



River Moorings Policy 2017 - 2023 Consultation Summary Report

| Contents | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Purpose | 3 |
| Background to the consultation | 5 |
| Consultation Actions and Summary List | 7 |
| Wider Public Consultation | 9 |
| Items that arose during the consultation | 18 |
| Overall Observations | 20 |
| Conclusions | 22 |
| Appendix – Consultation document | 24 |

1. Purpose

- 1.1 To summarise the consultation undertaken for the revised River Moorings Policy (RMP) and based on the analysis of the consultation responses outline the result in regards to:
- a) Whether responders' consider that annual licences are held at current levels with a modest annual increase?
 - b) Whether responders' support an increase in baseline fees being brought in line with current providers providing similar facilities elsewhere in the country?
 - c) Whether responders' felt it is proportionate to charge a penalty of £100 for each 24-hour period or part thereof when a boat overstays a designated visitor mooring?
 - d) Whether responders' would support mooring fees being based on length of vessel?
 - e) Whether responders' would support additional charges for wide beam vessels?
 - f) Whether responders' support the ending of temporary permissions to moor at Riverside and to move all boats moored offering alternative moorings elsewhere in Cambridge (to those which have registered and are regulated by the City Council and have people living aboard?
 - g) Whether responders' believe the proposal to offer alternative moorings if temporary permissions to moor at Riverside are ended is fair?
 - h) Whether responders' support the designation of the Riverside as a 'no mooring zone' through the powers of the Cam Conservator?
 - i) Whether responders' support the introduction of a revised enforcement policy with powers delegated to Council officers?
 - j) Whether responders' support the current location numbers and type of mooring berths being appropriate as the permanent number and type?
 - k) Whether responders' support a future reduction in the overall length of riverbank provided and number of mooring berths?

- l) Would you support a temporary increase in the number of Residential Mooring Licences from 70 to accommodate those displaced from Riverside? Licences would not be issued to the waiting list until the number of licences returns to and drops below 70?
- m) Whether responders' support the Council's position not to establish winter mooring sites?
- n) Whether responders' support the waiting list remaining closed to new applicants for the foreseeable future?
- o) Whether responders' support those regulated moorings displaced at Riverside being offered Residential Mooring Licences on the Regulated Moorings elsewhere before those on the waiting list to assist those who may be impacted by any decision to remove moorings from Riverside?
- p) Whether responders' support those regulated moorings possibly displaced at Riverside being added to the waiting list in chronological order based on evidence of first occupancy at Riverside?

2. Background to the consultation

- 2.1 Consultation and feedback regarding the moorings in the City of Cambridge is continuous by fact that a number of reviews have been undertaken that offer suggestions for Policy and these have included:-
- Changes to Moorings Policy (16th January 2014);
 - an Update Report on Riverside Moorings (11th July 2014);
 - Riverside Moorings Options Report (Skanska, July 2014);
 - Progress on the Review of the River Moorings Policy (8th October 2015) and
 - River Moorings – An Update on the Contract Law Model consultation (17th March 2016).
- 2.2 During 2016/17 Cambridge City Council reviewed its management of river moorings and it was decided to consult widely and on a range of moorings related matters and options. The council would then assess responses and revise and publish a new River Moorings Policy for 2017 to 2023
- 2.3 The consultation as part of this review was open to anyone who wanted to take part and was completely confidential and with the assurance it was anonymous. The Council engaged directly with representative groups known to have an interest in the river during the consultation period.
- 2.4 The consultation ran for a period 12 weeks, and was made widely available through the City Council's website and supported by news releases and social media.
- 2.5 The consultation was also targeted at stakeholders who broadly included those with a River Moorings Licence, those on our waiting lists, local resident groups, national and regional boat organisations and the Cam Conservators.
- 2.6 Paper copies of the consultation were directly delivered to all boats on the River and electronically where the council had contact emails.

- 2.7 In addition to responses from individuals, submissions were also received from the following stakeholder groups: Camboaters, Cam Conservators, National Bargee Travellers Association and Cambridgeshire Rowing Association.
- 2.8 A range of interested parties also responded on behalf of their organisations.
- 2.9 Responses include submissions from organisations that cannot be redacted as they can be attributed to either an organisation or an individual have not been published. The consultation was confidential and anonymous and there was the voluntary supply of information, therefore disclosure in this case could prejudice the supply of information in the future.

3. Consultation Actions and Summary List

- a) Mid-November 2016, 250 paper pamphlets circulated regarding the River Moorings Policy Issued and Options consultation;
- b) Consultation Postcard sent out in November 2016 to properties in close proximity to the River;
- c) Initial (Web-based) Wider Public Consultation 48 responses between the 27th October and the 31st October 2016.
- d) Updated (Web-Based) Wider Public Consultation (to enable quantitative analysis) 774 responses between the 31st October 2016 and the 20th January 2017;
- e) Additionally 23 responses made on paper copies of the consultation and these have been manually entered onto the web collector;
- f) 23 individual responses were additionally made via email however these were not in a structure to enable entry into the web based consultation and analysis, these responses came from Camboaters, NBTA, Cam Rowing Association, The Green Party and the County Councillor for Abbey Ward.
- g) Among the responses the council received 161 automated replies from the Camboaters website as follows:-

Dear Cambridge City Council,

Please don't move boaters on from Riverside wall - they have been there for longer than many of the local houses and they are an important part of our city.

Boats add colour and vibrancy to Cambridge. They offer a rare form of low-impact housing in the city, and allow an affordable way of life for those who care little for consumerism, like to be independent, wish to be self-sufficient and want to live in an environmentally sound fashion. Please don't carry out your threat to reduce the numbers of residential boaters in the city by a third.

Please don't double mooring fees either. Please stick to the existing simple fee structure that covers the cost of running the mooring scheme with plenty to spare.

Please stick to your previous commitments to find a way to integrate Riverside into the Council mooring scheme, and to base fees on the cost of providing services to boaters rather than the maximum you think you can get from them.

4. Wider Public Consultation, 27th October 2016 to 20th January 2017

4.1 From the various consultation media and response to the wider public consultation overall there has been **822** responses received.

4.2 There were **766** responses to the question asking,

a) **Whether responders' consider that annual licences be held at current levels with a modest annual increase**

- 622 of the responses or **81.5%** said Yes they supported the proposal to have a modest annual increase in annual licence fees and
- 142 of the responses or **18.5%** said No they didn't support the proposal to have a modest annual increase in annual licence fees.

The findings support the recommendation that RMLs fees increase annually by Retail Price Index in April, as determined in the preceding September.

4.3 There were **750** responses to the question asking,

b) **Whether responders' support an increase in baseline fees being brought in line with current providers providing similar facilities elsewhere in the country.**

- 159 of the responses or **21.2%** said Yes they supported the proposal to have baseline fees being brought in line with current providers and
- 591 of the responses or **78.8%** said No they didn't support the proposal to have baseline fees being brought in line with current providers.

The findings support the recommendation that RML fees are calculated locally based on cost to deliver the service.

4.4 There were **757** responses to the question asking,

c) **Whether responders' felt it is proportionate to charge a penalty of £100 for each 24-hour period or part thereof when a boat overstays a designated visitor mooring.**

- 343 of the responses or **45.3%** said Yes they supported the proposal to charge a penalty of £100 for each 24-hour period when a boat overstays a designated visitor mooring and
- 414 of the responses or **54.7%** said No they didn't support the proposal to charge a penalty of £100 for each 24-hour period when a boat overstays a designated visitor mooring

The findings support the recommendation that the penalty charge is reduced to £50.

4.5 There were **749** responses to the question asking,

d) **Whether responders' would support mooring fees being based on length of vessel**

- 363 of the responses or **48.5%** said Yes they would support mooring fees being based on length of vessel and
- 386 of the responses or **51.5%** said No they didn't support mooring fees being based on length of vessel

The findings support the recommendation that RML fees are based on length of vessel and for simplicity replicate the Cam Conservators tariffs and categories.

4.6 There were **736** responses to the question asking,

e) **Whether responders' would support additional charges for wide beam vessels**

- 408 of the responses or **55.4%** said Yes they would support additional charges for wide beam vessels and

- 328 of the responses or **44.6%** said No they didn't support additional charges for wide beam vessels

The findings do not support the recommendation that there is no change at this time. Given the limited space and demand for moorings, charging by length is the fairest option.

4.7 There were **697** responses to the question asking,

f) **Whether responders' support the ending of temporary permissions to moor at Riverside and to move all boats moored offering alternative moorings elsewhere in Cambridge (to those which have registered and are regulated by the City Council and have people living aboard).**

- 186 of the responses or **26.7%** said Yes they would support the ending of temporary permissions to moor at Riverside and to move all boats moored offering alternative moorings elsewhere and
- 511 of the responses or **73.3%** said No they didn't support the ending of temporary permissions to moor at Riverside and to move all boats moored offering alternative moorings elsewhere

The findings do not support the recommendation however where technically feasible and financially justifiable adaptations are made at Riverside to support mooring, therefore negating the need to find alternatives for those on the Regulated Waiting List.

4.8 There were **677** responses to the question asking,

g) **Whether responders' believe the proposal to offer alternative moorings if temporary permissions to moor at Riverside are ended is fair.**

- 211 of the responses or **31.2%** said Yes they believe proposal to offer alternative moorings if temporary permissions to moor at Riverside are ended is fair and

- 466 of the responses or **68.8%** said No they didn't believe the proposal to offer alternative moorings if temporary permissions to moor at Riverside are ended is fair.

The findings do not support the recommendation, however those on the Regulated Waiting List are offered alternatives.

4.9 There were **731** responses to the question asking,

h) **Whether responders' support the designation of the Riverside Wall as a 'no mooring zone' through the powers of the Cam Conservator.**

- 204 of the responses or **27.5%** said Yes they support the designation of the Riverside Wall as a 'no mooring zone' through the powers of the Cam Conservator.
- 530 of the responses or **72.5%** said No they don't support the designation of the Riverside Wall as a 'no mooring zone' through the powers of the Cam Conservator.

The findings support the recommendation not to pursue a no mooring zone at this time

4.10 There were **649** responses to the question asking,

i) **Whether responders' support the introduction of a revised enforcement policy with powers delegated to Council officers.**

- 417 of the responses or **64.25%** said Yes they support the introduction of a revised enforcement policy with powers delegated to Council officers.
- 252 of the responses or **35.75%** said No they don't support the introduction of a revised enforcement policy with powers delegated to Council officers.

The findings support the recommendation to write and implement a revised enforcement policy.

4.11 There were **669** responses to the question asking,

j) **Whether responders’ support the current location numbers and type of mooring berths being appropriate as the permanent number and type**

- 472 of the responses or **70.55%** said Yes the current location numbers and type of mooring berths are appropriate as the permanent number and type and
- 197 of the responses or **29.45%** said No they don’t feel the current location numbers and type of mooring berths are appropriate as the permanent number and type

The findings support the recommendation of no change.

4.12 There were **695** responses to the question asking,

k) **Whether responders’ support a future reduction in the overall length of riverbank provided and number of mooring berths?**

- 155 of the responses or **22.3%** said Yes they would support a future reduction in the overall length of riverbank provided and number of mooring berths and
- 540 of the responses or **77.7%** said No they didn’t support a future reduction in the overall length of riverbank provided and number of mooring berths.

The findings support the recommendation of no change.

4.13 There were **567** responses to the question asking,

l) **Would you support a temporary increase in the number of Residential Mooring Licences from 70 to accommodate those displaced from Riverside? Licences would not be issued to the waiting list until the number of licences returns to and drops below 70.**

- 273 of the responses or **48.15%** said Yes they would support a temporary increase in the number of Residential

Mooring Licences from 70 to accommodate those displaced from Riverside and

- 294 of the responses or **51.85%** said No they didn't they would not support a temporary increase in the number of Residential Mooring Licences from 70 to accommodate those displaced from Riverside.

The findings support the recommendation of no change, however the City Council may need to use available Licences to support those displaced from the Regulated Waiting list at Riverside.

4.14 There were **652** responses to the question asking,

m) **Whether responders' support the Council's position not to establish winter mooring sites?**

- 388 of the responses or **59.5%** said Yes they would support the Council's position not to establish winter mooring sites and
- 264 of the responses or **40.5%** said No they wouldn't support the Council's position not to establish winter mooring sites?

The findings support the recommendation that no winter moorings are created.

4.15 There were **664** responses to the question asking,

n) **Whether responders' support the waiting list remaining closed to new applicants for the foreseeable future**

- 299 of the responses or **45%** said Yes they the waiting list remaining closed to new applicants for the foreseeable future and
- 365 of the responses or **55%** said No they wouldn't support the waiting list remaining closed to new applicants for the foreseeable future

The findings support the recommendation that waiting lists remain closed to avoid raising expectations at this time, and reopened when there is less than an 18 month waiting period.

4.16 There were **636** responses to the question asking,

o) **Whether responders' support those regulated moorings displaced at Riverside being offered Residential Mooring Licences on the Regulated Moorings elsewhere before those on the waiting list to assist those who may be impacted by any decision to remove moorings from Riverside.**

- 272 of the responses or **42.8%** said Yes they support those regulated moorings displaced at Riverside being offered Residential Mooring Licences on the Regulated Moorings elsewhere before those on the waiting list to assist those who may be impacted by any decision to remove moorings from Riverside.
- 364 of the responses or **57.2%** said No they wouldn't support those regulated moorings displaced at Riverside being offered Residential Mooring Licences on the Regulated Moorings elsewhere before those on the waiting list to assist those who may be impacted by any decision to remove moorings from Riverside.

The findings do not support the recommendation however, the City Council may need to use available Licences to support those displaced from the Regulated Waiting list at Riverside.

4.17 There were **629** responses to the question asking,

p) **Whether responders' support those regulated moorings possibly displaced at Riverside being added to the waiting list in chronological order based on evidence of first occupancy at Riverside**

- 247 of the responses or **39.3%** said Yes they support those regulated moorings possibly displaced at Riverside being added to the waiting list in chronological order based on evidence of first occupancy at Riverside.
- 382 of the responses or **60.7%** said No they wouldn't

support those regulated moorings possibly displaced at Riverside being added to the waiting list in chronological order based on evidence of first occupancy at Riverside.

The findings support the recommendation of no change.

4.18 Age of Respondents

The following table details the age profile of respondents

| Age | Number | Percentage % |
|--------------|---------------|---------------------|
| 15–19 | 7 | 1.13 |
| 20–24 | 25 | 4.05 |
| 25–29 | 56 | 9.08 |
| 30–34 | 70 | 11.35 |
| 35–39 | 80 | 12.97 |
| 40–44 | 79 | 12.80 |
| 45–49 | 59 | 9.56 |
| 50–54 | 78 | 12.64 |
| 55–59 | 46 | 7.46 |
| 60–64 | 48 | 7.78 |
| 65–69 | 40 | 6.48 |
| 70–74 | 19 | 3.08 |
| 75–79 | 8 | 1.30 |
| 80–84 | 2 | 0.32 |
| Total | 617 | 100% |

The information has been considered in the Equalities Impact Assessment that supports the Strategy and Resources Committee report.

4.19 Respondents interests?

| Response | Number | Percentage % |
|---|---------------|---------------------|
| Live on a boat in Cambridge | 51 | 7.62 |
| Would like to live on a boat in Cambridge | 35 | 5.23 |
| Live in Cambridge and have an interest in Mooring | 60 | 8.97 |
| Live in Cambridge and have a an interest in other uses of the River | 163 | 24.36 |
| Live in Cambridge and offer a view | 228 | 34.08 |
| Live Outside of Cambridge and have an interest in mooring | 23 | 3.44 |
| Live Outside of Cambridge and have an interest in other uses of the River | 21 | 3.14 |
| Live Outside of Cambridge and offer a view | 34 | 5.08 |
| Represent the interests of a local group or organisation | 5 | 0.75 |
| Prefer not to disclose | 49 | 7.32 |
| Total | 669 | 100% |

The information has been considered in the Equalities Impact Assessment that supports the Strategy and Resources Committee report.

5. Items that arose during the consultation

5.1 During the consultation period Council Officer's responded to a range of Freedom of Information request as follows:-

- a) A request for the Councils benchmarking data;
- b) All payments made to the Cam Conservators since 2011;
- c) Details of any and all complaints or comments made to the City Council or Cam Conservators regarding any aspect of residential boats, moorings and licencing on the River Cam;
- d) Details of any communications between Cambridge City Council and the Cam Conservators regarding any aspects of residential boats, moorings or licencing on the River Cam;
- e) Details of any research carried out to investigate any changes in the type, quantity and/or frequency of occurrence of different uses of the River Cam over time in the last 10 years;
- f) Details of any impact assessments carried out into the potential social aspects of any changes to the current system of residential mooring licencing on the River Cam;
- g) What process and what data were used to determine that the mooring sites by the railings on Riverside were unsafe?;
- h) What cost analysis was done to consider options for providing safe access to mooring sites on the railings on Riverside?;
- i) What is the legal basis and the policy document which provides the basis for the claim that there are illegally moored vessels on the railings on Riverside?
- j) Which stakeholders are going to be sent an invitation to complete the consultation about moorings, and how will the decision be made to decide which of the responses to the consultation are from eligible stakeholders?;
- k) Correspondence between Cambridge City Council and Dewar Stuart Associates relating to the original proposal document of May 2016;
- l) The proposal document sent to Dewar Stuart Associates by Cambridge City Council, May 2016.

- m) Correspondence relating to the review of the river moorings policy between Cambridge City Council and Dewar Stuart Associates; and
- n) Any documents prepared for Cambridge City Council relating to the review of the river moorings policy by Dewar Stuart Associates.

5.2 Officer also responded to the following direct questions

5.21 A request for clarification on Council Tax liability prompted by a poster campaign that drew comparisons on price increases with a change from Council Tax Band A to F has been addressed in the River Moorings Policy recommendations.

5.2.2 A question as to why the capital spend set aside for Moorings was not used?

In the Budget Setting Round 2013, a request was made by Officers for a Capital release of £75k to be set aside for Adaptations to Riverside Banks (SC561 – 38190). This request related to the forecast decision in October 2013 that the Executive Councillor for Public Places would agree at Environment Scrutiny Committee to instructed Officers to pursue:-

- *Option 2: Permit mooring on Riverside wall, but not where the river is narrowest;*
- *Option 3: Ban mooring on Riverside wall, and relocate Riverside craft to other locations on the river;*

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places instructed Officers on the 11th July 2014 to pursue option 2, using a scheme of regulation whilst Officers continued the review of the Moorings Policy. No capital spend was required for this decision

In 2015 a review of all capital schemes was undertaken and those which were not ready to be carried out were moved to a PUD (Projects under Development) list at Full Council on

25 February 2016 (bottom of page 34 of 109 BSR 2016 link below) following a recommendation from the Capital Programme Board in November 2015. This happened to the river bank scheme as there was no likely project to undertake at that time and other more urgent capital items required funding. This funding would not have been used to fund revenue items. Future Riverside adaptations bids were not precluded by this decision.

6. Overall Observations

- a) Overall the majority of respondents support the proposal to have a modest annual increase in annual licence fees. (81.5% support).
- b) Overall the majority of respondents do not support an increase in baseline fees being brought in line with current providers providing similar facilities elsewhere in the country. (78.8% do not support).
- c) Overall a small majority of respondents (55%) feel it is inappropriate to charge a penalty of £100 for each 24-hour period or part thereof when a boat overstays a designated visitor mooring.
- d) Overall the respondents are split (48%/52%) on whether responders' would support mooring fees being based on length of vessel.
- e) Overall the majority of respondents would support additional charges for wide beam vessels. (55% support).
- f) Overall the majority of respondents' do not support the ending of temporary permissions to moor at Riverside and to move all boats moored offering alternative moorings elsewhere in Cambridge. (73% do not support).
- g) Overall the majority of respondents' do not believe the proposal to offer alternative moorings if temporary permissions to moor at Riverside are ended are fair. (69% do not support).
- h) Overall the majority of respondents' do not support the designation of the Riverside Wall as a 'no mooring zone' through the powers of the Cam Conservator. (73% do not support).

- i) Overall a small majority of respondents' support the introduction of a revised enforcement policy with powers delegated to Council officers. (64% support).
- j) Overall the majority of respondents support the current location numbers and type of mooring berths being appropriate as the permanent number and type. (71% support).
- k) Overall the majority of respondents' do not support a future reduction in the overall length of riverbank provided and number of mooring berths. (78% do not support).
- l) Overall the respondents are split (48%/52%) on whether they support a temporary increase in the number of Residential Mooring Licences from 70 to accommodate those displaced from Riverside?
- m) Overall a small majority of respondents' support the Council's position not to establish winter mooring sites? (60% support).
- n) Overall the respondents are split (45%/55%) on whether they would or wouldn't support the waiting list remaining closed to new applicants for the foreseeable future.
- o) Overall a small majority of respondents' (57%) wouldn't support those regulated moorings displaced at Riverside being offered Residential Mooring Licences on the Regulated Moorings elsewhere before those on the waiting list to assist those who may be impacted by any decision to remove moorings from Riverside.
- p) Overall the majority of respondents' do not support those regulated moorings possibly displaced at Riverside being added to the waiting list in chronological order based on evidence of first occupancy at Riverside. (61% do not support).

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 The online survey approach provided the opportunity for a wide range of people to provide feedback on the council's proposals, however this methodology is self-selecting; participants are free to choose whether or not to participate and invariably it is those with the strongest views (either positive or negative) that choose to do so. As such the use of the data for quantitative data is unreliable. The data is influenced by campaign and this was identified in the responses collected.
- 7.2 Responses to self-selection surveys and consultations are usually non-representative of the wider area, typically with greater levels of response received from older residents (55+) and from women. Those less likely to participate in self-selection surveys are busy workers with families and younger residents (under 35's – and particularly men in this age band).
- 7.3 From the consultation responses officers have identified greater levels of response from those aged 35 to 54 compared to the City population estimate. There is also a greater response from those with an interest in river activities (53%) than Cambridge residents (34%).
- 7.4 The consultation data does, however, provide excellent qualitative data and has allowed officers to consider a range of opinions and feedback when formulating policies.
- 7.5 The response to the consultation has been comprehensive with responses from individual boat owners and organisations with an interest in the residential, visitor, commercial, leisure and sporting use of the river.
- 7.6 The consultation has indicated that there are a wide range of views, agendas and ambitions, which the consultees would like to see delivered. In many cases the views expressed are from the perspective of individuals and stakeholder groups rather than a

consensus on the specifics of what needs to be done to resolve the current situation.

- 7.7 The majority of those consulted agree that improvements have to be made to resolve current conflicts, develop integrated management solutions and minimise the impact of those aspects, which are likely to continue to cause further problems if left unresolved.
- 7.8 The Council needs to finalise its ambitions and proposals for the areas it operates as licenced and visitor moorings to take account of its statutory and regulatory responsibilities, the needs of boat owners and to ensure the effective management of the moorings to deliver the widest range of benefits to user groups.
- 7.9 The key areas which need to be determined during the development of an updated policy and management arrangements have been identified as follows.
- Identification and finalisation of current riverbank areas and mooring permissions;
 - Policy issues and management arrangements for licenced moorings in particular those areas which are being used for residential purposes and may not be complying with regulations;
 - Resolution of areas currently used for illegal mooring including management recommendations;
 - Updating and agreement of mooring charges for all categories of moorings;
 - Development of an enforcement policy, code of practice and management arrangements for boats in breach of mooring policy. (Compliant with Cambridge City Council, Enforcement Policy 2014); and
 - Preparation of an updated River Moorings Policy to reflect changed requirements and agreed consultation outcomes.

Appendix A - Copy of Consultation document

Revised Moorings Management Policy 2017-2023 Consultation



Consultation Process

Cambridge City Council is in the process of reviewing its River Moorings Policy. The City Council is considering a series of changes to the current policy with the intention of a revised policy being finalised and published during 2017.

We have identified a number of options which could be realised and wish to engage with those with an interest in mooring on the River Cam, and the wider community with an interest in the river.

You can respond to this consultation in several different ways:

- We encourage you to respond using this electronic form; or if you wish you can
- Request a paper version of the questionnaire by contacting us on **01223 457200**
- Send us an email, moorings@cambridge.gov.uk, telling us your views
- Write to us at **Moorings Management Policy, Streets and Open Spaces Team, Cambridge City Council, Mill Road, Cambridge CB1 2AZ**

The consultation is open to anyone who wants to take part, is completely confidential and anonymous. We will be engaging directly with representative groups known to have an interest in the river during the consultation period.

Format of Consultation Questions

Each item has been provided with an outline explanation of the key points for consideration and why the City Council considers that they would benefit from a revised policy focus.

At the end of each introductory section, options have been provided for which we would welcome your response. In some cases, where more than one option can be considered, a range has been provided.

Please respond by 5pm on the 20th January 2017 to ensure that your opinions are included in our analysis.

Once we have everyone's comments, we will produce a report summarising the views we received for consideration as part of the finalisation of the updated Moorings Management Policy.

Once the updated Moorings Management Policy is approved it will remain in place for a five year period between 2017 and 2022.

Introduction

A number of factors which will influence the future policy direction have been identified by river users, stakeholders, local residents and the City Council. These include: increasing demand for visitor and long term licenced mooring locations, potential conflict between mooring boats and other river users such as rowing clubs, angling organisations and commercial operators such as punting as the user demand on the river and environs steadily increases.

Research undertaken by the Cam Conservators has, for example, indicated that in comparison to other waterways the River Cam had a crowded water space with over 1000 craft in a 14 mile stretch of river; this gave a density per mile of almost 6 times that of East Anglian waterways. Similarly, the research indicated that in the last 20 years that rowing had increased by 148% within the River Cam to approximately 3,000 participants and moored boats increased from almost nil to ~120.

Residents whose properties overlook and/or are adjacent to the river have raised concerns over a number of years about the way in which the City Council operates and manages its mooring sites, particularly enforcement against vessels moored without consent, overstays and subletting.

The demand for licenced moorings (12 month duration) far outstrips the availability of City Council moorings and this is likely to continue at the same level or increase if the current interest in boat dwelling continues.

The principal responsibility of the City Council is to ensure the safe, responsible and proportionate use of its areas of riverbanks where mooring is permitted, and in furtherance of its statutory duties and responsibilities, where appropriate. Most importantly, the City Council must work in partnership and with due adherence to the role and responsibilities of the Cam Conservators as the statutory navigation authority for the River Cam.

The Council and the Cam Conservators have for some time been concerned about the mooring of boats without safe and proper access, notably along Riverside. The Council has registered boats to provide regulation pending this review. We are now consulting on a revised Moorings Policy, including a proposed No Moorings policy for Riverside, and are keen to hear views on how such a policy can be introduced with regard to the welfare of current residents.

We are also consulting on the implementation of a proportionate and proactive enforcement policy. We are keen to hear views on how changes can be made to any policy that will propose a fair, proportionate and proactive enforcement mechanism to remove illegal mooring and ensure that any new illegally moored vessels are quickly removed.

The City Council has previously conducted a number of consultation exercises to gauge the views, ideas and opinions of a wide range of organisations, representative bodies, individual boat owners, residents and members of the wider community in recent years.

Most recently in 2015, when the Council proposed a policy for control of visitor moorings based on a Fixed Penalty Notice Model.

The development of the updated policy has taken account of the views previously expressed by consultees and has, where appropriate, incorporated these into the revised proposals.

River and Riverside Activities and Functions

The River Cam provides an extremely important and valuable natural asset within the heart of Cambridge City Centre, adding to the value of the locality in a number of ways, ranging from the biodiversity of the natural environment through to the commercial benefits realised from tourism and leisure activities. Although the primary purpose of the moorings policy is to ensure the effective provision and management of the moorings provided by the City Council it also needs to reference the wider benefits and values of the river for a range of functions and activities. These include:

- The value of the River Cam as a blue corridor connecting a pattern of biodiverse, historic and recreational green infrastructure within the City;
- Hosting a range of river borne and river related active leisure pursuits including rowing, punting, events, visitor cruises, recreational boating and angling;
- Provision of a safe and accessible traffic free towpath for walkers, runners and cyclists which connects the city in an environmentally sustainable way;
- Providing high quality visitor and tourism attractions which can be accessed by visitors at a number of ability levels from quiet enjoyment through to challenging physical activity; and
- Providing a variety of on-line moorings for visitor and residential moorings.

Social Rented Sector: Residential Moorings Considerations

Through previous consultation exercises relating to moorings issues a number of comments and statements have been put forward which would imply that there is a perceived linkage between Cambridge City Council's social housing policy and its provision/allocation of residential mooring licences.

Whilst some residential boat owners have purchased their vessel and sought residential moorings in order to reduce their housing costs in comparison to land based dwellings, this is not equivalent to social housing.

The Council does not own or intend to own any residential boats for rental, all boats in receipt of an annual licence are privately owned rather than rented, and therefore outside the boundaries of any social housing considerations, in terms of housing need.

Moorings have hitherto been allocated on the basis of a waiting list and not from an assessment of housing need.

It should therefore be clear that the residential mooring licences provided by the City Council do not form part of its social housing policy.

The Council has a Housing Strategy and a Housing Allocation Policy as well as statutory duties relating to homeless persons, and works proactively with people who have housing needs. In the event that any boat owner should find themselves in a position in future where they required social housing consideration they would then apply to the Council or its social rented sector providers and their case would then be considered on its own merits against agreed allocation criteria. More information about social and affordable housing can be found at cambridge.gov.uk, or from the Housing Advice Team 01223 457918.

Background to the Current Policy

The Cambridge City Council, Moorings Management Policy 2010, was the first such policy prepared by the Council which had the intention of describing and itemising how moorings would be provided and managed. It stated a number of purposes including:

- To set out in a single location the different decisions and conclusions that had been reached over the previous fifteen years during which the Council had taken a more proactive role in managing moorings within Council ownership;
- To ensure safe enjoyment of the river and its banks for residents and visitor alike, both on land and on the water, and to ensure the protection of wildlife and the natural environment associated with the river; and
- To advise of the role of the Conservators of the River Cam as regulators of navigation through byelaws granted by The River Cam Conservancy Act 1922.

Options for Revised Policy Objectives

The proposed updated policy itemises principal changes which the Council is considering from its experience of operating the policy between 2010 and 2016, and changes which have occurred or become more of an issue in the intervening period. The overall aim is to establish a clear, fair policy that enables the Council to manage the its Moorings in a sustainable way which meet the needs of boat owners and mooring users, balanced with the recreational and residential needs of others.

Proposed Changes include:

- Mooring licence fees to be based on length of vessel;
- Benchmarking of fees and charges with other mooring providers;
- Visitor moorings to be managed via a Fixed Penalty Notice Model;
- Temporary mooring licences to be extinguished on Riverside Wall, and arrangements put in place to provide alternative moorings to regulated live-aboard vessels moored there; and
- Application of No Mooring Byelaws to be applied to Riverside Wall area.

Item 1: Mooring Fees and Charges - Annual Residential Licences

Recent benchmarking of fees and charges between Cambridge City Council and a range of other mooring providers indicates that Cambridge charges considerably less than other providers for annual (12 month) licences. The benchmarking exercise also factored in the variation in associated services and facilities provided as part of the mooring licence fee and/or available for an additional fee by the various providers. In most cases, particularly at Marina sites and offline (i.e. out of navigable river channel) moorings the services and facilities were of a greater range than those provided by Cambridge City Council. However, the provider which was the most equivalent to the City Council in terms of mooring type and services was charging a fee twice that of the Council.

Appendix B – River Moorings Policy 2017 – 2023 Consultation Summary Report

Therefore, in terms of being able to charge a mooring licence fee which is closer to that of other providers the Council wishes to consider a number of options and seeks views on what would be most acceptable to the majority of the community. Broadly the options would be for the Council;

- to hold fees at the same baseline level increased each year by the Consumer Price Index, inflation or similar ratio,
- substantially increase fees by a baseline adjustment to bring them in line with other providers or

The income received from licence fees is used to pay for the operational costs of the service and to make a contribution to the broader services provided by the Council to people living within the City. For the Council to be able to consider investing in improving mooring facilities a higher level of income is needed from the fees for licences.

Option 1.1: Hold fees at the current baseline level increased annually by Retail Price Index or similar.

Do you consider that annual licences fees would best be held at current levels with a modest annual increase determined by inflation or similar measures?

Yes No

If not, why?

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?

Yes No

An appropriate percentage would be:

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

Yes No

If so, what are they?

Item 2: Mooring Fees and Charges - Visitor Moorings

Cambridge City Council took a committee decision to manage visitor moorings through a Fixed Penalty Notice Model approach in March 2016 with the intention to fully install this model for operational and enforcement purposes during the fiscal year 2017/2018.

It was agreed by Committee that there would be no charge for visitor moorings provided that a maximum mooring period of 48 hours and no return to the mooring within 7 calendar days was complied with.

To ensure the effective management and enforcement of the visitor moorings, it was considered that a penalty charge should be applied to those who overstay the permitted times on the visitor moorings or return within a period of less than 7 days.

The penalty charge needs to be set at a sufficient enough level to act as a deterrent and to cover the costs of enforcing the management arrangements. For example, East Cambridgeshire District Council has set the penalty charge at £100.00 for each overstay period of 24 hours or part thereof, and this has demonstrably reduced the number of those overstaying on visitor moorings. It is therefore recommended that Cambridge City Council set an equivalent level of penalty charge.

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?

Yes No

If not, what level of charge would you support?

Item 3: Differential Pricing by Vessel Length and/or Beam (Width)

Cambridge City Council currently charges a single licence fee irrespective of boat length or width (beam). Comments from previous consultation indicates that this has been perceived as being unfair by owners of shorter vessels who have to pay the same fee but occupy less mooring space on the bankside. They have cited that other mooring facilities charge by boat length rather than a fixed fee.

The same argument has been raised in the case of wide beam vessels which occupy a greater area of water than narrow beam boats of equivalent length and therefore more should be charged for these vessels.

There is however less support for this latter proposal as this does not appear to be applied as a cost criterion by other mooring providers. 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.

The 2016 benchmarking exercise in comparison to other providers indicates that the majority of other providers base their charges on the length of vessel. It is therefore recommended that Cambridge should adopt a pricing policy based on length of boat. This will have the added benefit of reducing the total area required for mooring (or increasing the number of moorings available) if shorter boats were encouraged as a result of the revised pricing policy.

That an additional charge based on beam should not be applied at this stage but should be reviewed if future benchmarking exercises indicate that other providers are basing their charges on this criterion.

Option 3.1: Mooring fees to be based on length of vessel.

Do you support this change?

Yes No

If not, why?

Option 3.2: Additional charges for wide beam vessels not to be applied at this stage.

Do you support this proposal?

Yes No

If not, why?

Item 4: Riverside Wall Moorings

The County Council until early 2012 was believed to be the owner of land at Riverside.

There is evidence that supported a claim, that the City Council is in fact the riparian owner.

The successful claim to register an interest in/ or ownership of the land at Riverside (Title no. CB368081, dated 17 Feb 2012) with the Land Registry by the City Council allows the Council to consider how it wishes to manage this land and regulate any moorings or any other activities.

The area is not covered by Cam Conservator byelaws and this has permitted the area to be occupied by a number of vessels for a substantial period of time. Now this area is known to be within the ownership of the City Council it is imperative that the issues within this area are effectively resolved.

Appendix B – River Moorings Policy 2017 – 2023 Consultation Summary Report

The Council previously consulted on the issues at Riverside Wall. The consultation received 32 responses from stakeholder groups and in excess of 500 individual responses from boat owners, residents and leisure users. There were a number of valid issues, concerns and suggestions raised by respondents and this serves to illustrate the complexity of dealing with a number of bodies with competing views and agendas. However, the overriding factor from the City Council's perspective is the need to address, as soon as practicable, the identified health and safety concerns arising from the unsuitability of the site for mooring purposes.

These are principally:

1. The lack of suitable boat mooring points, with boat owners currently mooring on the guard rail which separates the river from the highway;
2. The lack of safe access for those embarking and disembarking from vessels which currently requires boat owners to climb from their vessel onto and then over the railing adjacent to the highway and perform a similar exercise in reverse when returning to their vessel;
3. 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.

Since the last consultation, the Council has carried out feasibility work to consider what options might be available to make the site safe for mooring vessels.

This has included the consideration of the use of floating pontoons combined with steps/stairs to then take people safely from the pontoon at bank level up to the pavement at ground level: however, this would reduce the navigation width of the river at that point to an unacceptable level. The wall was designed and built prior to mooring and it is not therefore designed to specifically take the weight loading of moored vessels and for these reasons the Cam Conservators have indicated that a request for permission to install pontoon access with mooring points would be refused as it would, coupled with the fact that the Environment Agency have indicated that in principle they would be likely to support the view of the Cam Conservators, in opposing the proposal.

There is no safe access to and from moored vessels and the adjoining bank at a higher level and no acceptable access solution which would not reduce the river to a width which endangered navigation and therefore would not be permitted. Therefore the Council has concluded that the vessels mooring in this area need to be removed as soon as practicable.

The Council is also considering the option of requesting that the Cam Conservators designate the Riverside Wall area as a 'No Mooring Zone' to facilitate the prevention of illegal mooring reoccurring after the site has been cleared.

In addition to the health and safety issues, damage to the railings has been caused by people moving materials and belongings over them to and from moored boats with consequential costs to the council in repairs to the railings.

Appendix B – River Moorings Policy 2017 – 2023
Consultation Summary Report

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?

Yes No

If not, why?

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?

Yes No

If not, why, or do you have any suggestions as to how this process should best be managed?

Option 4.3: Designate Riverside Wall as a 'no mooring zone' through the powers of the Cam Conservator.

Do you support this proposal?

Yes No

If not, why?

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

Yes No

If so, what are they?

Item 5: Enforcement Policy Development with Delegated Powers

Previous consultation indicated a level of dissatisfaction with the way in which the Council managed its mooring sites, particularly in terms of illegally moored vessels or those failing to comply with the terms and condition of the mooring licence. It is therefore considered that a number of areas of Moorings Management would benefit from an updated and integrated enforcement policy which would permit consistent and transparent action to be taken within an agreed framework. The primary purpose would be to communicate and facilitate the ability of the Council to take proportionate action when illegal mooring or licence transgressions occurred.

The Enforcement Policy for Moorings would be aligned within the Council's Corporate Enforcement Policy to ensure consistency of approach and alignment with the core purpose and objectives of the Council.

A principal of the enforcement activity would be that of punitive action and resort to the Civil Courts, (for example, eviction notices or possession orders) would only be triggered after attempts at voluntary compliance with the mooring management requirements, had been unsuccessful.

The process for voluntary compliance with regulations would be itemised within the policy with defined timescales for responses to prevent delay or cases dragging on before action was started. This would have the added benefit of defining the delivery expectations of the policy, by itemising the series of actions which had to be taken after a trigger event had occurred. This would include process mapping so that staff with responsibility for applying the policy would clearly understand the steps and stages to be followed.

The enforcement process would define the responsibilities and contact details of individual officers and service units within the Council, such as Streets & Open Spaces, Enforcement Officers and Legal Services. This would also assist in preventing local interpretation and reduce the discretion to give cases a lower priority against other workload demands or to make individual arrangements with transgressors which didn't comply with fair and transparent processes.

By setting time scales for the completion of each stage, combined with a series of standard letters and forms the administration of the process will be simplified and more efficient.

A similar approach will be prepared for Civil Court proceedings with expected response times to map the outline of the process.

The same will be produced for the action required by the Council to expedite, communicate and enforce court decisions.

The effective delivery of the enforcement process will, dependent on the extent and numbers of proceedings need a level of dedicated staff resources to be committed. Financial resources will also have to be committed to pay court costs and for removal of abandoned or possessed vessels should that prove necessary. In the latter case some or all of the costs may be recovered from the scrappage value of the vessel.

It is recommended that the management and delivery of the process is structured through a system of delegated powers whereby appropriately experienced officers would deliver the process without further recourse to Committee. Final approval to proceed in an individual case would be signed off by a senior council officer.

For the revised enforcement policy to be successful it is important that the various sections of the Council who would be required to deliver the policy are involved in its preparation and development and that they make the required commitment of staff and resources for delivery.

It is anticipated that once the new policy is in place and current enforcement cases are cleared that the requirement for future enforcement action will be greatly reduced.

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?

Yes No

If not, why?

Item 6: Optimum Location/Number/Type of Mooring - Visitor, Licenced & Commercial

As has been confirmed by the previous River Cam moorings research reports, widespread consultation with stakeholder groups and individuals and the River Cam Conservators as the navigation authority and a key City Council partner, the River Cam has to accommodate a wide range of potentially competing demands, this covers both the waterway, bankside activities and the needs of residential and commercial property occupiers.

Similarly, the level of use of the river and environs for leisure activities has increased in recent years and there is a requirement to balance the level of activity to ensure that the quality and sustainability of the resource is not significantly reduced or irreparably damaged.

The Cam Conservators in permitting and licensing boats navigating and traversing the river have to ensure wherever practicable the health and safety of users of the river in the knowledge that the skill level and ability of waterway users will vary according to their experience. The frequency, type and volume of use at any particular time is likely to exacerbate the risk and likelihood of an accident occurring.

The need to manage potential conflict between different legitimate uses of the river and the bankside is also an important role for the City Council and its partners. The Cam Conservators continue to be consulted and fully involved in any decisions by the Council to increase or decrease moorings numbers and remove illegally moored vessels or unlicensed activities.

In general, all mooring facilities provided by CCC are considered to be at an optimum level and therefore there is no proposal to increase the availability of moorings within any of the three categories as part of the current policy review.

Appendix B – River Moorings Policy 2017 – 2023 Consultation Summary Report

This is in part due to the critical need to resolve the issue of unsafe moorings at Riverside Wall. When the number of regulated vessels moored at Riverside is added to the permitted visitor and licenced moorings, this exceeds the total level which the City Council and Cam Conservators consider that the river can reasonably accommodate, but an increase in moorings on commons could be considered as a temporary measure to facilitate regulated boats moving from Riverside. The health and safety risks at Riverside Wall are noted elsewhere within this consultation document.

When the totality of the differing viewpoints of stakeholders and individuals with an interest in the river is currently taken into account there would perhaps be an argument to support the future reduction of mooring berths to benefit the overall locality. This would include visual and view point opportunities, ecological and biodiversity considerations, facilitating river bank leisure pursuits such as angling.

The proposal is that the approved site locations, length of riverbank, number of licenced and commercial moorings will remain as follows.

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Visitor Moorings | 8/9 (depends on the size of the boats) |
| Licenced Moorings | 70 |
| Commercial Moorings | 4 |

It is proposed that this number of moorings is the appropriate number though some extra licenced moorings would be allowed on a temporary basis if it is decided that lived on boats currently registered to moor at Riverside be moved and offered alternative moorings.

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?

Yes No

If not, why?

Option 6.2: Future reduction in the extent and number of mooring berths provided.

Would you support a reduction in the overall length of riverbank provided and number of mooring berths?

Yes No

If not, why?

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

Yes No

If not, why?

Item 7: Provision of Winter Mooring Berths

The consideration of a request for winter moorings to be provided by the City Council was raised as part of the 2015 mooring consultation exercise. The proposal would be to create temporary mooring licences for a maximum of three months. Such licensing would run from October through to the end of March.

Although it was not specified in the consultation responses, the only area available would be on the areas currently utilised for 48-hour visitor moorings, on the basis that these would be quieter during the winter months.

In the case of other mooring providers, the use of winter moorings is to provide a home mooring for those categories of boat owners who would otherwise be classified for navigation and mooring purposes as continuous cruisers i.e. they continually traverse the waterway and temporarily moor during the spring and summer months rather than have a home mooring. Winter Moorings are therefore designed to provide a longer stay berth during the winter months when navigation is less attractive or more difficult due to weather conditions.

Council Officers and Cam Conservancy have considered the option of winter moorings and cannot identify what benefits this proposal would have, given the current issues and high level of demand for long stay licenced moorings.

Encouraging more boats into the locality during a traditionally quieter period for relatively long stays is likely to be counterproductive and increase pressure on the river and associated uses. The area(s) occupied by visitor moorings currently are some of the most scenic areas bordering residential areas and greenspace.

The currently reduced number of visitors during the winter months assists in the restoration of these areas by reducing environmental disturbance to the water course and river bank. This also provides the opportunity for essential maintenance to be carried out without having to relocate moored boats.

Whilst this would be the opportunity for increased income through the issuing of temporary winter licences at 25% of the 12-month licence fee, this would require additional staff resources to manage and administer the scheme and ensure that the duration, terms and conditions of the licence are enforced.

It is therefore recommended that winter moorings are not supported at this time.

Option 7.1: Establishment of short term licenced winter moorings.

Do you support the Council's position not to establish winter mooring sites?

Yes No

If not, why?

Item 8: Management of Waiting Lists

The Council has maintained waiting lists of those who met the eligibility criteria for annual mooring licences for a number of years. The waiting list had to be closed to new entrants in 2014 due to the level of demand and limited supply which indicated that it would take an unrealistically long time scale before the entire current list could be provided with a licence.

The waiting list has been managed on a chronological basis, that is, those who had been on the waiting list for the longest time were next in line for when a licence became available. Due to the limited number of licences surrendered each year, and as current licence holders had an almost automatic right of renewal providing they had adhered to the conditions of the licence in the previous 12 months, there was no realistic likelihood of the waiting list participants being accommodated within the medium to longer terms.

If no other changes are agreed to the current system of allocating annual mooring licences, it is proposed that the waiting list remain closed to new applicants for the foreseeable future and/or all those on the current waiting list have been allocated a mooring licence.

Option 8.1: Retention of closed waiting list

Do you support the waiting list remaining closed to new applicants for the foreseeable future?

Yes No

If not, why?

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

Do you support this?

Yes No

If not, why?

Option 8.3: Those regulated moorings possibly displaced at Riverside should be added to the waiting list in chronological order based on evidence of first occupancy at Riverside.

Do you support this?

Yes No

If not, why?

Option 9: Other Items

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?

Yes No

If so, what are they?

Equality Monitoring Form

Introduction

Why are we monitoring equality?

All services are familiar with the idea of monitoring performance, measuring how well the service is performing against agreed objectives and targets.

Equality monitoring is simply checking whether the service is performing well for all customers.

What are we going to do with the data?

The data provided in this questionnaire is strictly confidential and will only be used to make things better, tells us where to direct our services, if the services currently on offer are being used and if there are additional services required for a better future.

This is to make sure the Council is being fair and that people from all backgrounds are represented. The details you give are protected by strict laws.

Contact details:

If you would like this form in an alternative format ie larger font, brail, or need assistance, please contact: Cerise Bradford, Asset Development Officer on **01223 458203** or via email: cerise.bradford@cambridge.gov.uk

For further information on equality monitoring, please contact: Suzanne Goff, Strategy Officer, **01223 457174** or via email: Suzanne.goff@cambridge.gov.uk

Thank you for taking the time to complete the Equality Monitoring questions which follow.

Age

What age were you on your last birthday?

Do you have a long term medical condition/critical illness?

- Yes
- Yes, affecting mobility
- Yes, affecting hearing
- Yes, affecting vision
- Yes, a learning disability
- Yes, a mental ill-health
- No
- Prefer not to say
- Yes, another form of disability (please specify)

Gender

How would you describe your gender?

M F X

Interest

- Live on a boat in Cambridge
- Would like to live on a boat in Cambridge
- Live in Cambridge and have an interest in mooring
- Live in Cambridge and have an interest in other uses of the River
- Live in Cambridge and offer a view
- Live outside of Cambridge and have an interest in mooring
- Live outside of Cambridge and have an interest in other uses of the River
- Live outside Cambridge and offer a view
- Represent the interests of a local group or organisation
- Prefer not to disclose