

River Frontage Management Moorings Review 2010

1 Introduction

Cambridge City Council is responsible for managing boat moorings on the River Cam within the confines of the city, apart from a short stretch of riverbank at a location called Riverside which is, for reasons of history, under the control of Cambridgeshire County Council. The City Council has designated different stretches of the river for different types of mooring, and has reserved areas for licenced mooring, visitor mooring, and specifically for the mooring of widebeam craft.

The City Council reviews its mooring policy, including fee structures, periodically, and also carries out its own analysis of the impact of its policy on all those affected by it, including boaters (residential and visitors), other river users, and local residents. Consultation on charging last took place in 2007. The Council also monitors feedback, received from time to time through its established complaints and feedback systems, concerning people's views on moorings and mooring policy.

In 2009, the City Council commissioned a report examining the mooring and charging policies that operate for residential moorers in other areas of the country. This report noted, among other things, that

- Cambridge's fees for residential mooring are the lowest in the country; in addition, discounts are offered for single occupancy, and for students and over 60s;
- Cambridge provides a lower level of service for boaters than other Councils, and also does not provide a permanent right to moor in any specific location; moorers are expected to relocate periodically along the riverbank, and therefore have to pay a navigation fee in addition to the mooring charge;
- Unlike other residential moorers, moorers in Cambridge do not pay Council Tax, though they do make use of Council and other public services paid for in part through Council Tax.

Following this report, the Council decided to review its charging and mooring policies further, and to this end it produced a questionnaire designed to explore the issues which had emerged from these various processes. At the same time, the consultant's report on mooring policies elsewhere was made available for public consideration.

The questionnaire was sent out to all those known to have an interest in the subject matter, using a combination of post and email according to the known preferences of the individuals and organisations concerned. The mailing list was extended to include not only those who are normally included in any discussion of this type, but also those who have recently contacted the council about moorings (regardless of the nature of the contact). In addition, the questionnaire was available through the Council website for four weeks, including a link on the home page for two weeks.

The response to this consultation has included:

137 completed questionnaires, many of which include detailed comments (a question in the form invited people to make comments or observations, and some took up the invitation to comment on a separate sheet as well);

40 letters or emails that did not accompany questionnaires but which offer comment and observations on the issues covered in the questionnaire and beyond;

121 emails generated through a campaign via the Camboaters website. This offered a template email that could be adapted and sent direct to Council officers. Most of emails reiterate the same key points and use the same language and construction, in response to the issues raised in the questionnaire, with some variations and also some additional commentary and observation. Some, but by no means all, of these are from individuals who also completed a questionnaire or who have also fed back in other ways.

A total of 299 responses have therefore been received. These include, however, eleven responses from representative bodies, which might be thought to carry more weight than individual responses (although we do not know if individual members of these organisations have also responded). They also include some individuals who have responded more than once, using different mechanisms (we did not detect anyone who had replied more than once to the questionnaire, but there are people who have completed the questionnaire and sent an e-mail as well; one person who sent the email twice has been counted only once).

These responses also raise more than 50 separate areas of comment and observation, some of which are common to a number of responses and others which are voiced uniquely by one respondent. For a handful of these it is hard to detect the relevance of the comment, but in most cases the observations pertain to some aspect of the area under study.

This raises questions about how the results are analysed. Our view is that

- Each response merits due consideration, regardless of how it was communicated;
- Responses to the questions in the questionnaire should be presented as they have been received, but distinction should be made between different interests;
- Responses from local and non-local people and organisations should be treated as of equal value, but where possible a distinction should be drawn in the analysis to distinguish local views from non-local views;
- Responses from representative organisations should be separately identified to allow comparison with the responses of individuals; where these are lengthy or detailed, editing has been applied to convey the sense of the argument without the detail provided;
- Comments and observations made in the questionnaire, or in the separate emails, including those from the email campaign, should be considered alongside the results of the appropriate questions in the survey, so as to highlight areas of strong consensus but also to illuminate people's views and clarify differences of opinion.

- Comments and observations made to others, such as on Facebook, but not made directly to the Council, should be disregarded.

The report is therefore structured to reflect this approach.

2 Results and analysis

2.1 Respondents

Respondents to the questionnaire were asked to indicate what their specific interest in this subject is, and respond as follows:

Type of respondent	Questionnaire
Existing licence holder	34
On waiting list for a licence	38
Thinking of joining waiting list	3
Rower	16
Resident near river	46
Representative of an organisation	11
Other	40
Total identifiable responses	163

Respondents divide into five main groups: those who have a mooring licence at present, those who are waiting for one or thinking of applying, residents who live near the river, rowers, and “others” which includes substantial numbers of residents of other areas of Cambridge and beyond, and also boaters who live elsewhere, some of whom may visit Cambridge from time to time. There are also twelve responses from representative organisations speaking on behalf of a membership.

A number of people have more than one interest, which is why the total does not correspond to the rest of the table.

Where it is possible to do so, we also looked at responses to see what proportion are from local people and which are from further afield:

Location of respondent	Questionnaire	E-campaign
Local to Cambridge	77	66
Not local to Cambridge	23	32
Total identifiable responses	100	98

About three quarters of the responses to the questionnaire come from people who live in Cambridge or in the villages immediately surrounding the city; a quarter are from further afield and these include responses from Scotland and the West of England as well as from people living closer to Cambridge itself. In the campaign, about two-thirds of the responses where an address is provided come from people local to the city, with the balance coming from further afield.

Some respondents did not give us their details and are therefore unclassifiable in this regard.

2.2 Area B

Respondents were advised that the Council is reconsidering the permitting of mooring at Area B (Jubilee Gardens) and were asked to give their views on this, with the following results:

Response	No. of responses	
	Questionnaire and other comments	E-mail campaign
In favour of retaining mooring	103	120
Against retaining mooring	24	1
No strong view either way	10	
Total response	137	121

The majority response is in favour of retaining mooring at Jubilee Gardens; three quarters of respondents to the questionnaire indicate their view in this direction, and this is also the overwhelming view of those who used the e-campaign to contribute to the debate.

It is nevertheless instructive to look at how this result breaks down across different groups of respondents.

- **Licence holders** and those on the **waiting list** are overwhelmingly in support of retaining mooring in this area, with very few people against retention.
 - Respondents who **live outside Cambridge** strongly favour retention of mooring in this area.
 - **Rowers** are more equivocal; around half are in favour of retaining mooring, but a quarter of rowers have no strong view. Some comment that mooring in this area does not affect rowers to any significant extent.
 - **Local residents** are generally opposed to retaining mooring in this area, and those against retention outnumber those in favour by three to two. There is nevertheless a minority of local residents who want to retain mooring in this area .
-
- **Camboaters** wish to retain mooring here. They draw attention to the need for the Council to manage mooring in this area, rather than ban it altogether, and to ensure correct signage and communication with moorers to ensure proper management. They also draw attention to the problem of mooring wide beam craft at Jesus Green, noting that this is the only place they can moor, and that moving narrowboats to accommodate widebeam craft elsewhere will be difficult and divisive.
 - **CamCon** accept the retention of mooring in Area B, but suggest that there would be social, recreational and aesthetic reasons for discontinuing residential mooring here. They suggest instead that this area be allocated for visitor mooring, either year round or summer only to address the peak in demand and to coincide with the restriction on motorised vessels using the Backs.

- The **Canoe Club** opposes mooring in this area, on the grounds of congestion on the river. **The Jesus Green Association** also opposes mooring in this area.
- The **Cambridgeshire Rowing Association** would be concerned about the impact of removing craft from this location and the potential for congesting the Cam elsewhere as a result.
- **GOBA** supports the retention of mooring here, and is concerned at the impact of this proposal on the number of moorings available in the city, and at the need to relocate those mooring there at present. This situation would be compounded if the County were to take action on Riverside as well; it could create pressure on other locations in other authority areas. **GOBA** urges the Council to look strategically at the situation before making a decision with ramifications.

Several comments and observations are made which may have a bearing on this question, and these have been grouped into themes as follows:

Comment group	No. of comments
Comments on boats generally	64
Riverbank access	26
Area B mooring	23
Mooring provision generally	19
Needs of area B moorers	14
Marina needed	3

It is not always clear whether the comments on **boats generally** are specifically targeted on those at Jubilee Gardens or at the wider river community, but it is noticeable that opinion is fairly evenly divided on their attractiveness. Fifteen individuals comment on the appeal of the boats, noting (for example) their popularity with visitors and photographers, but fourteen others suggest that the boats are unattractive, using words like “eyesore” and commenting negatively on the presence of clutter and litter on the riverbank, or on the noise and pollution produced by their generators.

- The **Friends of Midsummer Common** report complaints about the condition of some of the craft moored there, and about the pollution these can cause.
- **CamCon** also report complaints, sometimes strongly argued, from members of the public about boat conditions and the polluted environment around some boats. This reflects badly on CamCon because the public see them as responsible for enforcing cleanliness regimes. Others have noted how attractive Area B was when the boats were temporarily removed for the lock renovation.

The largest single group of comments here, though, is on the **value** that the boating community represents to the city. This is interpreted in different ways, but a total of 30 people note that the riverbank residents add value to the local economy, mitigate a shortage of affordable local housing, and provide an informal safety and policing function on the riverbank which improves people’s sense of safety when using this area, especially after dark. Five people also comment on the “green way of life” being pursued by boaters.

Comments on **riverbank access** are also polarised; 15 respondents say that riverbank access is compromised by the presence of so many moored boats, whilst 8 others say that there is no genuine problem over riverbank access for other users.

As might be expected from the overall results, comments on **area B mooring** divide between those in favour of retention (13 comments) and those against (9 comments). Some people also take the opportunity to comment on mooring provision generally (some motivated by a fear of loss of provision if this area is closed), and there is little consensus here, with advocates of more and fewer moorings, more space for visitor moorings, and for no change. One person suggests that Area B moorers are using visitor spaces as permanent moorings.

- **CamCon** also suggest, on the basis of complaints received, that visitor moorings are being used inappropriately by residential craft.
- **CamCon** note that the occupiers of the Area B moorings have proved very reluctant to move in the past when requested to do so. There is evidence to suggest that these moorers are semi-permanent and that use of these moorings is effectively blocked to other licence payers. The semi-permanent nature gives rise to concerns over sewage concentrations. This area has also been over-moored until recently.

Several people comment on their concerns about the **future of boaters** moored at Area B, expressing concern about the possible break-up of their community and the loss of their homes (9 comments), and about their inability to moor elsewhere (5 comments). A small number of people (none of whom are current moorers, or on the waiting list) also suggest a **marina** as a solution to the pressure on moorings.

2.3 Mooring bollards

The questionnaire asked about the installation of secure mooring points along the riverbank, and provided an illustration of the type of bollard favoured by the Council. Opinions on this are shown in this table:

Response	Questionnaire responses
Support proposal	94
Do not support proposal	24
No strong view either way	15
Total response	133

The overall response is strongly in favour, with a distinct minority (about one in five) of respondents opposing this idea. The e-campaign does not address this issue.

Looking at the response from different groups, we note these differences:

- **Licence holders** are generally in favour of this proposal; those in favour outnumber those against by around three to one. The **waiting list** is even more strongly supportive of this proposal, with very few objectors;
 - **Local residents** expressing a view favour this proposal in similar proportions to licence holders. Respondents from **outside Cambridge** are very much more likely to support this proposal;
 - **Rowers** are generally in favour, with dissenters outnumbered by two to one
-
- ***Camboaters** oppose the Council's proposal, and point out that they have been suggesting mooring rings for some time.*
 - ***CamCon** support the proposal.*
 - *The **Friends of Stourbridge Common** dislike the proposed design of the bollards and feel these are out of keeping with the Common, because of its semi-wild nature. They urge the Council to reconsider the proposed design and to note the very different character of Stourbridge Common from the rest of the riverbank.*
 - *The **Friends of Midsummer Common** support the proposal. So too does **GOBA**, and so does the **Canoe Club**.*
 - *The **Jesus Green Association** supports the installation of bollards, but would want to ensure that there are spaces at intervals to allow other river users access to the bank.*

Asked about where bollards might be installed, respondents answer in this way:

Response	Questionnaire responses
Entire riverbank	53
Visitor mooring sites	41
Stourbridge Common	34
Midsummer Common	33
Jesus Green	31
Total response	136

Around two in five of those in favour suggest they can be installed along the whole riverbank. Even those who do not suggest this have little difficulty in suggesting some areas where they would be useful, though, and all the suggested options get some support.

- *The **Friends of Midsummer Common** support installing bollards along the whole length of the river, as do the **Canoe Club** and **GOBA**.*
- ***CamCon** supports installation only at visitor mooring sites.*

Comments on mooring posts are grouped as follows:

Comment group	No. of comments
Mooring posts	6
Alternatives	25
Other observations	1

The six comments on posts specifically are evenly divided between those who like the idea and those who dislike it. Of more consequence perhaps are the 25 comments on alternatives, almost all of which indicate a strong preference for **mooring rings** rather than posts; some argue that rings are safer for those walking along the riverbank, while others want to see a securing mechanism that allows ropes to be secured on the boat rather than the riverbank. Comments from Camboaters has express a preference for rings. The final comment is from someone who feels that boaters should be asked to pay for this rather than Council Tax payers.

2.4 Discounts

Cambridge City Council currently offers a discount of 25% to residential mooring licence holders who live alone. The questionnaire asks whether this should be retained or not, noting that it does not reflect ability to pay and is difficult to enforce. Responses on this are shown here:

Response	No. of responses	
	Questionnaire and other comments	E-mail campaign
Retain discount	74	118
Withdraw discount	45	1
No strong view	14	0
Total response	133	119

Overall, a majority of respondents favour retention of this discount; supporters outnumber opponents in the questionnaire by around three to two overall. They are supported in this by an overwhelming majority of those contributing through the e-campaign.

Looking at how different groups of people respond to this issue, we note the following:

- **Licence holders** are strongly in support of retention, with a small number of dissenters; **waiting list** people are also supportive, but a substantial minority (about a quarter) favour dropping this discount;
- **Rowers** are generally opposed to the single person discount, and two thirds of rowers responding want to see it removed;

- **Local residents** are strongly opposed to the single person discount, with only a small handful in favour of retention. People living **outside Cambridge** are more supportive of the discount than those living locally.
- **Camboaters** wish to retain this discount. They draw attention to the potential fee increase for some moorers if this proposal and the widebeam increase go ahead.
- **CamCon** supports withdrawal of the single person occupancy discount.
- **The Jesus Green Association** would like to see the single occupancy discount abolished, and so also would the **Canoe Club**. **Riverside Area Residents Association** also supports abolition of this discount.
- The **Friends of Midsummer Common** agree that it should be abolished.

The Council also offers a discount of 50% to students and those aged over 60, and respondents were asked whether or not these discounts should be retained, again bearing in mind the fact that these discounts are not necessarily linked to ability to pay.

Response	No. of responses	
	Questionnaire and other comments	E-mail campaign
Retain discount for both groups	62	
Retain for students only	5	
Retain for over 60s only	12	
Withdraw discount from both groups	39	
No strong view	15	
Total response	133	

The overall result in the questionnaire is evenly split between those who want to keep both discounts and those who think there should be a change. Those who want change, however, are not of one mind, although those who support withdrawal from students (51 in total) outnumber those who want to withdraw discount from over 60s (44 in total).

The e-campaign does not address this issue specifically but does indicate a desire that fees should not increase.

The results from different groups of respondents are as follows:

- **Licence holders** are strongly in favour of retaining the discount for both groups, and very few support withdrawal of discount from either group. People on the **waiting list** are more equivocal, with three in five wanting to retain the discount in its entirety, but two in five who want to remove the discount from one or both groups.
- **Rowers** are also evenly divided on this, with a balance between complete retention and complete withdrawal of discount.

- **Local residents** are strongly in favour of withdrawing the discount in its entirety, although there are small numbers of advocates for both students and over 60s. Respondents from **outside Cambridge** who express a view on this at all tend to support the retention of the discount for both groups.
- ***Camboaters** wishes to retain both discounts*
- ***CamCon** supports withdrawal of both discounts.*
- ***The Jesus Green Association** supports abolition of both discounts, as does the **Canoe Club**. **Riverside Area Residents Association** also supports abolition of both discounts.*
- *The **Friends of Midsummer Common** agree that they should be abolished.*

Comments on discounts are grouped thus:

Comment group	No. of comments
Basis for discount	21
Enforcement	16
Reasonableness	14

Those who comment on the basis for the discount draw attention to their understanding that the fees for residential mooring are, or should be, **aligned to the Council Tax**, and that discounts should therefore follow the lead given by Council Tax legislation which would allow a discount for single occupancy. Some also note that single person occupancy is actually indicative of **ability to pay**, in that only one income is coming into the household. Two people argue that students deserve a discount, and one notes that students would be entitled to a full rebate of Council Tax on land. One commentator notes that residential moorers draw on Council services but do not pay Council Tax, and they believe this to be unfair to those who live on land and do pay Council Tax.

Several people comment on **enforcement**, and the difficulties associated with this. These comments include observations about the difficulty of enforcing a single person discount in practice, though no-one suggests this privilege is being abused; one adds that enforcement of this entitlement is just as difficult on land. Comments on enforcement also stray beyond discounts, however, and include requests for the Council to enforce other rules regarding tidiness and movement of boats as specified in the licence.

Reasonableness comments divide into two camps; those who think the pricing proposals the Council has in mind are reasonable (Five comments, including one person who thinks the Council's proposals don't go far enough), and those who think they are unfair (seven comments). Two commentators think there should be a cap on fee increases, as there is in Council Tax.

2.5 Wide beam vessels

The Council is considering a 50% increase in mooring fees for wide beam vessels, on the grounds that they create a larger impact and a loss of amenity to residents and other river users. Views were sought on this proposed increase, and the results are as follows:

Response	No. of responses	
	Questionnaire and other comments	E-mail campaign
Support fee increase	59	1
Do not support fee increase	63	116
No strong view	14	
Total response	136	117

Overall, there is a very slight majority of respondents to the questionnaire who do not favour increased charges for wide beam vessels. However, the response from the e-campaign is overwhelmingly against this proposal, on the grounds that providing services to wide beam vessels costs no more than doing so to any other vessel, and that wide beams do not occupy any more bank space than narrowboats. One widebeam owner draws attention to the fact that there are only 13 such vessels on the river, moored in three different locations, suggesting they are not the major problem this proposal implies.

Looking at the different constituencies of the overall result, we note the following:

- **Licence holders** are generally against the proposed increase, and although there is a minority view in favour they are outnumbered by a factor of nearly three to one. Those on the **waiting list**, however, are equally split between those in favour and those against an increase.
- **Rowers** strongly support an increase in fees for widebeams.
- **Local residents** are strongly in favour of an increased charge for widebeams, and the minority who oppose this are outnumbered by a factor of five to two. Respondents who live **outside Cambridge** are more likely to oppose a fee increase.
- **Camboaters** oppose this proposal, and suggest that a fairer pricing scheme would be one based on the floor space of the boat, rather than its width. They also draw attention to the potential for large fee increases if this proposal is coupled with removal of discounts.
- **CamCon** report complaints from the public and other river users on wide beam craft and their impact on visual amenity and navigation, especially when these craft are under way. CamCon supports the Council's proposal.
- The **Canoe Club** suggests that charges for mooring should be based on length of vessel, with a supplementary charge for those in excess of a certain beam. It supports the Council's proposal.

- *The **Cambridgeshire Rowing Association** have particular concerns about the location of wide beam craft and the impact of these on navigation. They have no strong view either way on the Council's proposal, however.*
- *The **Jesus Green Association** supports the Council's proposal. So do the **Friends of Midsummer Common**. **GOBA** also express support for the proposal.*

Comments on this issue can be summarised as follows:

Comment group	No. of comments
Relationship between size and fees	38
Opinions of widebeams generally	16

In all, 38 people comment on some aspect of the relationship between **boat size and charging**. It is not always clear whether they are making a comment about a length-based charging system (some clearly are) or about the size of the boat generally (again, some clearly are), but it is noted that there is considerable interest in the idea that charging should in some way be related to the amount of river space the boat occupies.

The other comments on widebeams are evenly divided between those who agree with the suggestion that widebeams obstruct **access to and on the river** (mainly residents and rowers) and those who see no grounds for suggesting this (primarily licence holders and unidentifiable respondents).

2.6 Other comments

Two other issues are raised by the e-campaign that are not covered in the questionnaire, and both attract considerable support. The vast majority of respondents to this campaign believe that the **mooring policy should not be reviewed as frequently as it is**, and that moorers should have a degree of stability. They draw attention to the fact that pricing was reviewed only two years ago, and suggest an interval of five years as more reasonable. In all, 119 respondents support this view and just one opposes it.

A similar level of support attaches to the suggestion that the Council should **speed up the process of filling vacant mooring berths** through the waiting list. Again, 120 respondents want the Council to act more quickly to fill vacancies, and to publish details of current licences and the full waiting list online (presumably this means to disclose its length, rather than its contents). Only one respondent is opposed to this view.

In addition, ten respondents comment adversely on the **frequency of review**, and six on the need to **reduce the waiting list**, echoing the points raised by the e-campaign.

- ***Camboaters** echo this and draw attention to the frequency of review; they would like to discuss and agree a structure that will work, and be less subject to review.*

There are seven comments about the **service provided to boaters**. One notes that better services are needed, but three others comment on the low level of use of the Jesus Green pump-out, and one draws attention to the fact that boats are reluctant to move to use it. Three people comment on fees by noting that homeowners get better services than boaters.

- ***Camboaters** see potential in developing further services for river residents as a possible source of extra income.*

There are also comments on **this consultation**. Six people suggest this consultation is wasteful of public money, but six say that boaters (and in one case other interested parties) should be consulted more often. Two licence holders say that Camboaters does not represent their views; another resents the idea that a few complaints from residents can lead to a policy review on this scale. Four people ask for the questionnaire to be more readily completed electronically. Two people would have liked the accompanying consultant's report to have addressed the **legal issues** relating to moorers, which they feel are unclear, although one comments favourably on the report apart from this.

- ***Camboaters** challenges the validity of asking for the opinions of other interest groups.*
- *The **Friends of Midsummer Common** suggest that the Council should have explored other issues raised in the consultant's report such as the licence fee, the Council Tax, and the difference between what is payable in Cambridge and the charges that apply elsewhere. They would also welcome clarification of the legal position of residential mooring on the Cam.*

Two residents of **Riverside** express their concern that the consultation map specifically excludes the Riverside area, and express their frustration about this. They draw attention to the unsightly and unpleasant environment created by moorers at Riverside and express surprise and disappointment that the Council appears unwilling to address this.

- *The **Riverside Area Residents Association** also draws attention very strongly to this issue, highlighting that it creates problems for boaters (no rubbish collection or water service) as well as for residents whose amenity is threatened by pollution and anti social activity. The boats are located very close to residents' homes. The efforts of Camboaters to broker a solution to this have been appreciated by RARA.*

3 Conclusions

The results to the questionnaire are, in summary...

1. Licence holders, waiting list, and non-local people want to retain mooring at area B, but local residents oppose this. Most of the representative bodies support retention, but for different reasons, some of which are linked to the impact elsewhere on the river of abolition here;
2. Secure moorings are favoured by most people, but a significant number of people would prefer to see mooring rings, rather than posts, as less obtrusive and safer, and more secure for boaters. Secure moorings are supported at all points along the riverbank. Most representative bodies support the proposal but some do so with reservations; Camboaters prefers mooring rings.
3. Licence holders and residents from outside Cambridge favour retention of the single person discount; waiting list are also in favour of retention but to a lesser degree. Local residents oppose the retention of the discount. Representative organisations differ: Camboaters wants to keep the discount, but the others expressing a view want to remove it.
4. Licence holders favour retention of the discounts for students and over 60s. The waiting list is evenly divided on this; local residents favour abandoning both discounts. Representative organisations differ: Camboaters wants to keep the discounts, but the others expressing a view want to remove them.
5. There is more support for retaining the over 60s discount than for the student discount.
6. Opinion is evenly divided on the proposed increase for wide beam craft, but this has strong support from rowers and local residents, and from representative organisations, and strong opposition from licence holders and people living outside the city. Several representative organisations support the Council's proposal, but Camboaters opposes it and the Rowing Association have no strong view.

The campaign results overwhelmingly support the views of the licence holders on single person discount, Area B mooring, and widebeam charges.

There is also an overwhelming view that mooring charge reviews should be carried out less often and the position for moorers stabilised, and that the Council should speed up the process of allocating vacant mooring licences to the waiting list.

The campaign makes no observation on discounts for students or over 60s other than opposing fee increases generally.

There are two consistent patterns of response here. Firstly, people responding to either the questionnaire or the campaign who live outside the Cambridge area generally support the view taken by the majority of boaters. Secondly, residents living close to the river generally take a view that is the opposite of boaters. This is oversimplifying, in that there are exceptions to both these rules, but does indicate the general pattern.