waiting list should be reopened
No	Waiting lists are a fair way to allocate licences
No	Waiting lists are a fair way to allocate spaces.
No	Waiting lists are fair ways of allocating spaces.

No	Waiting lists should be open but appropriately managed.
No	We support re-instating waiting list immediately
No	We support the waiting list being re-instated immediately. Otherwise it would be very easy for you never to re-open it and just let boater numbers slowly dwindle. Plus, when you do re-open it, how would you come up with a fair system for allocating the next licences?
No	What about people on riverside if you remove them. Will they be excluded from this list?
Yes	what is "the eligibility criteria" to be on the waiting list? I thought it was open to all - with the opportunity being equal for all? if the number of licences is increase to include riverside it should have no impact on the waiting list.
No	What's the problem with an open list?
No	What's the problem with the waiting list? As long as people are made aware that they may be waiting some time then I am sure it works. Why cut something, the number of Cambridge moorings, which is demonstrated to be in such high demand anyway?
No	what's the proposed alternative?
No	Where are people supposed to live. The streets of Cambridge are awash with piles of blankets in doorways. There is not enough being done to help ordinary people.
No	Why can you not make clear that it is vanishingly unlikely that a place will become available to an applicant, but still list them on the waiting list?
No	Why close the waiting list? People can get a realistic estimate of how long they'll need to wait, and choose whether or not to be on it.
No	Why do you need to keep it close? For boats in harbors, there are waiting lists for the next 20 years and this is not a problem. I am not sure if people have to reapply annually, but if not, maybe a a better solution?
No	Why not give a chance to everyone who wants it
No	Why not have a waiting list - what harm does it do?
No	Why not have a waiting list - what harm does it do?
No	Why not let people get in the queue if they want to. They will be aware that they may have a long wait.
No	Why should current licence holders think they have a right to occupy a mooring indefinitely and pay peanuts? Cambridge council is not a charity. There should be a new waiting list set up for applicants who are willing to pay a sensible fee and current licence holders should pay the same fee or surrender their licence.
No	Why should the waiting list be closed, what does it achieve? And it would hardly be reasonable refusing those on Riverside the opportunity to register.
No	Why should the waiting list be closed? It is fair and equitable. The length of the list is (or should be) public knowledge and people may add their names in the full knowledge of the likely waiting times.
No	Why stop people wanting to live here?
No	Why would you?
No	Why would you?
No	Why would you? Would you close a doctor's waiting list or a social housing waiting list? I suspect not.
No	With a closed waiting list you cannot assess the need for affordable habitation which has been almost completely ignored in recent building schemes. It is the failure of the Council Planning Department to force developers to build properly affordable housing that leaves people with no other option than live on a boat.
No	would it ever be reopened in the future?

Option 3.3 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?

IP Address	Response	Comment
	Yes	... but I don't support the displacement at Riverside.
	No	Absolutely not. There is no need to move those at Riverside at all and cause further serious issues for other river users.
	No	Again because it presupposes that people will be displaced from Riverside. This would reduce the overall number of places available which just seems stupid and short sighted when there is shortage of housing. Why should those already on the waiting list lose their place because the council has introduced a stupid policy?
	No	Again, I strongly oppose the relocation of boats from Riverside. It seems unfair on those who have been on the waiting list already in any case.
	No	Again, no need to stop mooring on Riverside
	No	Already answered previously.
	Yes	Although, as I have said above, I do not think they should be moved from Riverside. The health & safety issues are rubbish. These people have lived on their boats for years and I have never heard of an accident. Leave them alone.
	Yes	Anyone who can prove a reasonable length of residence at Riverside (say 3 years) should be allowed to stay at Riverside and offered a licence.
	No	As already stated, I do not support any displacement from Riverside. However, if that is to go ahead, then an alternative mooring location must be offered to each displaced occupant. It is not sufficient to offer a place on a waiting list.
	No	As before, address the issue and then these questions can be asked.
	Yes	As long as the moorings were still in the city.
	No	As stated above there is no real movement on the waiting list. I'm sure you are aware that a lot of people on the waiting list are utilising the visitors moorings until they get a permanent license making it nigh on impossible for visiting boats. This lessens the money that the Cam Conservators receive from visiting boats as many don't bother to visit because of the scarcity of available visitor moorings once past Botolphsham lock
	No	As this is unfair on those currently on the waiting list. A better option would be to turn the riverside moorings into official moored spots, and offer them to those already moored there.
	No	Because I do not believe those residents should be moved
	No	Because I do not support the Riverside moorings being closed in the first place, so there should be no displacements.
	No	Because I don't agree with the boat residents being moved off Riverside in the first place.
	No	because I don't agree with the displacement of moorings at Riverside.
	No	Because I don't support 'extinguishing' the moorings on Riverside. It seems like you have already decided to displace the moorings.
	No	Because I don't support people being moved from Riverside, they should be allowed to stay there.
	No	Because I don't support removing moorings from Riverside.
	No	Because I don't support the displacement of those on Riverside and I respect those who have been waiting patiently on the list.
	No	Because I don't think the moorings on Riverside should be got rid of.
	No	because it interferes with a fair scheme, and it isn't necessary to move boats on
	No	Because it is unfair for them to jump the list but I do believe boats from riverside should be offered a mooring space. The council should be made to publish the list as I believe it is open to corruption and I know of council employees who have got license rather quick, everybody knows its not what you know its who you know in the council.
	No	Because it's unnecessary
	No	Because it's working FINE as is.
	No	Because riverside mooring should be allowed to continue
	No	Because the mooring arrangements at Riverside should remain unchanged
	No	Because the Riverside moorings should not be revoked.
	No	Because they shouldn't be forced to leave their moorings.
	No	Because you are encouraging queue jumping.
	No	Because you shouldn't be screwing these people in the first place.
	No	Better no change to Riverside
	No	Boats should NOT be moved from riverside
	Yes	But do not support the movement from Riverside
	Yes	but I don't support re-homing
	Yes	But only if they must be displaced. I do not see this as a given.
	No	But riverside displacement has not been agreed! If unfortunately it does them of. Purse existing dweller should have automatic preference
	Yes	But they should not be relocated in the first place
	Yes	But what is meant by regulated moorings? Does this mean all boats currently on riverside?
	Yes	But, once again, I do not think they should be moved. The fact that this appears here means that the earlier part of the consultation is a fraud as you have clearly already decided to move the Riverside boats.
	No	Can not be pre-judicated if Riverside would even be cancelled as mooring.
	No	Create tensions
	No	Defeats the object of people being on a waiting list and is unfair.
	No	Do no displace them in the first place
	No	Do not remove moorings from riverside
	No	Do not support relocation of Riverside moorings
	No	do not support the underlying policy of displacement
	No	Do you mean allowing those on Riverside to jump the queue on the waiting list? Which is hardly fair on those who are already on it. This wouldn't even solve the problem for those made homeless as they would be waiting in some cases for years before a place came up.
	No	do you mean queue jumping for the Riverside boaters that's not fair on the ones in the front of the queue.
	No	Does not seem fair.
	No	Doesnt seem fair on those already on the list
	No	Doesn't seem fair on those who have been on the waiting list for a long time.
	No	Don't agree with stopping moorings on riverside
	No	Don't displace people from their moorings by force
	Yes	Don't get rid of the Riverside moorings! - there's no need, that are fine as they are.
	No	Don't remove the Riverside moorings! Simple!
	No	Everyone dwelling there has always known this day would come and have done so in the hope to jump the ridiculously long waiting lists. They've had the benefit of free mooring all this time and it would be a farse to now give them all hard to come by moorings. Half of them haven't had their boats fully legal or even been there that long. Perhaps offer spaces to those who can show to have been living there on a fully legal boat for at least the last 10 consecutive years?
	No	Flaunting the rules should not be rewarded. Those moored there endangered road users by weakening the railings, obstructed river traffic, and created unsanitary conditions.
	No	I am on the list
	No	I believe only those with an employment or education link to the city should be promoted above the existing waiting list.
	No	I consider 18 Option 3.3 a better solution
	No	I do not see why those who have been mooring illegally (and presumably without charge), or at best dubiously, for many years should be given priority over law abiding boat owners who have been on the waiting list for long periods.
	No	I do not support any decision to remove moorings from Riverside.
	No	I do not support displacement - those considering such a move should be ashamed at trying to ruin other peoples' lives. Disgraceful to even consider it.
	No	I do not support moving the existing boaters
	No	I do not support removal of Riverside moorings. Need more moorings. Expand
	No	I do not support the displacement
	No	I do not support the transplantation of boats from Riverside
	No	I don't agree with ending mooring at Riverside and it would be unfair for those on the waiting list.
	No	I don't see why boats should be made to move from Riverside and also it is not fair for riverside boaters to 'jump the queue'
	No	I don't support closing down riverside. You seem to be prejudging the issue!
	No	I don't support displacement at riverside
	No	I don't support displacement of those at Riverside
	No	I don't support displacement.
	No	I don't support the displacement of boats from Riverside
	No	I don't think anyone should be displaced from Riverside
	No	I don't think people should be displaced from Riverside. I don't think people who have been living on boats in Cambridge should have to go on a waiting list to stay where they are, but would like the waiting list system to be transparent and simple for people who want to get moorings here, respecting the existing names on the list.
	No	I don't think that boats that moored illegally and who are resisting relocation should be rewarded with a berth when those who have followed the legal process are in effect penalised by being denied a place for longer
	No	I don't think the CCC is making fair this consultation. It seems it is already decided that the Riverside is going to be cleared
	No	I don't think there is enough space for them anywhere else on the Cam.
	No	I got to those adhering to the law and placing themselves on the waiting list over tries currently illegally moored at riverside
	No	I imagine that those already on the waiting list will find this very unfair. The riverside residents will also be very unhappy about being forced to relocate. What will happen to riverside residents if there are not enough new moorings becoming available in the near future? This seems like a ploy by the council to try to reduce the number of residents on the river for some unknown reason. It would be better to let the Riverside residents keep their current moorings.
	No	I need more information
	No	I support the current moorings on Riverside to remain as they are, and the current waiting list to be re-instated immediately.
	No	I think that this has to be on a case by case basis according to circumstances and link to the city as could be unfair to those on waiting list
	No	I think the moorings at riverside should stay and not be displaced, therefore unnecessary.
	No	I would rather that the existing moorings on Riverside are retained.
	No	I would support this if, and only if, it is decide to remove boats from riverside. I would rather they stayed.
	Yes	If anyone is displaced from the longterm community at Riverside, they should definitely be reallocated as a priority- this is their established home!
	Yes	If it goes ahead which it shouldn't.
	Yes	If the waiting list is closed, how can there be places available for the boats from Riverside? Please explain this more fully
	Yes	If wrong headed decision to suspend riverside moorings goes ahead
	No	If yes why?
	No	If you close the Riverside, yes BUT if you treat them as priority over the waiting list then you are still reducing moorings overall. Seems unfair as waiters will need to wait even longer than expected.
	Yes	In principle yes, as I think that those on the wall have been waiting longer than those on the list. I do think this needs to be transparent however and there may be cases of people on the waiting list who have been waiting longer than people on the wall issued with temporary licences.
	No	In the event of displacement from the Riverside moorings, priority should be given in accordance with date of arrival in Cambridge and date of inclusion on the waiting list
	Yes	Include riverside and you will have no problem with this. otherwise I feel that those that signed up to the registration two years ago should have priority over those on the waiting list.
	No	Is this something to do with allowing those on Riverside to jump the queue on the waiting list. Which is hardly fair on those who are already on it. We don't support this.
	No	It discriminates against those already mooring for the sake of potentially wealthier tenants- no way!
	No	It give an unfair advantage to some.
	No	It is unfair to allow Riverside boat dwellers to jump the queue, bring them into the scheme now, as additional licence holders and keep the current order on waiting list as it
	No	It means in effect that acting without a proper licence results in jumping ahead of those who have applied properly.
	No	It rewards irresponsible behaviour on behalf of those moored at Riverside.
	No	It seems unfair but leave Riverside moorings where they are.
	No	It seems very unfair to people in the waiting list. There are Riverside boats who would be queue jumping. Could the council move them to temporary moorings to end the safety problem but not give them a full mooring licence until they are at the place they would have been on the waiting list if they had applied in the first place? They would have to show they meet all the criteria first.
	No	It seems very unfair to those waiting their turn on the list that they lose their place to Riverside boats who squatted on the railings. I think the Riverside boats should not be rewarded for breaking the rules.
	No	It would be unfair to give licences to those who originally moored at Riverside without a licence over those who applied in the proper way.
	No	It would be unfair to those who have been on the waiting list for years (especially those waiting for a widebeam licence).
	No	It's unfair for those who has been on the waiting list.
	No	It's inappropriate to allow queue jumping in order to gradually reduce the overall number of boaters.
	No	Its not fair on non riverside moorers
	No	Its not fair, nor is there space on the commons
	No	It's Unfair - unless they are already on the waiting list.
	No	Its unfair to others on waiting list but only applicable if the riverside moorings are reduced
	No	it's unfair, and unnecessary
	No	I've been on the list for 3 years
	No	Jumping the waiting list is not fair.
	No	Just keep the Riverside moorings
	No	Just keep the Riverside moorings!
	No	Just keep the Riverside moorings.
	No	Just leave the boats at riverside
	No	Just leave the people at Riverside to stay there
	No	Just let the boats on Riverside keep mooring on Riverside and bring them into the licensing scheme.
	No	Keep moorings on Riverside. Queue jumping by Riversiders who are forced to leave their home, would be highly unfair to those on the waiting list
	No	Keep Riverside Moorings.
	No	Keep riverside!
	No	Keep Riverside.
	No	Keep the moorings and keep the waiting list
	No	Keep the moorings. Don't displace people
	No	Keep the Riverside mooring so no action required
	No	Keep the Riverside moorings
	No	Keep the Riverside moorings
	No	Leave the boats moored on Riverside.
	No	Leave the moorings at Riverside as they are.
	No	Leave the riverside alone
	No	Let them stay
	No	Make Riverside part of the scheme, so they can have Residential Mooring Licences on the moorings they already have- no impact on those on the waiting list, as the amount of space elsewhere will remain the same.
	No	Moving at riverside should stay
	No	moorings should be retained on Riverside instead.
	No	Move them to Ely. Riverboats are meant to be mobile.
	No	Nice one, set different groups of boaters against each other. Half baked divide and conquer tactic. Won't work.
	No	No - only because you don't have a not sure button
	No	No allowing those on Riverside to jump the queue on the waiting list is unfair on those who have been waiting for years. We don't support this
	No	No boat should be displaced
	No	No cogent case has been made for not using Riverside for moorings
	No	No need if Riverside is not closed
	No	No need to remove moorings in Riverside

No	No, leave them on riverside and maintain a fair waiting list for others.
No	No, not because I don't think the displaced deserve the moorings, it's because I don't think they should be displaced in the first place.
No	No, those at Riverside should remain there and people who have been waiting shouldn't be displaced.
No	No-one should be able to jump to the front of the list.
No	No-one should be evicted from Riverside.
No	Not clear.
No	Not exactly fair to those that have been waiting on the list for ages. Just keep the moorings at Riverside and avoid this altogether.
No	Not fair.
No	Not fair.
No	Not fair on those on the waiting list.
No	Not fair to people on the list waiting.
No	Not fair to those already on waiting list.
No	Not fair to those on the waiting list, which is already an unreasonable prospect. Just keep the Riverside moorings and you don't have this problem.
No	Not fair to those who are already on the waiting list.
No	Not fair, and unnecessary - keep the Riverside moorings.
No	Not really fair to those who have been on waiting list for years is it?
No	Not sure.
No	Not unless they're also on the waiting list as many of them are.
No	Once again this is sounding suspiciously like a "FORGORN CONCLUSION" and my answer to this is the present system is FAIR so leave it alone! And I hate to labour a point but some people need the repeat message but WHERE are you going to put these boats?
No	Option B.3 seems fairer.
No	People on the waiting list have obeyed the rules and have priority over freeloaders.
No	people should not be displaced from any where
No	prefer to retain Riverside moorings
No	Queue jumping for those you evict...come on that's never going to work for those who have been patiently waiting...Its clear you need to make riverside work for those who are already there and ensure that all those who are moored in the area are law abiding, there should be more down stream mooring opportunities with associated buses into the city centre as a way of dealing with excess desire to moor in the Cambridge area. A moor and ride system...
No	Question assumes you will be removing the boaters from Riverside
No	Rather than trying to make up for the consequences of the proposed poor policy, better to avoid kicking people out in the first place
No	Retain all moorings.
No	Retain and improve Riverside moorings instead
No	Retain moorings at Riverside!
No	Retain moorings on Riverside
No	Riverside boat residents should not be displaced, or pressured to move. There is a case for giving the current Riverside boat residents first refusal on any vacant moorings, given the uncertainty that they have faced over the last few years.
No	Riverside moorings should not be moved.
No	Riverside residents should be allowed to stay in their homes and this should not impact on people that have been waiting a long time on the list for a licence.
No	Riverside residents shouldn't be displaced. Loaded question again
No	Riverside should be kept, also jumping the queue with so many people on the waiting list doesn't seem fair
Yes	See above
No	See answer, above, to 6.3
No	see earlier comment about which boats should be accommodated
No	simply keep all moorings. this is a solution to a problem that doesn't exist.
No	sounds like a scam
No	Sounds very unfair - just leave the Riverside moorers where they are.
No	Stop all of this nonsense.
No	That is very unfair on the people on the waiting list!
Yes	That measure would be essential.
No	That would be grossly unfair on those who are on the waiting list. Those on Riverside have had ample time to get on the waiting list.
No	That would be unfair to those who have been on the waiting list. They should be able to get added, maybe even with an appropriate place but to queuejump completely is not going to do any good to the already fragile peace on the river.
No	The better solution is to keep Riverside moorings
No	The boaters at Riverside should not be displaced.
No	The fairest system is for moorings to go to people who waited the longest
No	The moorings at Riverside must be kept. The community is small as it is and there is a huge need for affordable housing in Cambridge, especially green affordable housing. It is also unfair on those on the waiting list.
No	The people moored at Riverside have exploited a loophole for many years and have always run the risk of it being closed - why should they get priority over people who applied for the waiting list in good faith?
No	The question carries the presumption that I support the ending of moorings at riverside. I do not support this presumption
No	The Riverside moorings should be made permanent.
No	The Riverside moorings should be retained.
No	the systems must support the majority of rule abiding citizens.
No	There is a queue.
No	There is a recognised waiting list and no one should be allowed to get a mooring before their turn. Leave the boats on riverside and no need for what could be a very corrupt method of getting a mooring.
No	THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE MOORINGS SITES EXISTING IN THE CURRENT MOORINGS PLAN!
No	There is no reason to displace them in the first place!
No	There should be no displacement at Riverside.
No	There should be no displacement.
No	There would be no need to do this if the moorings are not in fact removed.
No	These boats moored on riverside knew the situation, other people waited patiently or may not be able to climb over a fence
No	They already have a mooring spot and has been proven no problem so why move them and create a problem for everyone?
No	They are freeloaders who haven't paid and should go to the bottom of the list!
No	They are illegally moored and do not currently pay fees. Unless they are already on the list they should go to the bottom.
No	They are temporary moorings, why should they jump the queue on people who have legitimately applied and been added to the waiting list
No	They chose to moor illegally so they need to join the back of the queue
No	They have somewhere to moor and should not jump the queue
Yes	They need to be prioritised.
No	They should be allowed to stay where they are.
No	They should not be displaced
No	they should not be displaced
No	They should not be rewarded for squatting. This would encourage re-mooring at Riverside in the hope of receiving the same treatment.
No	They should stay on riverside
No	they shouldn't be displaced
No	They will not be moved
No	they won't be moved.
No	This doesn't make sense to me
No	This is a lose-lose situation, as explained above. Not sure why the same question has been asked once more.
Yes	This is a tyrannically worded questionnaire. It assumes that they WILL be displaced. Note the use of the word 'place'. Those moorings are the boaters homes.
No	This is an ill thought out measure that is trying to cover up for cognitive dissonance.
No	This is certainly unfair to those on the list.
Yes	This is difficult. The moorings should stay! But if the worst happens it is very tough for the people on the waiting list. The only way I can decide this is that the people already there stand to be made homeless so they should be given moorings. One caveat could be 'as long as they are on the waiting list for 24 months or more'. The problem with that is that the list is closed so many newer residents will lose out.
No	This is effectively queue jumping and rewards those who were willing to circumnavigate the due process - presumably they could all have been on the waiting list any way. This would discriminate against those who joined the waiting list in good faith that the mooring policy would be operated as stated and not influenced due to special interest pleading.
No	This is fundamentally unjust. What you are suggesting is that the council, having changed its mind about one group, should disadvantage a second group in order to make good its mistake. Just don't displace people. Think about the equivalent monetary value of those moorings: you would basically be destroying over £1 million pounds of utility.
No	This is grossly unfair on the people who have been waiting for years.
No	this is impossible to understand but it sounds unfair
No	This is in effect queue jumping. Should you maintain the Riverside moorings you would have more spaces potentially coming available to reduce the queue and no need to instate queue jumping.
No	This is not fair to the people already on the list, and does not help the displaced boaters who must still leave the area and wait for a vacancy to appear. Letting them remain at Riverside is a much better solution.
No	This is unfair on people on the waiting list, and is not even possible within the mooring scheme. There's not room to do this even if it was fair.
No	This is unfair on those already on the list and may result in queue jumping
No	This is unfair to people on the waiting list. Riverside boats should get temporary moorings only, until they reach their chronological place on the waiting list
No	This option is just another way of slicing up an unacceptable cake: I don't support this because I want to see the riverside moorings retained.
No	This undermines the purpose and the terms of the waiting list and the position of those who are already on the waiting list.
No	This would also affect those wanting to get a mooring licence in other parts of the area who have not had the luxury of mooring on the Cam.
No	This would be a slap in the face to those that have legitimately waited for mooring licenses. Those on riverside are no better than queue jumping squatters.
No	This would be unfair on other people on the waiting list.
No	This would be unfair to those who are already on the waiting list.
No	This would be very unfair to individuals currently on the waiting list
No	This would presumably mean recent arrivals on Riverside would jump the queue on the waiting list, which would be unfair in the extreme.
No	Those attempting to obtain a mooring through the regulated route will be subordinated to those who jumped the queue by establishing unauthorised moorings on Riverside.
No	Those in Riverside should not be moved!
No	Unfair
No	Unfair
No	Unfair
No	Unfair and unnecessary. Keep the riverside moorings.
No	unfair on those already on the list
No	Unfair on those who are already on the list.
No	Unfair to people already on the waiting list
No	Unfair.
No	Unfair. Just keep Riverside with additional mooring rings, ladders and gates.
No	Utterly unjust, both to those on the waiting list, and to those whom you are about to make homeless for no valid reason.
No	Well if this is the case, everyone on the waiting list should go and buy a boat - moor on the wall and wait for a license. Some of the people on the list have been waiting for a river licence for a much longer than others who have moored illegally.
Yes	Well, seeing as they are already resident in Cambridge it would be unfair to not let them stay, if not on the Riverside then down in town. See other notes
No	What on earth does this mean?
No	Where would this new mooring site be. Please inform me; please ensure any new moorings comply with the Wildlife and Countryside act and species protection.
No	Why "displaced" in this question and "possibly displaced" in the next (sounds like the decision has already been made). Don't support clearing of Riverside.
No	Why displace those at Riverside? Why create a knock-on effect for those moored elsewhere? Why add to a housing crisis in Cambridge?
No	Why not consider not displacing these people in the first place, rather than skipping them ahead in a queue, which is unfair.
No	Why should riverside people jump the queue?
No	why should they jump the queue? What a badly worded question!
No	Why should those who have tethered their boats to the railings at Riverside be allowed to jump the queue? This is the law of the squattocracy.
Yes	With reluctance
Yes	With the caveat that they shouldn't be displaced in the first place.
No	would it be fair on people on the waiting list?
No	Would not be necessary if people are not displaced from Riverside.
No	You are approving of an illegal activity
No	You don't need to remove riverside moorings
No	You give no indication of where these moorings are
No	You have a waiting list. Those people have been on there waiting for a mooring. If someone from Riverside is on the waiting list, they will get their turn. But better still, do not remove people from Riverside.
No	You need more space. The waiting list is a sign of failure to capitalise on a clear need. closing it is burying your heads in the sand and would justify unlicensed mooring.
No	You want to get people off riverside that everyone else is happy with there. You want to make other people suffer to get your will (quicker)?

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
	Yes	1. Education on incoming houseboaters and support from existing ones on how to protect their boats from other boat users.
	Yes	1. Clear conditions in licence of acceptable behaviour by Council and boat moorers. 2. Clear commitment (and resources) for quick action to remove illicitly moored vessels in future. 3
	Yes	1. overstay fines taken out of boat hire deposit via boat hire business'. why not, it'll stop legal delays. 2. Farmers with river frontage are building marina's - so why don't you just have a permanent solution - instead of always half measures that don't last. Build for the future as the river is popular but out of town also move boats away from playpark areas - also stop boat owners using the river bank like a garden
	Yes	1. Don't make people homeless by hiking up mooring fees. 2. The moorings on riverside have been a safe and happy home for many people for years, who are integrated into the community and have jobs and families here. 3. Please don't make your consultations deliberately misleading (pretending to compare like for like when you're comparing the mooring fees to places that provide more facilities). 4. Please treat people with respect and dignity, and don't be so unkind as to make people homeless for financial reasons, as well as putting interests such as leisure users and commercial users of the river on equal grounds with people who consider it their home. 5. This way of thinking would not be considered with people who lives in houses, a city is there for the good of those who live in it, and this includes boat dwellers.
	Yes	1. Is there a possibility of creating a joint interest group so that all stakeholders can meet and be involved in thrashing out "bones of contention"? At present the relationship between some boaters, some rowers and some residents is fractious and unhelpful. Could the council coordinate representatives from each group to help people feel that they are involved. 2. It does not seem that the council spent enough time talking to the boaters before the consultation process began. Learn for future "consultations".
	Yes	5year licence renewed annually. Right to self mooring licence with boat.
	Yes	A fairer more open debate, more publicity to the wider populace and better study of the effects your policy's will have on the boat dwellers of Cambridge and the effect on the Lifestyle they have chosen as a direct effect horrendous cost of living in Cambridge compared to rest of the country
	Yes	A large increase is needed, to say 500
	Yes	A marina built opposite riverside. Rowers being reduced in numbers rather people losing their homes. Rowers being given alternative areas to pursue their hobby such as rowing lakes already used by others, this would also lower impact on wildlife on the river which at the moment suffers from the high traffic of boats. I have unfortunately seen this first hand on a number of occasions with ducklings and swans being killed and injured by rowers.
	Yes	A sensible plan that doesn't involve people losing their homes.
	Yes	Actually ASK the people who live there what they want and need to live their lives as well as possible! I have seen no millionaires living in boats on the river. This survey and action to try and get more money from a good Cambridge community feels WRONG. Seriously -get your priorities right. I am marching for women's rights, immigrants rights, asylum seekers rights and LGBT rights. I hope I do not have to march for people not to get kicked out of their homes.
	No	All boats are much needed homes, their number should not be cut or life made more difficult for boat people
	Yes	All craft moored in the city should have pump out tanks or cassette toilets. More 48hour visitors moorings needed
	Yes	Allowing more opportunities to gather feedback from those moored on the river, and taking those opinions into account, would be well received. Currently there is widespread feeling that the council considers opinions of housing developments and the University to be more important than those of the residents, and thus the council appears as uncaring (to the extent where it would rather families become homeless rather than lose a contract with another unaffordable housing provider).
	Yes	Any boat permanently moored along the river should be maintained in a reasonable condition and the owners should responsibly dispose of any waste. Currently, a significant number of boats moored along the Riverside wall are in a very dilapidated condition and there is quite a bit of rubbish. Parts of the Riverside wall resemble a floating scrapyard!
	Yes	Any change should be gradual and predictable by those affected
	Yes	As a (land dwelling) resident of the city I think you need to be cautious as to prejudicial attitudes from small numbers of people fundamentally opposed to alternative ways of life. Helping the boating community without changing it's nature seems like the best way forward and thus consulting with them on ways forward seems best.
	Yes	As a former town rower and cox I can say I have never been aware of any conflict between river users at the Riverside point of the Cam, and that these proposals seem like a solution to a confectioned 'problem'.
	Yes	As already mentioned, all or most moorings should be moved to perpendicular moorings either side of Jesus Lock.
	Yes	As an angler I am regularly challenged by boat owners on the basis that the bank near their boat is their 'home' and therefore I should respect their privacy and not approach their boat - they effectively claim ownership of the bank and the right to deprive me of its use.
	Yes	As far as I can see, and hear from friends on the boats at present, the present structure works perfectly well. I think it is imperative that Riverside is left alone. Any extra budget should be used to increase the number of available riverside moorings in Cambridge and outskirts and to keep the present infrastructures affordable. Thankyou.
	Yes	As I've hinted in my answer to question 4.1, a more mature answer to the issue of boats moored on Riverside needs to be found, than is being offered in a simplistic "move 'em all" policy. A Council which is prepared to invest in white elephant schemes such as new cycle paths over Ditton Meadows (which go nowhere and benefit few) should consider investing some strategic attention in this much more used locality. A strategic overview should take into account the needs not only of boaters but of pedestrians and cyclists. What is currently in place for the latter is also inadequate.
	Yes	As mentioned above really think over use of the river is by rowers and not boat residents

Yes	As mentioned before, air and noise pollution by the moored boats seriously disturbs other users of the river. There should be standards of what is acceptable, which should be properly enforced. Moored boats should be encouraged to switch to a more sustainable and non-polluting energy supply. Many moored boats are clearly not properly maintained, dirty, holes, covered by plastic tarpaulins). This spoils the view on the river. A policy that enforces proper maintenance of the moored boats should be developed.
Yes	As there is a lack of affordable housing in Cambridge, I think the council should try to provide more mooring sites for boats where people live on them.
Yes	Be reasonable and nice, and don't make anyone homeless :-)
Yes	Better enforcement for breaches of byelaws such as obstructing the navigation.
Yes	better policies, better facilities, more incentives to moor downstream of the city (ie below waterbeach) with transport options into the city
Yes	Boaters are an essential part of life on the water, and have been for centuries. They should be respected and allowed to have some ease in maintaining their way of life. It is a happy and inspiring thing to see people living on the water and it should be valued. Please respect boaters, their views, and their way of life.
No	Boats should NOT be moved from Riverside
Yes	Boats should work and be able to get mooring permits. Invest in the river community and it will give back.
Yes	Boats with people living on board should be moored further out of town. City centre along the river, only allow to stay temporarily for no more than one week, no permanent stay. Tourist boat only.
Yes	build a marina
Yes	Build a marina downriver.
Yes	Build a serviced marina for boats. I also think no boat should be allowed to put untreated sewage into the river this would improve the river in many ways.
Yes	Build an out of town marina to accommodate vessels before you start clogging up Stourbridge Common with excited houseboats.
Yes	Cambridge is a world city. Many of the boats are like third world squatter camps and reflect poorly on the city. Boaters should not be allowed to use the land adjoining their boats for storage purposes. We would not be as tolerant of travellers setting up site on Jesus Green but they too have housing needs. Mooring (including enforcement of reasonable rules to protect the environment and other river users) must be self funding and not be seen as a cheap housing option, subsidised by others. Boats must be maintained in a reasonable condition and subject to safety certificates akin to cars on a public highway. I am sure that many boaters live as responsible citizens but equally there are some who, at least give the impression, do not.
Yes	Cc TV to monitor antisocial behaviour on Midsummer common, reduced mooring fees for pensioners in line with student and single occupancy.
Yes	Changing less. Leaving things as they are. Throughout this survey there has been no compelling reason offered why pretty much anything needs to be changed.
Yes	Changing rowing clubs more and combining the revenue from all river uses to improve the river experience for all
Yes	Cherish our river community and recognise that they are part of the diversity we need in Cambridge
Yes	Clean up the shanty town that has sprung up on the entrance to Stourbridge common. It's a disgrace to Cambridge
Yes	Close the waiting list permanently and make the moorings transferable with the boats
Yes	Combine Council and Camcon into a new city harbour/port authority
Yes	Common humanity.
Yes	Communicate properly. The City Council have upset a lot of people and it really does feel rather unpleasant.
Yes	Communities continue to be disrupted and it would be saddening to break up yet another, namely at Riverside. I have always perceived Cambridge to be inclusive and to prioritise it's long-term residents over visitors and boat clubs.
Yes	Condition and float worthiness of boats should be enforced. Existing dwellers should not be treated unfairly, this location has been their home, and whilst I row on true river and this is a pinch point I am there for sport and they are there for life. Dwellers who are continually rude and harassing of other legitimate river users should be dealt with effectively and removed where their behaviour is offensive, threatening or otherwise unacceptable
Yes	Continue to research ways of leaving boats on riverside or continue with the status quo
Yes	Consider all the users of our river. Walkers, fishermen, canoeists, rowers, etc. The houseboats usurp the rights of others and reduce the pleasure of many others. This has to be ended.
Yes	Consider making Riverside into Premium moorings with a slightly higher rate and individual electricity bollards. Give other boaters in Cambridge the option to move here for an increased rate, and move boats off Riverside onto the commons when Commons moorers choose to take up those more expensive but higher quality provision. Consider opening up the area on Jesus Green above the lock to visitors mooring.
Yes	Consider permanent mooring on Riverside and recognise that they are part of the charm of that stretch of the Cam.
Yes	Consider the fact that for most their boat is their home. They should be allowed to use their boats a their living place.
Yes	Consider the wider implications of the impact on Cambridges image as an interesting exciting and diverse place to visit. Reducing the number of affordable and unusual places to live in Cambridge would negatively impact on this.
Yes	Consult with the boating community, please!
Yes	Current licence holders should not have automatic renewal, as a number already own another home - the boat is their 2nd home. This should be now investigated, also looking at how many months they live on their boats or in their other home. People on the waiting list may have no proper home
No	Dealing with
Yes	Dealing with people causing unrest -- either through risking wildlife and health of other river users alike, or by defamation and slander such as the occupant of the vessel moored at the P&B where now the new luxury homes are practicing.
Yes	development of a purpose built marina between the railway bridge and Marley's Holt and remove all boats permanently moored on riverside
Yes	digging a lode either side of the railway embankment on ditton common for mooring. negotiating with Eight's Marina to ensure better use of the empty marina next to Elizabeth Way
Yes	Do not displace.
Yes	Do not place an inappropriately disproportionate emphasis on the hostile views of any new residents who do not respect the traditions of the area they have brought into. This has occasioned fierce and effective protests elsewhere - for instance at Pimlil in Suffolk, where a few affluent incomers objected to the locally residential barges on their long-established moorings near the Butt and Oyster. They did not reckon with the professional status of many of the 'scruffs' (lawyers and retired policemen among them) and ended by making monumental fools of themselves. Be warned
Yes	Do nothing. There's no reason for any of this.
Yes	Dwellers of Regulated Moorings receive a 100% Council Tax Discount. This should be reviewed as the residents of Cambridge are presently funding this.
Yes	Enforce the ban on renting out boats and those that are clearly not the main residence
Yes	Enforcement of the hours within which generators may be used by residents of boats. Noise pollution levels are unacceptable and intrusive. Regulation of solid fuel use - air pollution has reached unacceptable levels along Riverside and in the vicinity of moorings alongside and opposite Stourbridge Common.
Yes	Ensure that designated mooring spaces does not result in bottlenecks for navigation. Too often the Cam Conservators and riparian owner take turns passing the buck when this happens. Consider some mooring spaces to be unsuitable for wide boats.
Yes	Establishment of winter moorings at a greater than 25% cost to defray additional costs related to administration. Establishment of a waiting list group of individuals who are willing to purchase at risk boats
Yes	Expand Stourbridge and Ditton Meadows for more mooring spots.
Yes	Few of the boats on Riverside ever move. This means their effluent goes directly into the Cam. The smoke from on-board fires is released at Street level and is usually acrid and choking. I currently have a chest infection and it is highly unpleasant to walk down Riverside. I believe drug dealing is common at the East end of Riverside, and I am told the boaters are responsible for much of the activity.
Yes	Find a way to provide more residential mooring to meet demand.
Yes	For goodness sake stop being so negative and see the opportunity rather than the problem. The river bank provides a cheap housing resource which a more go ahead council would be eager to grasp rather than keen to control. The Cam Conservators should be reformed by the removal of the University and City Council representatives and their replacement with boaters, who actually live on it, perhaps they would have a bit more vision.
Yes	For the most part the river using community (leisure users, visitors and residential) co-exist very successfully, and the proposals have the potential to disturb the current balance.
Yes	Formally recognising the broader social impact of moorings and what they offer to the city. Instead of spending all this public resource on trying to reduce moorings, how about researching the huge value that offering moorings gives to the lifeblood of the city? Have you considered the knock on effect on the city's cultural or entrepreneurial life? Low cost living is vital for the creation of art, new ideas, business - bright thinkers are not restricted to those who own or can afford to rent, houses. In fact, certainly when it comes to artists - often, it's quite the opposite. Or have you even tried to assess where some river residents may sit within the broader remit of the council's own anti poverty strategy? Or considered the huge stress all this causes them? Especially those with children? Planning for your future when you have constant pressure hanging over your community, is very hard. Have you done an Equality Impact Assessment? Researched those with protected characteristics on Riverside, who may be impacted by all this? Those with mental health conditions, for example? There's tremendous opportunity for Cambridge to trailblaze here and embrace the sustainable, affordable lifestyle that moorings offer - rather than fight it.
Yes	Gates and ladders in the railings
Yes	Gates, ladders and proper mooring points at Riverside. Respect for Cambridge residents who live in boats
Yes	Get rid of all the residential moorings. This has mushroomed over the last twenty years as a consequence of a laissez faire approach by the enforcement authorities. The occupants if many if the moorings have no regard for tidiness, disposal of waste, compliance with larking regulations.
Yes	get rid of the broken down old crates on Stourbridge common and further out.
Yes	Give boaters the right to sell their mooring licence with their boat
Yes	Give serious consideration to the needs of the boating community - what we have works, it doesn't need breaking.
Yes	Given the scandalous lack of housing in this town the needs of existing residents who live on the river and those of people who wish to do so should be the major determinant of policy!
Yes	Giving more of a voice to the residents at the moorings. Appreciating the asset to the cultural environment.
Yes	Have a serious rethink about removing the boats from Riverside.
Yes	Have the interests of visitors to Cambridge and their ongoing enjoyment of the boats moored at Riverside, as a tourist attraction, been considered by the council?
Yes	Hold a councilor, conservators, boaters, residents of Riverside meeting to revise the terms of reference of this consultation
Yes	Houseboat appearance must be kept in good order incl paintwork. No external unsightly storage or temporary tarpalins on roofs etc.
Yes	I am happy with the status quo. I get the feeling the Council is trying to profit from the boaters and use a divisive pricing strategy for the moorings to split the community. The City Council should charge us no more than it costs to administer the moorings. Any left-over money should be refunded to the boat-dwellers. You might also consider that there has been little improvement in recent years in the service provided to boat-dwellers despite our fees gradually creeping up.
Yes	I am suspicious that the reasons provided for revising the moorings situation on Riverside are false and that the council and/or other Cambridge residents have some underhand motive. Specifically, I suspect that the atypical lifestyle of the boat residents may be a cause of discriminatory attitudes toward them from others, and this may be driving the current plans. It is unacceptable for the council to give in to such bigotry. I am not personally acquainted with any of the inhabitants of the boats but never have encountered any problems with them; this is in spite of walking or cycling down Riverside almost daily since moving to my current residence two years ago. I have encountered plenty of examples of antisocial behaviour from other members of the public on Riverside - including, but not necessarily limited to, illegal motorcycling, dangerous driving, begging, and inconsiderate cycling from university rowing coaches, and it seems to me appalling that the council should ignore these issues while targeting a community that has never to my knowledge harmed anybody. If the council is concerned to improve health and safety in Cambridge I would suggest it instead focus on the much more problematic issues caused by dangerous road layouts, inconsiderate and illegal driving, of licensed taxis, etc.
Yes	I appreciate that many of those who currently moor unofficially along the riverside may be unable to afford an official licence. Unfortunately the world in which we live is one in which almost everything has a price, including the land on which we live and the services provided by Councils and others. There is no reason, even in a socialist or anarchist utopia why a squatterocracy should receive preferential treatment.
Yes	I can't access council services without a Cambridge address, like parking permits, garages Etc but as part of my mooring I have to say the boat is my primary home. It would be really useful to be able to do all of my council correspondence by email and online. Please consider that the facilities you have won't be enough to support an increase in mooring fees and that some people having lived here for a while and won't need them. Can the mooring license be considered as a housing issue suitable for housing department and not as parks or open space department and to have a long term plan so not to disrupt people's home security. Thanks
Yes	I feel that it should be more accessible to people wanting to move aboard. Living aboard is an exciting, and in some ways more affordable option for those living in this area.
Yes	I feel that you are not taking into account that a lot of us who live on the land in Cambridge really like the boats, even though we don't choose to live in them. So making the boating community upset or making their lives harder just seems rather unfair. I can only assume it's because some "rich interests" ie people who own posh flats near Riverside or prospective developers for the area are jumping up and down - but the boaters have been there much longer than the flats, and have as much right to be there as anyone else. Let us celebrate diversity of modes of living in our community! Let it be a tourist attraction, pretty boats in photos etc! Let's try to make life easier for them, and to support them being part of our community.
Yes	I find it ridiculous that there are silly things in place such that some boaters randomly park their boats where they aren't allowed, but because it's technically the land of colleges, there is nothign that can be done by the council. It's also bonkers that people can be moored without licences but effectively nothing done about it because of red tape.
Yes	I have on many occasions, especially in the summer, seen tourists taking photos of the boats and their dwellers. Perhaps the council could think outside their box in this situation and consider that the Riverside houseboats are part of the diverse areas of Cambridge that tourists, especially those from overseas, find so attractive. With proper, safe entrances/ exits, including gates, ladders and even planters the whole attraction could even encourage more tourists into the area.
Yes	I left Cambridge two years ago to continue my education with a PhD elsewhere. Next year I will face the decision whether or not to return to Cambridge. The ability of the City Council to ensure a fair use of the river and to uphold the diversity of lifestyles to which the houseboats contribute will be extremely important for me when making plans for my future. I think that many people value the contribution of livaboads to the public space along the river. Therefore, I urge the city council to not see houseboats as a problem that needs to be eliminated. Instead, the council should embrace the fact that the river can provide housing and adapt a policy that fosters the sustainable development of the river space as shared area of nature, residency and leisure.
Yes	I live near Riverside, and routinely cycle along it at all hours of the day and night. I feel much safer doing so with boats present - it means there are far more people around with good reason. I've lived in Cambridge for almost 20 years, and there have been boats on Riverside for as long as I can remember. I don't see why these people should lose their homes.
Yes	I love the fact there is a boat-dwelling community in Cambridge; I feel they really add to the character of the place and reflect a much more interesting, diverse aspect of the city than the overpriced and University-dominated areas. It's a much more affordable accommodation option for many too, now that the housing situation has reached ridiculous proportions. Ultimately these are real people, whose lives are being affected by the decisions made in the Council offices.
Yes	I suggest that boaters should not be allowed to burn dirty coal - only smokeless fuels or wood. The smell of coal fires can be unpleasant, especially in the winter when it is foggy.
Yes	I suppose it's a separate policy, but if not I think it would be good to find some way to reduce the number of commercial punts on the river, if that is at all within the council's power (I write this as someone who works as a punt tour guide in Cambridge, and has worked for 3 different licensed punting companies in my time)
Yes	I think the council should focus on realistic small changes to support the thriving boating community. Boaters are able and willing to work together with the council and this is not best used at the moment. The boating community is a Cambridge asset. The council should make more effort to collaborate with river users.
Yes	I think you should allow all boats currently moored on the Cam to stay where they are. With regard to your comment about increased leisure activity on the Cam. There is increased traffic on the A14. What are you going to do about that? Increased traffic on the A14 leads to more congestion. Increased leisure activity on the Cam has the same result. You could widen the A14, but you can't widen the Cam.
Yes	I walk my dog everyday down Riverside. As far as I am concerned the biggest issues are 1. Toxic Smoke Pollution 2 Human feces in the Childrens playground 3. Allowing boats to moor with no ability to get to the waste disposal site so there occupants go to the toilet on the bank or in the river
Yes	I would like to see a comparison published between the number of complaints filed by residents of new properties built and bought within the last ten years and residents that have lived on Riverside itself and the roads in between Abbey Rd and Stanley Rd. If there is a significant number of complaints against house boat owners I would like this taken into consideration as I believe that the house boats represent a certain amount of heritage and culture from the fens entering Cambridge and trading routes. I also believe that when acquiring property in an area with neighbouring communities it is fundamentally wrong for the new residents to try and change something that existed at the point of sale. I strongly believe that dog walkers, cyclists and local residents have a good relationship with the boat owners and to move them away from that stretch of river takes something away from the community and that Riverside would be a less safe area as a result.
Yes	I would like you to consider the FACT that the railings have been operating for over 30 years with live aboard boaters who have managed to survive in one piece without any contribution from the council. You claim in your introductory blurb that 'people are
Yes	I would like you to consider the very nasty impression this gives that you are 'deshaming' the centre of Cambridge of these people. Perhaps this would please the wealthier house residents who share the Riverside area, perhaps you feel it would more picturesque for tourists? I cannot really understand the motivation, but am surprised and disappointed to see this initiative coming from a Labour Council. It would simply increase the number of people needing housing in the Cambridge area.
Yes	I would like you to consider what is your ultimate motivation for this intolerant policy?
No	I would strongly encourage the linkage between the development and densification occurring in the Newmarket road area with the funding of significant improvement in the infrastructure at Riverside for those moorings. We have seen in the past that significant funds can be raised in this way. What is being proposed is ethnic cleansing. Promoting investment will lead to a much happier outcome in the long run.
Yes	I'd like you to consider that increased diversity of accommodation and lifestyles is important to the City of Cambridge. The centre already lacks identity due to the very high proportion of chain shops, unlike say Brighton which manages to support niche vendors and food establishments. I also think that there are areas such as Regents' Canal in East London that support mixed use very well and that this increases revenue to the area. This proposal suggests instead that the boats are a bit of an embarrassment that needs to be controlled.
Yes	I'd like you to consult properly & fairly with all who live on the river. This consultation has been forced upon the City and the boat community un-fairly.
Yes	Identification of land alongside the river that could be developed as a commercial marina for residential boats, as part of the Local Plan.
Yes	If the council is concerned about safety of the mooring sites, then maybe it could invest in proper access and a stonger, concrete banks for the areas it considers unsafe. Rather than threaten those who live on boats by reducing access and increasing cost, maybe it could support and value them as being a part of a greater community.
Yes	If there are two many craft on the river reduce the number of commercial punts. Look after your own people first.
Yes	I'm sure the council could encourage development of some marina space near to Cambridge, given the will. If this were done it would make it easier to clear the Riverside moorings and satisfy at least some of those on the waiting list.
Yes	Improving facilities at Riverside as far as is feasible. Support dialogue between boat and land-based residents on Riverside.
Yes	Improving facilities for boaters
Yes	Improving the facilities in order to justify a large increase in the Mooring Fee.
Yes	In all of this, the part that the boat residents play in the community is overlooked. You comment that boats are private and are not part of the social housing policy. This seems to me an error. We should encourage people to take their own decisions, and take options that are consistent with their means, and not necessarily depend on council policy and allocations of social housing. I value the boat residents, they are active members of our community, they are more active than most people in security and safety, and have high levels of awareness of problems in the community.
Yes	In this time of extreme housing shortages, please consider why there is a proposal that would increase homelessness?
Yes	Increase the number of visitor moorings by looking at new sites. Increase the length of time visitors are allowed to stay in the winter. Set out a clear and unambiguous enforcement policy, whilst realising that boaters may, from situations outside of their control such as floods etc, be unable to move exactly when they need to - Provide a second chemical toilet disposal on Stourbridge Common near the water point
Yes	Instantly please leave our homes alone
Yes	Insure that those people living on low incomes on houseboats be able to get housing benefit.
Yes	Invest in the riverside to an extent that sees provision for visitors and residents, cut out new moorings, marina berths, perhaps off fen road?
Yes	It needs to be decided what the moorings are for. If these are for residential use then any boat not using a mooring for this purpose should be moved on. Also boats must be fit for purpose and any that are not scrapped at owners cost. There are I believe a few wrecks along Riverside that fall into this category
Yes	Jeep the mooring at riverside

Yes	Just leave everything alone. It is all fine and everyone is happy as it is. Stop causing fear and uncertainty amongst vulnerable citizens of Cambridge for no reason whatsoever.
Yes	Just leave it like it is and stop causing trouble and frightening people. I am going to vote Tony forever, just because of this shambles and the number of innocent people you are victimising and scaring with just this process, let alone if you actually put any of your half-wit plans into action.
	Just leave the boaters alone. It feels like genuine users of the moorings are being punished for the minority of river users who abuse the system.
Yes	Just remember you're there to serve us and try and build/maintain the best city we can. Let this city be great because of your work not in spite of it. It feels like gentrification and we need a mix of people here, and the river to be a living, breathing place.
Yes	KEEP RIVERSIDE MOORING
Yes	Keep the moorings that have worked fine for years. Work WITH the current water and land residents to improve accessibility and services to keep all parties involved happy.
Yes	keep things as they are - displace no one - increase moorings all along the river. Offer them free for the homeless.
Yes	Leave the Moorings Policy in place. You made a commitment not to change the scheme but a change of councillor seems to take precedent. As a Labour authority you should be ashamed to cause so much anxiety and potential harm to a community who are an asset to Cambridge...just ask the visitors and tourists
No	leave them all alone!
Yes	Leave them where they are. solve any perceived problems, this is a lazy solution and any socialist supporting this should be ashamed of themselves.
Yes	Leave these quiet, helpful and useful people alone. They are a massive asset to the community and to local safety and they deserve to be allowed to live in peace.
Yes	Leave things exactly as they are.
Yes	Leave well alone - these proposals are a disgrace to a fine city like Cambridge.
Yes	Leave well alone. There is too much council meddling, for instance the 20mph speed limit and cost of implementing it in the Riverside area, where it is impossible to drive at more than about 15mph anyway.
Yes	Let them stay
Yes	Let them stay there
Yes	Listen to the statistics, make a balanced, sensible decision based on real information. Leave the boaters there, use money earned (see stats) to install safe access to boats on Riverside
Yes	Listen to your boating community rather than make bad decisions which affect people's lives.
Yes	Liveaboard boats provide an interesting, colourful and nearly always friendly aspect to any river or harbour. It is always sad to see them moved on, leaving empty, dead, waterways.
Yes	Look hard in the mirror, re-think your priorities, be creative, kind and fair. Imagine how I would feel if this was your home under threat. One size will never fit all and we need to evolve.
Yes	Look to include more moorings and do not be heavy handed. Increase facilities such as water and waste disposal.
Yes	Maintain some visitors moorings not full of local resident boats
Yes	Make additional moorings available, in order to ease Cambridge's housing crisis.
Yes	Make all residential mooring transferable with their boats. Not having a waiting list. And therefore gradually rise the profile of the river but by not making anyone homeless.
Yes	Make more moorings available, with safe access, and power / utilities. It is a sustainable way of providing much needed housing. Create floating villages - as in Holland.
Yes	Make people and their homes your top priority. Make existing moorings safer if necessary. Add more moorings where possible so that more people who want to live on the river are able to do so.
Yes	Make the boat community a self-managed stakeholder.
Yes	Make the life of the people down there easier not harder! They are part of your Cambridge as well!
Yes	Many of the craft show no evidence of either using the pump out facility or having a portapotty and proper disposal of sewage. There should be a clear expectation that any craft offered moorings may not dispose of sewage into the river and breach of this policy should result in immediate loss of mooring rights.
Yes	Many of the illegally moored boats have created constant issues and tensions between other river users, rowers, passers by. These people have been allowed to continue on their own war path, creating danger and generally taking the law into their own hands. There was a specific incident at the weekend where video evidence of an illegal boat dweller feeding water foul so they would be hit by boats - how has he, for example, been allowed to remain on the river and abuse the law as he sees fit. He is not the only one, but an example of a select few to name: the purple boat moored on Ditton fields, the cream wide beam located at the old Pike and Eel pub site. The council needs to manage this situation properly and quickly. It has been left in a complete mess for too long. Due to the poor management, it has allowed the river to become an unnecessary war zone between users as a result.
Yes	Many of those currently mooring along the river have been there for a number of years, lived peacefully with their neighbours, joined in the life on the river and contributed to the community. This is their home. I know from meeting some of them that they have been caused considerable anxiety by the possibility of having to move and the increase in mooring fees. I accept that the situation on the Wall has to be assessed, but I feel it is important that the other boaters are given some security of tenure and are not priced out of the area.
Yes	Might be an idea to actually talk to the boaters, rather than trying to make decisions without talking to them.
Yes	Moored boats should have to burn smokeless fuel. The smoke from boats on Riverside is terrible. People on moored boats who own dogs need to keep them under control and stop them roaming about on the towpath. There is a terrible parking problem on Riverside near Stourbridge common as the people living on the boats park all their vans and cars there. They also leave rubbish piled next to the railings.
Yes	Mooring license to be renewed every 3 years.
Yes	Need to properly regulate (and so get rid of) those very few boats (the purple narrowboat, the red and white plastic cruiser) whose behaviour is consistently antisocial - disrupting rowing races and making a tip of the riverbank where they have moored; stourbridge common has been damaged extensively by these two.
Yes	Need to retain and enhance this alternative to land-based accommodation - it makes social and economic sense and also helps preserve the rapidly diminishing character of Cambridge which is being eroded by the granting of planning permission for aesthetically displeasing construction
Yes	Not being dicks, and thinking further outside the preconceptions. There are alternatives to the policies proposed that are fairer and would be more popular and beneficial to the area in the medium and long term. Get out of the ideological rut you have dug for yourselves and consider the people you are supposed to represent.
Yes	number one option is to leave as is. Money/Council time could be better spent elsewhere.
Yes	Only that consultations have taken place before and boaters have been promised extra facilities before, and they seem to have been given an unfair ride. Finding out that their moorings might be auctioned off and being labelled as illegal is outrageous. I think they have been treated as if they were a nuisance and it has given Cambridge a bad name.
Yes	People's lifestyle choice. Diversity and sustainability. Tolerance and what makes life's rich tapestry so interesting. Please don't make Cambridge bland!
Yes	Please bear in mind the effect it will have on people with families - most importantly the children themselves and also vulnerable people.
Yes	Please concentrate your enforcement on the boat owners who refuse to contribute by paying the mooring fees, or moor without permission - removing them would make an instant and significant contribution to improving life on the Cam!
Yes	Please consider the item that covers the persecution of minorities by the abuse of power.
Yes	Please could you treble the number of moorings in Cambridge.
Yes	Please do not propose any measures from which the council could make substantial new income. The large figures suggested for fines for instance come across as using a need for better management as an opportunity to increase funds. It is of course clear that due to government funding cuts and other additional pressures the entire council has to tighten its budgets however it is entirely unacceptable to do this in an opportunistic way as has clearly been done in these proposals.
Yes	PLEASE get the boats to reduce the air pollution from their heating systems. Any other source of air pollution would be intolerable I don't understand how boats are somehow exempt.
Yes	Please look really hard for a workable solution that supports these Cambridge residents in the lifestyle that they have chosen. Cambridge has shown itself to be a beacon of tolerance and diversity with the recent refugee crisis, so please be on message with this! It is extraordinary that money is around for high value new builds that have demonstrably been sold at a loss to leave empty properties, and there seems to be more boat sheds for the various and several rowing clubs along the river, and yet the council is prepared to squeeze a long standing set of residents out of the city - what about building a marina somewhere along the river? engaging with the boat residents to generate a sense of pride and ownership in their surroundings? Please show some imagination and creative response to demonstrate that the council does believe in inclusiveness and diversity! And while I'm at it, what is with that tumbledown wreck of a boat shed on the North side of the river on Jesus Green? I believe it was once the home of the former owners of Fitzbillies, today the main resident was a swan - seriously why haven't you cracked down on that before coming after people who largely just want to get on with living their lives?
Yes	Potentially related to residents of the boats are the large number of campervans and other commercial vehicles seemingly used as accommodation at the Stourbridge Common end of Riverside. Does CCC have any proposals to enforce resident's parking permits in this area to reduce this? I don't think the area benefits from being treated as a free camp site.
Yes	Price changes should only be brought in line with other moorings if the level of services on offer are taken into consideration.
Yes	Promote safety and access for the Riverside community and promote a carbon friendly city.
Yes	Protect our community. Keep it safe and open and diverse. Showcase Cambridge as the forward thinking city it is. Be honest! Take care of minorities and vulnerable residents. Don't gentrify Cambridge! Don't set an example of dealing with a 'problem' by removing it. Please please please... use this situation to showcase how wonderful this city can be! Please take care of our community!
Yes	Provide more recycling bins and facilities at the stourbridge end or riverside please.
Yes	Provide proper mooring points on the Riverside wall and allow mooring there to continue
Yes	Provide water points and better rubbish bins - the junk left at the bins by the entrance to Stourbridge common is an eyesore. Perhaps they should not have been sited under trees?
Yes	Providing more moorings rather than fewer. Low cost lifestyle for those who chose it and they also tend to be low maintenance from the point of view of the city who aren't really providing any facilities (e.g. electric hookup etc) anyway.
Yes	providing several gates in the riverside railings... banning all university rowing clubs from the cam
Yes	put in proper bollards, proper facilities, in order to create safe moorings.
Yes	Put this to bed, once and for all. Leave the Riverside alone. Stop preying on the vulnerable in order to 'socially cleanse' and 'gentrify' due to pressure from a few. encourage community cohesion for once.
Yes	Raised enforcement of - non pollution of air- the Jesus Green area is smoggy with smoke on still winter's evenings - no damage to the public river bank- debris, storage, planting damages Jesus Green.
Yes	Reconsider this bizarre policy. Displacing people from homes and removing soul from the city shouldn't be on the City Council's priority list. But this Cambridge in 2016 and seems to be the way things are done.
Yes	Reinstate the gates on Riverside incorporate boats into the mooring scheme and use this new revenue to improve the moorings and area in general. Then manage the whole mooring scheme in a more competent and efficient way.
Yes	Remove all permanent moorings along Jesus Green and Midsummer Common, it is not an appropriate place to moor houseboats.
Yes	Remove or fine those leaving empty/derelect boats. They should fall into line if not already with the empty homes policy. Address air/smoke pollution around Riverside bridge - at night especially if there a fog too it is a hazard to walkers and cyclists crossing the bridge. In winter the smell and smoke from wood burning is a twice daily hazard for those going to and from home to work.
Yes	Residential boats are an important part of Cambridge, so numbers of moorings should not be reduced. In a city where house prices are going through the roof, they represent an alternative form of home ownership, so as many should be accommodated as possible.
Yes	Retain moorings at Riverside
Yes	retain moorings at Riverside.
Yes	Revisions of the River Mooring Policy should be designed to encourage growth of both the residential boat community and rowers. As Cambridge expands in population, services should also grow to accommodate how our society is changing. These communities have existed in Cambridge for decades and are part of what makes Cambridge a great place to live.
Yes	See comments above. Reduce numbers of private boats that occupy the river to the detriment of other river and riverbank users. The river in the city should be accessible to all, not occupied by private residents. There is more space outside the city and good cycle and foot paths for access into the city from boats moored there.
Yes	Since the number of rowers on the river seems to increase enormously each year, maybe the council's attention should turn to consideration of how they could better contribute to the maintenance of the river and associated costs. This would be a fairer sharing out of the costs and since there are so many rowers, would be a much smaller burden on each of them than the current plan to double the fees for existing boat dwellers.
Yes	Smoke from chimneys getting into houses and buildings. Refuse and worse being deposited directly into the river, some of the boats never move so what happens to toilet waste?
Yes	some (many?) of the boats moored along Riverside burn wood fires. The smoke from these fires - which is very toxic - drifts into the nearby houses along Riverside I know, I have a son who lives in one of them. This is a health risk.
Yes	Some boats are well-maintained and attractive. Others are a sordid mess. The latter should be forbidden.
Yes	Some boats emit smoke which is unpleasant and harmful. This needs to be prevented.
Yes	Some people have lived on the river for decades, some since before you were born, others because living on land in Cambridge is disgracefully expensive and it's your job to realise that you'd make everyone worse off including yourselves
Yes	Sort out the housing market in Cambridge so that alternative like living on the river is left to people who want to live on the river and no as a cheap alternative to paying a huge rent.
Yes	Standards for maintenance of boat exterior - are there standards and if so are there penalties for not meeting them?
Yes	Stop harassing this community with poorly thought out threatening proposals. It is completely unreasonable to double the cost of moorings overnight. The council would never propose this to any other residential community. Moored boats already contribute significantly both the the council and Cam Conservators. There is no justification for raising the mooring fees other than that the boat dwellers are easy targets. I have never been so disorganised by Cambridge council proposal in the two decades I have lived in this city. Furthermore there is no need to extinguish the residential community mooring along Riverside. With minor, low cost adjustments the moorings can be improved and the Riverside berths can be brought into the mooring license programme, thereby increasing the council income and eliminating any need for draconian fee increases.
Yes	Students could be given priority. People who don't have a licence should be moved on. Improve the moorings, make them proper.
Yes	Support the Sports lake at Milton. Stop investing in already overcrowded rowing clubs. Invest in better facilities for boaters.
Yes	Take a serious look at the Irish model
Yes	that all people manoeuvring such boats around should be fit to be in charge of such a vehicle around young rowers who are in flimsy boats with no lifejackets
Yes	That you are dealing with people's homes and livelihoods. Although you say that social benefit and housing policy are not your business, you acknowledge the potential impact by saying people could be referred into the benefits and housing and homeless system. You would be transferring the responsibility and putting pressure on another department. But worse you would be making people homeless. In a city with a river, this is part of the whole scenario of residence and belonging. Why would you NOT look at this holistically rather than imply that it's not your job. This isn't acceptable from the council and public service that we residents fund. I accept your jobs are not easy but please look at it as part of the overall strategy of housing and social cohesion too.
Yes	The attractiveness of the boats and the positive impact this has on the area, for residents but also tourists. And please remember that most residents are suffering or going to suffer decrease in income due to Brexit price rises. No one needs to be charged more for living in Cambridge at the moment.
Yes	The big problem with Riverside boats is their behaviour and the pollution. They should be banned from the railings because they are too close to houses. They burn wood which causes smoke so we cannot breathe in our own front bedrooms at night and they run noisy generators which smell of petrol. They have dogs which jump on to the road and mess in the street and they are not put on leads. Their toilet waste is all going into the river as far as we can see. They should never have been allowed to moor there in the first place.
Yes	The boat community have lived on the Cam for many years without causing issue. I understand the need to generate income for the Council, but displacing people needlessly is not acceptable. I would like to point out that myself am not a boat dweller!
Yes	The Boaters have been poorly treated by the City, your approach has been lacking in fairness; subject to the partiality of officers and particular individuals who have had undue influence; you have constantly moved the policy goalposts and the governance of the moorings. It is time you settle this matter adroitly and then invest in some sympathetic customer-relations management and try to get the boaters on your side. Have you considered actually inviting them to join your management board and asking them to participate in management or give them self-governance?
Yes	The boaters which cause the most difficulties on the river are those living on unregulated moorings, where they are uncontrolled and can act selfishly and aggressively to other members of the river community without fear of consequence. An outcome of this review should be that good behaviour should be rewarded by maintaining the existing mooring fees at the current levels, while those boats which simply squatted to take advantage of the uncertainty about the Riverside area should not be rewarded for trying to circumvent the laws.
Yes	The boats on Riverside do not move, and so do not pump out sewage. The fires which release smoke at Street level can make breathing difficult. The noise from generators is not acceptable in an urban setting.
Yes	The Cam riverboats are an important and valued part of Cambridge community. Please don't do a Petty Cury and tidy away an integral part of our wonderful city. Spend your valuable time and energy on issues that help Cambridge citizens and just make the minimal changes necessary to river moorings. Regulate, licence and monitor. Fi email. Removal, very bad indeed.
Yes	The cohesion of the community
Yes	the consultation makes no mention of the benefit to the city and its land-side residents of having a live-aboard community. The policy should explicitly state that moored boats are welcome in our city.
Yes	The council has a duty to the current residents, who, to a large extent, keep clean quiet lives and are welcomed by the wider community. This means no unreasonable price hikes, reduction in numbers, sudden alterations in mooring policies. Given the majority of surrounding residents are fine with the Riverside moorings, which have been around for decades, and there have been no health and safety incidents, it seems unnecessary to try to change anything massively. Simply ask them for mooring fees and use the money to build a few gates and ladders. Evicting them is unlikely to be cheap or easy and will be considerable badly viewed by the boaters and surrounding residents.
Yes	The council seems to have made up their mind. The questions in the survey are rather biased. There should be a more detailed consultation, in order to support the validity of the council's claims.
Yes	The Council should accept an element of social housing which would be impacted if people are effectively ejected from living on moored boats.
Yes	The economic livelihoods of the people living on the boats.
Yes	The fact that mooring on the common land of Cambridge should be free it wasn't given to the council it was given to the PEOPLE of Cambridge.
Yes	The fact that you have not produced any Risk Assessment, Structural Engineering, or competent feasibility study to support the assertion that Moorings can not continue on Riverside.
Yes	The houseboats on Riverside are not good neighbours. Over the past 8 years there have been persistent problems with noise from generators and music systems, often operating late at night. Clearly some of these houseboats lack working engines and discharge sewage directly into the Cam. Riverside itself is frequently partially blocked as houseboat occupants undertake in situ maintenance, often resulting in old paint being scraped directly into the Cam and the recently painted railings being damaged. Unsupervised dogs owned by houseboat occupants, defecate on the public highway and pavements. Frequent problems with litter and flytipping from Riverside houseboats.
Yes	The mooring costs should be for services and therefore the same as the council tax for a band A house. There is no logical reason to charge boats more to moor against the bank than there is to charge a house to 'moor' against the pavement. To do so is to show prejudices against boats as homes compared to houses. The fairest system is a first come, first served system. Any system involving social housing would push out the true boaters who are on the river because they love boats and it is a way of life they prefer to living in a house. It would result in the river being only for the poor and create a ghetto. The river should be available for everyone, rich or poor so a diverse community can thrive. Not everyone finds it easy living in a house, the walls and closed front door can close in on you. The lack of connection with the elements and nature can be damaging for some. I get depressed living in a house for these reasons and if forced to I have to go and sleep outside sometimes, even though I work outside a lot. The council should get their legal issues sorted so they can properly enforce their rules and also stop favouring some illegal moorers. If people refuse to comply with the rules then they should know that they can and will be refused a mooring the following year or will lose their place on the waiting list. Most of the trouble on the river has been because of the lack of rule enforcement and it is not good for the city, the council or the community. I do not believe that those on riverside dock are illegally moored. It is a traditional mooring space and should remain so. It does not hinder navigation of rowers and others and provides 30-40 affordable green homes. The people there have a right to stay and any health and safety problems should be remedied.
	The next set of mooring licences to be handed out should give a time limit for purchase of a vessel as most people will hold their licence and not even purchase a boat I Give them say 6 or weeks to prove they are living on a boat in Cambridge and if they are not, revoke their licence and give it to the next person on the list.

Yes	The options presented under Item 4 all assume removal of the boats from Riverside, based on an unproved health and safety argument. This cannot be considered a proper consultation, and an option of allowing boats to remain on Riverside should be included
Yes	The people supporting themselves in this style of accommodation are taking some of the strain off land based social housing. Boat life isn't for everyone, so why not try to work with and support boat dwellers in their chosen way of life. In the past, councils have provided facilities for 'travellers' on land which have often been abused and rejected. Decent facilities like water points, good mooring points, electric points, Esan facilities have never been rejected or abused by the average boater, who is likely to be very grateful. In those few cases where boaters are not well behaved then they may deserve to be evicted, but most of them are law abiding decent people.
Yes	The people whose homes you are considering disrupting and who you are considering pricing out of their homes should be your first priority. A fair and equitable approach. The house boats are an important part of the Cambridge waterscape and have been on the river for many years, penalising them is not the right approach.
Yes	The phrasing of this survey, in particular many of the follow-up questions, is highly biased in favour of the Council's preferred outcomes. As such, it is inadequate as a method of objectively consulting the public and gathering the full range of possible opinions.
Yes	The regulations should be set permanently to give security to the tenants and to make clear that they are important and not optional residents of the city of Cambridge!
Yes	the results of this consultation should be made public
Yes	The river and the people that live on it help make Cambridge the beautiful place it is. Like flowers in a garden the boats brighten and soften the edges of a city.
Yes	The river banks are often filled with refuse, unwanted items of furniture, cardboard boxes etc that boat occupants spread onto them. They are unhygienic and unsightly, sometimes causing obstacles /trip hazards. The banks should be more closely monitored and boat occupants made to keep their goods inside their boats.
Yes	The sheer levels of hostility that some of the moored house boats have for college rowers is absolutely staggering. Despite being relatively recent additions to the river (in the past 15 years), they continue to suggest that anything that happens is the rowers fault. It feels that many of the problems on the river would be reduced if they were not there, in the same way they wish we were not there. This conflict would be reduced if the house boats were narrowing the rivers less in the key areas.
Yes	the status of residency, the postal address
No	The status quo seems the best way to proceed. If it ain't broke, don't fix it! Just stop messing it about!!!!
Yes	The waiting list has not been updated for several years - this is not acceptable.
Yes	the wishes of those boaters with boats moored on the riverside wall should be respected
Yes	there are a number of issues such as dog controls, waste management and obstructions on the river bank such as gas cylinders and wood piles.
Yes	There has, without doubt, been a substantial increase in problems caused by moored boats over the last 15-20 years. The number of boats moored between Jesus Green lock and the Chesterton railway bridge causes a huge amount of problems for other river users. Regrettably, the problems are generally caused by newer and transitory arrivals. Any proposal which reduces the total number of mooring berths and discourages short-term residents from taking up mooring berths is to be strongly encouraged.
Yes	There is a lot of emphasis on health and safety for the people who live on the boats, but nothing about the health and safety of everyone else. I have seen people coughing and choking in the smoke from boats, especially on Riverside. There is a boat person living on Stourbridge Common who burns rubbish in a oil drum, and the smoke goes all over the common and is so thick that nobody can breathe. I am also worried about safety for rowers as there are places where the boats are making the river too narrow for them to pass. There are boats with so much stuff on their roofs that they are a danger to rowers if it is windy, and these overloaded messy boats give a bad impression of Cambridge for visitors. I was told that one morning a boat deliberately blocked the river so the rowers could not hold their races and were stuck on the river in the cold in their rowing boats because they could not move until the houseboat was moved.
Yes	There is no need for all this. Make the Barrier and access to Riverside safe, as should have been done originally when the barrier was erected, and then there is no problem. Are you determined to eradicate the houseboats community? Cambridge would be the poorer for it, as well as an increase in people denied a place to live.
Yes	There is no need to revise the mooring policy. The council is threatening to make people homeless and take away the opportunity to own their homes in a city most could not afford to buy. Shame on you
Yes	There is only one pump put for all the boats and sometimes it does not work. There is no fall back. Boats as second homes should not have the same priority
Yes	There is plenty of room for more permanent mooring spaces on the Cam and this should be utilised to meet the demand.
Yes	There seems to be a rather nasty animosity towards those in the City who have found a way of living that potentially avoids some of the costs and problems of living on land. May I suggest that instead of complaining and being resentful about those who have managed to live at less expense that the rest of us on land, their way of life is accepted and they are left to get on with their law abiding lives free from interference.
Yes	There should be a direct link between the income generated by moorings and penalties and expenditure on the moorings and supporting infrastructure.
Yes	These boats are people's homes - please don't effectively evict them. They also add to security for passing pedestrians (admittedly less relevant to Riverside than to the commons). And everywhere they enhance the pleasure of walking by the river.
Yes	Things would be better left as they are as none of the proposals to change would be for the better
Yes	Think about the impact on people, think about the fact that we live in a city that has the river at it's heart. The boat owners add so much to the river and don't detract from it. Don't pander to the rowers, the NIMBYs on Riverside. For some it's a lifestyle choice, for some it's where they have no choice and it's a community. I think they also make it feel safer as a local resident I like them being there and feel very strongly that we should support them. They add to the community not detract from it. Come up with a solution (to a real problem not a made up one) and invest in the provision for these people who are actually city residents.
	This consultation waaaaay toooo complex. Need to retain these boats & reduce rights for rowing eights
Yes	This ignores previous consultations where it was agreed to keep boats on riverside and regulate them. It ignores the fact that it still says on your website that fees are charges in line with council tax, and as such boaters trusted them to remain a sensible amount that could be juggled with other financial obligations, like mortgages. I can't see a justifiable reason for clearing riverside, and if the Rowing old boys have said it's a problem, then don't believe that their views represent the majority of rowers. They absolutely do not.
Yes	this is a trivial point, perhaps, but it would help compliance with the no mooring areas is the notices indicating the out-of-bounds areas were mounted on the embankment instead of one the river wall where they are easily masked by any wrongly moored boat.
Yes	Those who are resident on riverside will lose their homes if you do this. Be sure that there really is alternative mooring for them, available immediately after they have to move - it's no good offering a new mooring 3 months after they've been evicted, they no doubt will either have had to give up their boats or have fallen foul of your enforcement policies by then. These are people who live, work and learn in our community, and deserve to be treated with respect as residents; if the lines of communication are poor, or they find themselves without a residence, then that will be a direct result of council policies. You have a duty to protect the vulnerable members of the community, and we'd like to remind you that many of those on Riverside do count as vulnerable people.
Yes	To clarify the legal situation around minor contact between moored and moving boats, as this seems to be a needless cause of friction. By their nature, unpowered craft sometimes need to push off the bank or whatever obstructs their access to it. A fairly trivial piece of matting or netting placed against the hulls of moored boats would facilitate that without damage.
Yes	To ensure that that there is no habitat damage to wildlife.
Yes	To leave this low impact vibrant community alone to continue their valuable contributions to Cambridge. There is no issue with the moorings on the railings. This is purely about the wealthy riverside property owners wanting what they consider an eyesore, removed. I suggest they move instead. I strongly oppose the stress this would put on many boat dwellers and the awful impact this could have on their health and lives.
Yes	To provide the Riverside with gated access to moorings.
Yes	Treasure the mooring community in every way possible. Keep it as low cost as possible. Keep as many mooring places available as possible. Low cost residential arrangements should be passionately defended against the competing interests of the University and city commerce.
Yes	Using surplus in mooring revenue to invest in facilities for the riverbank amenity & community in general
Yes	We would just like to reiterate our view that the house boats and their residents are part of the wider Riverside community. We've not experienced any issues with the boating community along Riverside. It would be sad for the river to be sanitized of its character.
Yes	Why cause more housing crisis/homelessness. This will impact on the city's resources more. Why just move people to other parts of the river and cause overcrowding? Lose out on some of Camridges character
Yes	Why keep faffing with the riverside moorings? It would be more interesting adding something like a kayak/canoe centre, or improving the cycle routes around the river. Or improving the gates/paths along the river bank. Or even better would be improved organisation between the rowing clubs! Moorings have been silly over the last few months.
Yes	Why not consider an affordable marina at an accessible location along the Cam. Would not suit all and needs to be in addition to the current moorings but would give people who still crave to live on a boat the opportunity to do so
No	Why revise something that works - if it ain't broke...
Yes	Wildlife and pollution should have been more prominent in the decision making process
Yes	Work in conjunction with the Cam Conservators, landowners and others to provide a marina not solely for moorings to generate employment
	Working in closer collaboration with the boaters community. Support them instead of trying to push them away. Bring a bit more originality and character in the city instead of trying to crush it.
Yes	Yes, here is a group of people who form a unique community with their families. Please consider their requirements above all others when deciding about their whole way of life. thank you.
Yes	Yes, whilst the council are considering moorings, and visitors and supposed 'safety' concerns, what they are utterly disregarding is that these are people, their homes, their neighbours, their friends and one hell of a strong community. STOP STOP STOP treating this as though you're doing something beneficial for them. You're not. The residents of the boats and moorings are the people who should take priority, not leisure users of the river, regardless of whether they are University rowers, or townsofolk. Leisure users are transient. Residents of the river are on the whole previous or current leisure users of the river as well so can act as their own devils advocate. Know your audience. Respect their rights and stop making this a financial rather than human interest case. I really hope the council makes the right decisions on this, and not just kowtow to the owners of expensive riverside flats of the 'prestige power' of the university.
Yes	Yes, you should seriously negotiate with the University and other rowing clubs to regulate their growth and what they are permitted to do and where and when on the river. It is they who impede navigation and threaten wildlife and riparian activities.
Yes	You have to do a lot better at enforcement. The boat at the P+E has been there forever it seems.
Yes	You seem to be prepared to dump a considerable number of peaceful individuals who prefer to live on the river, some of whom I know work in Cambridge - where property prices are sky-high - on to the streets, without the slightest justification in anything you have written for such a shocking change. Has the Council lost all sense of justice?