
Green Spaces PSPO Survey 2023 - summary of results

Introduction

This survey opened on 18 February and sought to gather residents' views on whether we should introduce a new Public Space Protection Order to protect Elmbridge Borough Council-owned green spaces, countryside sites and riverside sites against:

1. The use of barbeques (BBQs), campfires, bonfires, fire pits and other activities that involve the lighting of fire
2. Unauthorised moorings along the river
3. Overnight camping along the river

For the consultation, the proposed PSPO sites were listed and shown on maps. They included:

1. All council-owned open spaces for PSPO relating to the use of naked flames and barbeques
2. For PSPO relating to unauthorised moorings:
 - a) Albany Reach, Ditton Reach and City Wharf (Thames Ditton)
 - b) Hurst Park Open Space (West Molesey)
 - c) Cigarette Island (East Molesey)
 - d) Cowey Sale Open Space (Walton-on-Thames)
 - e) Surrey County Council's land adjacent to Hampton Court bridge (Parrs mooring)
3. PSPO relating to overnight camping:
 - a) Albany Reach (Thames Ditton)
 - b) Cigarette Island (East Molesey)

Results

So far, we have received 642 responses coming from the following wards:


Thames Ditton	32%
Molesey	24%
Others	9%
Walton-on-Thames	8%
Weybridge	5%
Esher	4%
Hinchley Wood	4%



Elmbridge
Borough Council
... bridging the communities ...

Hersham	3%
Long Ditton	2%

And from the following groups:



In response to questions covering the various aspects of the proposed PSPO, responses were as follows (%):

When asked:

- 1- if the use of naked flames (campfires, bonfires, fire pits and other activities that involve the lighting of fire) on public open space presented an increased risk of wildfires in Elmbridge, 73% of respondents strongly agreed and 12% agreed**

Strongly agree	73
Agree	12
Neither agree or disagree	9
Strongly disagree	4
Disagree	2

- 2- if the use of barbeques on public open space presented an increased risk of wildfires in Elmbridge: 67% strongly agreed and 15% agreed**

Strongly agree	67
Agree	15
Neither agree or disagree	11
Strongly disagree	4
Disagree	3

- 3- if the littering and human waste resulting from overnight fishing/camping at Albany Reach and Cigarette Island open spaces caused problems for residents and visitors:

Strongly agree	77
Agree	10
Strongly disagree	6
Neither agree or disagree	5
Disagree	2

- 4- if the littering and human waste resulting from overnight fishing/camping at Albany Reach and Cigarette Island open spaces caused damage to the environment

Strongly agree	75
Agree	11
Neither agree or disagree	6
Strongly disagree	6
Disagree	2

- 5- if the littering and human waste resulting from overnight fishing/camping at Albany Reach and Cigarette Island open spaces caused problems for the council

Strongly agree	73
Agree	12
Strongly disagree	7
Neither agree or disagree	6
Disagree	2

- 6- if the littering resulting from vessels moored without permission on Elmbridge Borough Council-owned land at Ditton Reach, Albany Reach, Cigarette Island, Cowey Sale and Hurst Park and Surrey County Council's land adjacent to Hampton Court bridge (Parrs mooring) caused problems for residents and visitors

Strongly agree	76
Strongly disagree	11
Agree	9
Neither agree or disagree	3
Disagree	1

- 7- if the littering resulting from vessels moored without permission on Elmbridge Borough Council-owned land at Ditton Reach, Albany Reach, Cigarette Island, Cowey Sale and Hurst Park and Surrey County Council's land adjacent to Hampton Court bridge (Parrs mooring) caused damage to the environment

Strongly agree	76
Strongly disagree	11



Agree	9
Neither agree or disagree	3
Disagree	1

- 8- if the littering resulting from vessels moored without permission on Elmbridge Borough Council-owned land at Ditton Reach, Albany Reach, Cigarette Island, Cowey Sale and Hurst Park and Surrey County Council's land adjacent to Hampton Court bridge (Parrs mooring) caused problems for the council

Strongly agree	75
Strongly disagree	11
Agree	10
Neither agree or disagree	3
Disagree	1

- 9- if the noise pollution from vessels mooring without permission on Elmbridge Borough Council-owned land at Ditton Reach, Albany Reach, Cigarette Island, Cowey Sale and Hurst Park and Surrey County Council's land adjacent to Hampton Court bridge (Parrs mooring) caused problems for residents and visitors

Strongly agree	59
Agree	17
Neither agree or disagree	11
Strongly disagree	11
Disagree	2

- 10- The noise pollution from vessels mooring without permission on Elmbridge Borough Council-owned land at Ditton Reach, Albany Reach, Cigarette Island, Cowey Sale and Hurst Park and Surrey County Council's land adjacent to Hampton Court bridge (Parrs mooring) caused problems for the council

Strongly agree	59
Agree	16
Neither agree or disagree	13
Strongly disagree	11
Disagree	2

- 11- A Public Space Protection Order to ban barbeques (BBQs) on public open space was the best way to deal with the risk of wildfires and to prevent injuries to humans, wildlife and damage to natural habitats, Council Land, private dwellings and other property

Strongly agree	68
Agree	13
Neither agree or disagree	7
Strongly disagree	7
Disagree	4



12- A Public Space Protection Order to prevent the use of campfires, bonfires, fire pits and other activities that involve the lighting of fire or naked flames on public open space was the best way to deal with the risk of wildfires and to prevent injuries to humans, wildlife and damage to natural habitats, Council Land, private dwellings and other property

Strongly agree	72
Agree	12
Strongly disagree	7
Neither agree or disagree	6
Disagree	3

13- A Public Space Protection Order to prevent overnight fishing/camping at Albany Reach and Cigarette Island Open Spaces was the best way to protect the open spaces for all and to preserve them

Strongly agree	69
Agree	12
Strongly disagree	10
Neither agree or disagree	5
Disagree	3

14- A Public Space Protection Order to prevent mooring without permission on Elmbridge Borough Council-owned land at Ditton Reach, Albany Reach, Cigarette Island, Cowey Sale and Hurst Park and Surrey County Council's land adjacent to Hampton Court bridge (Parrs mooring) was the best way to protect these open spaces for all and to preserve them

Strongly agree	76
Strongly disagree	13
Agree	9
Neither agree or disagree	1
Disagree	1

15- If they felt that a Public Space protection order was appropriate to manage fishing/camping, did they think that the best option would be to:

Implement an order at Albany Reach and Cigarette Island Open Spaces to restrict fishing to daytime only (7am to 7pm)	46
Implement a late night curfew at Albany Reach and Cigarette Island open spaces requiring people to leave the park between 11pm and 5am.	34
Other	11



Elmbridge
Borough Council

... bridging the communities ...

Comments to 'Other option' in question 15:

Most frequent answers:

PSPO not appropriate	12 responses
Ban camping/fishing	8 responses
Deal with litter	7 responses
Respect right to access	5 responses
Enforce rules	4 responses
Anti-social behaviour	3 responses

Summary (total 57 responses) – full comments on pages 7 to 9

In response to Question 16 relating to further comments on the PSPO proposal, the top responses were related to the enclosed:

Most frequent answers:

Enforcement for littering	17
Criminalising boaters	15
No evidence of issues	10
PSPO to impose Restrictions to rights to access	10
Anti-social behaviour	9

Summary (total 72 responses)



Elmbridge
Borough Council
... bridging the communities ...

Question 15: Full comments:

If you feel that a Public Space protection order is not appropriate to manage fishing/camping, state your preferred other option other than a) Implement an order at Albany Reach and Cigarette Island Open Spaces to restrict fishing to daytime only 7am to 7pm or b) Implement a late night curfew at Albany Reach and Cigarette Island open spaces requiring people to leave the park between 11pm and 5am.

A PSPO is not appropriate to manage fishing/camping. People have the right to access public space for recreational purposes no matter what time. Having a park ranger on site on the other hand would easily be able to help ensure everyone is acting and behaving with respect to each other and the environment. It would also provide a good job opportunity for local people and could be based around education rather than exclusions.
A PSPO is never appropriate to manage a recreational space which is for the enjoyment of everyone at any time of day or night.
A PSPO is NOT appropriate to manage fishing or camping.
A pspo is not appropriate. People should have the right to access public space at all times of day.
A public space protection order is not appropriate
a Public Space protection order is not appropriate to manage fishing/camping,
A Public Spaces Protection Order is the wrong way to go about this
Above proposals need a feasibility study.
Any type of Public Space protection order is inappropriate and is the wrong solution
Ban camping completely - perhaps both of the above?
Ban camping, tents, fires, barbecues, mooring of boats, littering, men relieving themselves in the bushes, altogether.
Ban it completely
Both
Cowey Sale should be included here too
Don't manage, leave people alone
Enforce environmental rules
Enforce existing laws against littering, the number of illegally moored boats forces fishermen to congregate in the only areas left accessible.
Fishermen aren't usually an issue - it is the camping and the litter they leave that needs to be restricted.
Fishing should be OK but not camping for long periods of time
Fishing should not be allowed
I believe public access should be allowed with out restrictions at any time of day
I disagree with the use of a Public Space Protection Order
I do not think that a PSPO is appropriate. People have the right to access public space for recreational purposes no the time of day.
I don't see curfews as being necessary.
I work in a hospital and work late shifts. Now I can't walk my dog in the park... this doesn't work for me.



Elmbridge
Borough Council

... bridging the communities ...

Implement permits for overnight fishing/camping.
Implement routine safety patrol on Hurst Meadows to deter the anti-social behaviour I was plagued with last summer (selling drugs/climbing over my garden wall/defacating/urinating/shouting obscenities etc. And lots of portable BBQ right beside my property (I live on Hurst Park). Its been a nightmare and Im considering moving because of it.(Ive only been here less than a year)
In addition to restrict fishing to certain hours(7am-7pm) also implement fishing zones to avoid fishermen fishing on the water access areas.
It is not appropriate at all!
it is not appropriate to ban camping and fishing. littering is already an offence, at any time of day, and a blanket ban is disproportionate.
It should not be allowed
It's inappropriate
leave at 9 pm, can return at 6am
Manage the issue don't target people who enjoy the space and clean up after them
National rod license required, regular bailiff visits and max 48hr fishing with no return in 7 days.
No fishing
No fishing and no camping 24 hours.
No fishing on Albany reach at all, damage to environment, nesting birds and wildlife too great.
No I don't agree with it
None of the above
None of the above - a public space protection order would not enhance the public's ability to use and enjoy the open spaces,instead it would criminalise many innocent every day activities
Only implement for those proven to be breaking public order rules & causing littering/inappropriate behaviour
Or you could just add some facilities like a public toilet and some bins to enable people to spend their time there responsibly and safely.
Other – A PSPO is not appropriate to manage fishing/camping. People have the right to access public space for recreational purposes no matter what time of day it is
People should be allowed to fish on a summer evening and what about late night dog walkers?
prohibit camping/fishing on this public land.
Provide appropriate facilities so persons may relieve themselves and dispose litter. Oftentimes, the anglers are amongst the cleanest and most respectful of the environment. Each category of people have the same amount of troublemakers. We shouldn't restrict their use of the open spaces just to prioritise our particular needs. The areas are meant to be used...not abused nor restricted to walkers only.
restricting the times people either fish or moor in this space is seems restrictive. What matter what time of day it is. Aren't people allowed to have public access for recreational purposes whatever time it is?
Restrictions should also apply as stated above to Cowey Sale. Summer time night time noise is unacceptable at times, although this noise is often from cars rather than people fishing.
should be allowed to night fish and camp



Elmbridge
Borough Council

... bridging the communities ...

Sign asking to take litter home or risk fine
That use if the space should be allowed no matter what time it is
The council has not provided any evidence of the alleged Anti Social Behaviour related to fishing and camping
This is simply insane
total ban to allow the areas to be enjoyed by walkers and families without the mess left behind
Using existing laws to ensure lawful use of the space

Question 16 further comments on the PSPO proposal

Full comments as follows:

Yes. The Council has not provided any evidence to back up its claim that littering and noise are a problem on the river bank. If there is evidence of a problem with littering and noise then the Council already has the enforcement powers to deal with it. Any PSPO or other enforcement should specifically target littering and noise, not the action of simply mooring a boat. It is not a criminal offence to moor a boat. The Public Right of Navigation includes the right to moor for a reasonable time on the Thames. 'Reasonable' cannot be defined in advance. This is a draconian and oppressive proposal and should not be implemented. Boaters should not be criminalised for exercising their public right to navigate, including mooring. To prevent boats mooring creates safety risks in itself, especially in flood or extreme weather conditions. The proposed PSPO would create homelessness among boat dwellers, depriving them of a place to moor their homes. The proposed PSPO powers would target homeless or vulnerable people which local authorities are specifically prohibited from doing.

This is just so unimaginative, lazy and elitist. You have provided no evidence that it's moored boats causing the problem, in my experiences its almost always middle and upper class kids and young adults binge drinking and behaving obnoxiously that causes the problems like noise and littering - so why no call to ban booze?

This is like blaming immigrants for councils being underfunded - it's actually racist against the travelling community - and it's not even logical because the boating community is massively diverse. Open fires can be a problem, but only when we're in periods of drought, so any banning on bbqs should be entirely weather related! You could simply also start by posting signs - or introducing groundskeepers whose job is also encouraging the use of low flame and partially electric eco bbqs like Casus grill or LotusGrill if you're actually concerned about the environment. (though I have my doubts, this appears to be a manipulative effort to just enclose the space away from public access).

I am absolutely disgusted at this move to try to strip away one of the few joys citizens have left during a cost of living crisis simply because you've probably received a few complaints - or because you're looking to cut costs on staff who are currently collecting litter and working on the grounds. This is not a decent solution, it's callous and reactionary and as already shockingly lazy.



Elmbridge
Borough Council

... bridging the communities ...

If there's too much litter, host a litter collection with volunteers once a week - littering is a problem all over this country and the reason it's not been dealt with is because people like yourselves come up with lazy solutions rather than dealing with the root causes of the issues - which you're usually too prejudice to recognise what these actually are and far too easily look for a group of minority individuals with no power to blame.

Boating has a long history of travelling and mooring outside palaces including Hampton Court; instead of banning (like the book burners and crazed pitched for witch burners of our past) why not try to do something that show the educational level humanity has reached? Invite boaters in, create a cohesive community with events showcasing the history of boating - for example, invite boating artists to host events teaching Roses and Castles art - that's something that would encourage family fun activities and less binge drinking behaviours. <https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/enjoy-the-waterways/canal-history/history-features-and-articles/roses-and-castles-canal-folk-art>

Try positive reinforcement and community cohesion, not exclusionary tactics and out-of-date punish all for the actions of a few mentality.

A PSPO is NOT appropriate to manage boats moored allegedly without permission. They do have permission, the public right of navigation on the Thames entitles them to moor for a reasonable time. If there is a problem with noise or littering the Council and/or Police have more than adequate enforcement powers at their disposal. This is a draconian and oppressive proposal and should not be implemented. Boaters should not be criminalised for exercising their public right to navigate, including mooring. To prevent boats mooring creates safety risks in itself, especially in flood or extreme weather conditions. The proposed PSPO would create homelessness among boat dwellers, depriving them of a place to moor their homes. The proposed PSPO powers would target homeless or vulnerable people which local authorities are specifically prohibited from doing.

Any PSPO or other enforcement should specifically target littering and noise, not the action of simply mooring a boat. It is not a criminal offence to moor a boat. Boaters should not be criminalised for exercising their public right to navigate, including mooring.

The Public Right of Navigation includes the right to moor for a reasonable time on the Thames. 'Reasonable' cannot be defined in advance. This is a draconian and oppressive proposal and should not be implemented. Boaters should not be criminalised for exercising their public right to navigate, including mooring. The proposed PSPO would create homelessness among boat dwellers, depriving them of a place to moor their homes. The proposed PSPO powers would target homeless or vulnerable people which local authorities are specifically prohibited from doing.

I live itinerantly on a narrowboat. Every year we travel along the Thames and moor around Hampton Court East Molesey and that general area for a few months depending on river conditions. The proposed PSPO would have a severe adverse affect on my family's ability to live in our home. We need to be moored in each place for a reasonable time, two weeks as I get the train or bus to work most weekdays in west London. We are not rich, we cannot afford to get a mooring. This would unfairly penalise us. We do not make a noise, leave litter or behave anti-socially. We are



Elmbridge
Borough Council

... bridging the communities ...

<p>responsible boaters. This would make us criminals for the simple and essential act of living in our home with the secondary effect of making our homes uninhabitable and evicting us from the borough. This is quite wrong. The PSPO legislation does not allow councils to pick on homeless vulnerable people or make people homeless by passing a PSPO. The Council would be committing an unlawful act by doing this.</p>
<p>A PSPO/ ASB order is the wrong way to go about this. The consultation has not provided any real evidence of any of the above mentioned problems nor about the complainants. If the problems are real as opposed to perceived, the best solution would be for the Council to provide toilet, rubbish disposal and other facilities and moorings for anglers/ campers/ boaters/ live-on boaters, in the same way as local authorities in popular coastal areas do. Why has this positive, people-friendly solution not been considered?</p>
<p>The proposals would require efficient monitoring . Removal of illegally moored boats needs to be less mired in legal processes .a quick effective response is vital & long overdue</p>
<p>The reported behaviours that are causing problems are not those that are targeted by the proposed protection order. If an order is to be passed, it needs to target the behaviours that are actually the problem, namely littering and noise pollution - not fishing, camping or mooring. An order may need to target lighting fires, but in my experience the best way to prevent field etc fires is education and the provision of simple fire fighting equipment</p>
<p>The main element which will have a positive effect on protecting these spaces is banning overnight camping and illegal mooring. It would also be useful to restrict / specify the number of fishing points - in particular Albany Reach has become overrun with fishermen using entrypoints into the river which prevents other users safely accessing / enjoying the river.</p>
<p>Fishing is ok after 7pm e.g. on summer nights, so a 7pm-7am ban might be rather harsh. The unpleasant, and sometimes intimidating problems, are people setting up tents, thus establishing their personal territories and mooring of shabby, dubious boats and scuttling old ones. Also please ban the groups of men who congregate and get drunk and intimidate passers by on summer evenings who may like to stop and enjoy the public space. Please ban men urinating in the undergrowth, littering, leaving beer cans by the bins. Please ban fires, barbecues and limit damage to the grass. I have noticed that trees are not replaced when old ones are removed so please replant the trees - this should also help the local wildlife and deter overcrowding and aid recovery of the river bank.</p>
<p>I encourage the adoption of PSPO on all the areas listed as thus far these spaces are being abused by a few to the detriment of many. This should not be allowed to continue.</p>
<p>Please include Cowey Sale and the green space around Walton Bridge in the PSPO. Cowey Sale/under Walton Bridge suffers from late night (between 10.30pm-1am+) people in cars who have loud music, backfiring exhausts, and/or use nitrous oxide canisters. Apart from the noise at night, the following morning you can see the evidence of littered canisters along with usually fast food litter or Red bull cans that have also been left behind. Also a question - does this consultation include the boats that are moored in Desborough Cut on the Elmbridge side of the river? Many of those that are there have been there a long time now and create litter and parking issues along Walton Road (going towards Weybridge).</p>



Elmbridge
Borough Council

... bridging the communities ...

<p>Why are you blaming all people that camp and moor in these places? I moor in these places sometimes and I don't pollute or litter etc. You shouldn't blame a whole group, we aren't a social problem.</p>
<p>Don't just ban people but have a no litter no fire rule and enforce that</p>
<p>only that it needs to happen. The slum boats and unlicensed moorings should have been dealt with a long time ago. If these were illegally parked cars they would have been lifted, removed and crushed by now.</p>
<p>More late night public toilets</p>
<p>I do not believe that the council have shown any evidence to back up any claims that would warrant a PSPO being put in place.</p>
<p>A PSPO would criminalise the everyday domestic activities of people who live on boats who have nowhere else to moor their homes. This would be a breach of their rights under Articles 6 and 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights.</p>
<p>No. The council is joke in my opinion... there's got to be a better way to deal with the boats and fishermen. The main issue is kids in summer coming and leaving everything all over the place, maybe if the local police spent less time at the local petrol stations and more time in the park, it would help...</p>
<p>I am not particularly in favour of reducing the availability of mooring for those who are the most vulnerable or have a nomadic lifestyle within our society. Not everyone can afford to have a mooring. Better ability to monitor and prosecute those who litter /cause damage to public areas needs to be better enforced. It is only a few who do this - don't punish everyone who wants or needs to live a nomadic lifestyle or those who are most vulnerable. Many are considerate.</p>
<p>Yes, Hurst Park security needs to be sorted ASAP. My house looks on to the river and is an end-of-terrace, and not overlooked by anyone. So teens gather in the summer - drinking, swearing, foul language, urinate, defecate behind a very large weeping willow which hides them from public view (apart from me). They sell drugs and smoke weed blatantly. I am now scared living in this house, after less than one year since moving here. I'm considering moving now to get away from the harassment.</p>
<p>A problem that has also been caused by the fishermen is when they fish at the water access points (there are 3 main access areas at Albany reach), making it dangerous for people/dogs wanting to enter or exit the river.</p>
<p>Why is this even being discussed, I have seen areas already where there are no authorised overnight moorings and it is revolting, ruining the environment, making it dangerous for women to walk around solo or walk their dogs alone in those areas. Mark my words, if this is allowed, you will have a case of assault, rape or murder in the areas you allow this and the blood will be on the council's hands for allowing this.</p>
<p>Any issues with litter should be dealt with in a targeted manner using existing powers. Interfering with people's right to access nature and leisure and moor their boats for the actions of a few inconsiderate people is not a proportionate response.</p>
<p>No further feedback but it should be known that one mooring at the top of Albany reach is actually responsible for cleaning up and actively litter picks regularly to help residents. Unfortunately this is not the same for all. Also the fishing should be contained to a single area or not at all. Regularly you cannot access any point of the water during the summer due to a line of fisherman and tents. Fishing lines also cause an issue with those swimming or using water equipment such as kayaks and paddle boards as they reach out into the water. The litter leaving is horrendous and bins overflow regularly causing issues for wildlife and residents.</p>



Elmbridge
Borough Council

... bridging the communities ...

Blanket bans are stupid enforce and fine people who constantly break the rules and litter and cause issue but don't tarnish everyone with the same brush.
Provide bbq areas, more frequent refuse collections for dog waste and litter, especially summertime. Total ban of moored boats on Albany reach side.
No fishing at the riverside
Children can't feed the ducks or play in the water as fishing men take over the hole stretch along Albany Reach and along the river. They camp all day and night and leave rubbish everywhere for the council to have to clean up. The area is an absolute mess in summer with litter and bottles left along Thames Ditton beach as it is strangely now known on Google Maps!
Under these proposals, Three Men in a Boat would be fined £100s of pounds every day of their journey! These proposals would be laughable if they weren't so frightening. Where is the Freedom we voted to leave the EU for? Certainly not in Elmbridge, where you can't potter along the river, catching a few fish, cooking Irish stew on a camping stove and sleeping under the awning of your little boat at nights. Jerome K Jerome would be turning in his grave if he knew the awful restrictions on our Freedom being cooked up for the river he had so much fun on.
It's a sledgehammer to crack a nut
This is a terrible idea,public spaces protection orders would criminalise ordinary people,including people living on boats, carrying out everyday recreational and domestic activities. This would make people's boat homes uninhabitable and evict them from large areas in all but name. Just who are these terrible protection orders supposed to protect? Answer, only the very rich residents around there who think that the entire rive bank belongs to them. Not any ordinary people who do not have their own gardens, river frontages, moorings, private fishing and access to massieve acreages of land to use for their own recreation or domestic activities. Leave the ordinary people alone.
Seems unfair to stop those respecting the environment & nature - if an order had to be in place, think it should only be between 11pm-5am.
You should be ashamed of yourselves and your attitude towards what you deem as "other people". Access to green spaces should not be a luxury reserved only for your wealthy residents. If the council is having issues with "waste" maybe think about paying for some bins and facilities.
Yes. The Council has not provided any evidence to back up its claim that littering and noise are a problem on the river bank. If there is evidence of a problem with littering and noise then the Council already has the enforcement powers to deal with it. Any PSPO or other enforcement should specifically target littering and noise, not the action of simply mooring a boat. It is not a criminal offence to moor a boat. The Public Right of Navigation includes the right to moor for a reasonable time on the Thames. 'Reasonable' cannot be defined in advance. This is a draconian and oppressive proposal and should not be implemented. Boaters should not be criminalised for exercising their public right to navigate, including mooring. To prevent boats mooring creates safety risks in itself, especially in flood or extreme weather conditions. The proposed PSPO would create homelessness among boat dwellers, depriving them of a place to moor their homes. The proposed PSPO powers would target homeless or vulnerable people which local authorities are specifically prohibited from doing.



Elmbridge
Borough Council

... bridging the communities ...

I strongly agree in principle, but this approach seems like a blunt instrument.
How is it going to be enforced anyway?
At a time when government has little funding to help the people who live in Elmbridge, it seems irresponsible to try to enforce a PSPO because there a few irresponsible persons.
Restricting either boaters or people fishing is not the answer. Boats have a public right of navigation and mooring on the Thames for a reasonable time. There is also an issue with water safety for boaters in cases of extreme weather that may not be foreseen in advance. They also have a right to navigate. Not all boaters nor anglers are causing disturbance nor littering. Seems as though these groups are being targeted. Where is the proof that loud noise and litter is ONLY the boaters and anglers? Obviously it is not them and them alone. From your survey, it could be construed that the council is discriminating against these groups
Any action that can be taken to reduce night time noise at Cowey Sale is welcome. We live opposite, and particularly during summer months noise levels can be too much, with music and cars revving sometimes into the small hours.
I am a boater and to ban all mooring in those areas because the odd one leaves litter is mean and short sighted.
Don't spoil people's freedoms. No curfew. Polite sign to enjoy, value and respect. Thankyou.
No
The Council has not provided any evidence of Anti Social Behaviour related to mooring boats. Mooring a boat is not in itself Anti Social Behaviour, nor is overstaying on a mooring, nor is living on a boat. Neither has it provided the text of the proposed Order, which by law it should do. This consultation is not valid.
This is simply insane people have been fishing and camping for thousands of years and is a natural and human right and should not be limited with extreme safeguards such as curfews etc is an absolute joke, as the for the boats moored "illegally" most of the them are live aboards and peoples homes and again people have been doing this for 2 or 300 years.. once again another right ruined by ignorance and blindness.
I would like to see a total ban on fires, BBQs, fishing and camping etc. to restore the natural environment of the areas and to protect the natural wildlife. I have lived locally near Albany Reach for over 22 years and have to avoid the area because of the anti-social activities and mess left behind, especially human waste, which is disgusting for those who wish to respect and enjoy the beauty of the area.
You do not need additional laws, flytipping laws cover the entirety of the council's complaints here and can be enforced if there are issues
It would be better if bailiffs patrolled areas where fishing takes place to check licenses and remind anglers of the importance of tidying up after them. And provide bins in fishing spots.
You are asking all the wrong questions! You seem to be picking on a very small group of people. The main problem with these areas is the general public picnicking on hot days leaving masses of rubbish, food, discarded nappies, beer cans etc. I walk regularly on Albany Reach and Hurst park and it is not the few fishermen and boats causing the problem. There is appropriate legislation to deal with illegal moorings but no policing of the areas to prevent anti social behaviour.



Elmbridge
Borough Council

... bridging the communities ...

Do you really think that banning overnight fishing will resolve the issues? New bins are great but no use if people just decide to leave their rubbish on the grass!
Restricting movement along the river and use of the river banks is draconian. The local shops enjoy a lot of trade by boat owners fishermen and various communities that use these spaces for a variety of purposes. These spaces are needed for everyone's health and relaxation.
Completely banning fishing overnight in the area, is an over reaction. Overnight Permits could raise money and restrict numbers. If human waste is an issue, install a toilet that is open 24hours
Why don't you like fishermen?
I feel that houseboats enhance the environment and show a diverse way of living. It increases bird activity and there is no noise issues. I feel that the council are discriminating towards boat owners as they dont confirm to the lives that they choose.
Yes. The Council has not provided any evidence to back up its claim that littering and noise are a problem on the river bank. If there is evidence of a problem with littering and noise then the Council already has the enforcement powers to deal with it. Any PSPO or other enforcement should specifically target littering and noise, not the action of simply mooring a boat. It is not a criminal offence to moor a boat. The Public Right of Navigation includes the right to moor for a reasonable time on the Thames. 'Reasonable' cannot be defined in advance. This is a draconian and oppressive proposal and should not be implemented. Boaters should not be criminalised for exercising their public right to navigate, including mooring. To prevent boats mooring creates safety risks in itself, especially in flood or extreme weather conditions. The proposed PSPO would create homelessness among boat dwellers, depriving them of a place to moor their homes. The proposed PSPO powers would target homeless or vulnerable people which local authorities are specifically prohibited from doing.
Targeting marginalised boating communities is not the best way forward
This is not needed, please police the illegal activities as per existing law enforcement and stop finding new ways of public restrictions. People are enjoying this places by day and night. Ad some AI operated cameras and fine or arrest people that are breaking the law and not restriction of genuine Leisure seeking people!!!
What evidence is there that littering and noise are an issue. If so you have enforcement powers to deal with it. Any PSPO or other enforcement should specifically target littering and noise, not the action of simply mooring a boat. It is not a criminal offence to moor a boat. The Public Right of Navigation includes the right to moor for a reasonable time on the Thames. 'Reasonable' cannot be defined in advance. This is a draconian and oppressive proposal and should not be implemented. Boaters should not be criminalised for exercising their public right to navigate, including mooring. It sets a precedent for other areas on the waterway (slippery slope) and should be managed by exception, using your existing powers not a total ban. To prevent boats mooring creates safety risks in itself, especially in flood or extreme weather conditions. The proposed PSPO would create homelessness among boat dwellers, depriving them of a place to moor their homes. The proposed PSPO powers would target homeless or vulnerable people which local authorities are specifically prohibited from doing.
Allow boats moor and fishermen to use these spaces with the checking and validation of fishing and boat licenses .



Elmbridge
Borough Council

... bridging the communities ...

Rubbish bins at busy and designated locations, and to check on miss use at busy or prolonged period's of use.
This survey seems very biased.
Target the litter and noise not the mooring up of boats. It is not a criminal offence to moor a boat.
There are already laws which can be used to stop antisocial behaviour such as playing loud music, and illegal behaviour such as littering. Peoples rights to enjoy public space are already absurdly limited in England. Why not spend valuable council time and money in expanding these rights for everyone rather than limiting access to the few scraps of the countryside we are free to enjoy. If everyone weren't squeezed into the same recreational space there would be far less conflict of interests. If you care anything for the environment then put money into compulsory purchasing marginal farmland on the river banks for nature reserve space... to use the leading questions in this survey to blame environmental degradation on boaters or youngsters out camping is a joke while the water authorities and farms are permitted to pour sewage into the river continuously. The river is in a state of complete environmental degradation because of neglect by both national and local authorities, who use actions like this proposal as a smoke screen to obfuscate their incompetence and cronyism on the heart of the matter.
Overnight fishing on council land by permit only. Provision of Free 24hr mooring spots on council land where appropriate
As a boater I am biased about closing moorings, but would add that every 'legitimate and licensed fully paid' boater is probably more annoyed by the mess and disruption caused by unauthorised boaters than most members of the public. Please... make us pay to moor. If your councillors take a trip along the river from Oxford to Teddington you will see that the cleanest areas of the river are those where the boaters pay a nightly fee to stay. There is no mess. The boats are quiet. The council makes money from the boaters and the stretch of river is less polluted and the banks cleaner. Oxford and Reading are NOT managed, and the river in these stretches is a mess. Henley, Pangbourne, marlow, Windsor etc ARE managed, and the river is lovely for all - boaters and non boaters alike.
I think it's absolutely horrendous that you're trying to restrict people's access to green space, and even worse that you're trying to criminalise people who moor their homes in the area. Shame on you.
There are many people that live on boats, the boat may be their only home. Unfortunately other humans have wrecked the nature and peace. I for one know, we always clean up after ourselves and in actual fact - we clean up others rubbish too! All I can politely ask is - Do Not Paint Everyone with the same paint brush
This is a leading questionnaire that doesnt clearly lay out the public rights you are removing from residents and the public. There are so many other options that would be more cost effective and actually good for the environment. It is a shame that the council seeks control through misinformation.
Leave the river how it is the only good thing you guys can do is start dredging the river again and make it cleaner that way
leave things as they are, provide better bins.



Elmbridge
Borough Council

... bridging the communities ...

All of this means nothing without the accompanying necessary enforcement and penalties. Over the years, neither the council, EA nor the private enforcement agency have done anything of merit to deter the antisocial behaviour and persistent overstayers.

Judging by numbers of people involved and frequency of instance incidence at your mentioned sites:

Indians hold the most significant barbecues;

Eastern Europeans are the most prolific fishermen;

Travellers hold en-masse yearly fixed-duration gatherings;

The poor, disadvantaged and 'free-spirited' moor boats for protracted periods on the river.

From a purely pragmatic viewpoint any proposed 'non-police' policing of the first three groups could prove troublesome. The last group are weak in their lack of community and so would be fairly simple to police, fine or persecute. To make the point clear, try policing, fining or persecuting 50 Indians, 100 travellers or half a dozen Polish men.

The above is merely a common sense guide and does not consider any notion of morality: by all means implement your PSPO against some groups interpretation of recreation or living and pave your way to Hell with your good intentions.

Please listen to this: Measures like this only stop responsible people from enjoying their freedom. The irresponsible people who actually engage in this type of antisocial behaviour already don't care, so they won't care about a PSPO. All this will do is reduce the freedoms of responsible citizens. Instead teach responsibility. Educate those that create these problems, don't punish the rest of us who do no harm. If passed I will complain to the ombudsman for this reason.

I believe it is best to encourage people to use the public spaces responsibly gaining maximum benefit from the green spaces in Elmbridge. Make Elmbridge a friendly borough that welcomes people and encourages them to use all the beautiful areas in the borough. Life should be about involvement not prohibition.

People on boats need somewhere free to stay



Elmbridge
Borough Council

... bridging the communities ...