



# Boat registration charges proposals from January 2022

Consultation response annex

Date: 2 December 2021

Version: 1

We are the Environment Agency. We protect and improve the environment.

We help people and wildlife adapt to climate change and reduce its impacts, including flooding, drought, sea level rise and coastal erosion.

We improve the quality of our water, land and air by tackling pollution. We work with businesses to help them comply with environmental regulations. A healthy and diverse environment enhances people's lives and contributes to economic growth.

We can't do this alone. We work as part of the Defra group (Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs), with the rest of government, local councils, businesses, civil society groups and local communities to create a better place for people and wildlife.

Published by:

Environment Agency  
Horizon House, Deanery Road,  
Bristol BS1 5AH

[www.gov.uk/environment-agency](http://www.gov.uk/environment-agency)

© Environment Agency 2021

All rights reserved. This document may be reproduced with prior permission of the Environment Agency.

Further copies of this report are available from our publications catalogue: [www.gov.uk/government/publications](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications) or our National Customer Contact Centre: 03708 506 506

Email: [enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk)

## Contents

1. Introduction.....	4
2. Proposals for a consistent framework for charging across our waterways .....	7
3. Proposed national navigation boat charges scheme starting on or after 1 January 2022 .....	13
4. Business boat requirements .....	28
5. Forward Look.....	30
6. Email responses to the consultation .....	34
7. Businesses and organisations responding to the consultation .....	35
Would you like to find out more about us or your environment? .....	37
incident hotline.....	37
floodline .....	37
Environment first.....	37

# 1. Introduction

This annex sets out the responses received to our consultation on 'Boat registration charges from January 2022'. The consultation ran for 8 weeks from 22 July 2021 to 16 September 2021.

We received responses to the consultation through an online tool, or by email or post using a consultation response form. We also received comments by email. We have considered all the responses we received and reflected the total number of responses and comments.

Within the consultation, the questions asked for a specific choice as well as giving free text boxes.

They were split into a number of topics:

- about your use of our waterways, about you and consultation feedback
- the proposed framework
- the proposed common waterway charges
- the proposed individual waterway charges
- new business requirements
- forward look

There were 1,046 responses to the consultation. This included 975 through the online tool and 71 using the consultation response form. We also received a further 105 emails with comments related to the consultation. These email comments are summarised in section 6 and are not included in the data for the consultation questions.

We will report all of the responses to each question within the topics. We will also show the themes we have identified from the comments made in the free text boxes.

## 1.1. About your use of our waterways and about you

We included the 'about your use of our waterways' and 'about you' sections to provide us with an understanding of who responded.

### 1.1.1. The 'about your use of our waterways' section

Within this section, we asked, are you responding as a private boat owner or on behalf of a commercial group or organisation, and you said:

- private boat owners - 977
- on behalf of a commercial group - 13
- on behalf of another organisation (for example, charity, not-for-profit organisation, trading body) - 40
- did not answer this question - 16

We asked you to tell us the main river or waterway you or those you represent keep or use a boat on and you said:

- River Thames - 429
- Anglian waterways - 503
- Upper Medway - 38
- rivers not managed by us - 63
- did not answer - 13

Of the 63 responses who said their main river was not one managed by us, they said:

- Canal & River Trust waterways (C&RT) - 35
- Middle Level Navigation - 7
- River Wey - 6
- coastal waters - 2
- Cam Conservancy waterway - 2
- Broads Authority waterways - 1
- other rivers or waterways - 10

We also asked if you or those you represent use a boat on another river, and you said:

- River Thames - 73
- Anglian waterways - 187
- Upper Medway - 14
- River Wey - 25
- C&RT - 48
- Middle Level Navigation - 13
- coastal waters - 22
- Cam Conservancy waterway - 19
- Broads Authority waterways - 7
- none of the rivers listed - 231
- did not answer - 407

We asked you to tell us the type of registration you purchase and you said:

- annual registrations - 923
- visitor registrations - 43
- did not own a boat - 14
- Gold Licence - 45
- did not answer - 21

We asked how you use your boat and you said:

- private, leisure or non-commercial clubs / charities - 941
- residential - 68
- commercial, business use - 18
- not a boat user - 1
- did not answer - 18

For those that said they used their boat for private, leisure or a non-commercial club or charity, we also asked the type of boat used, and you said:

- powered cruiser - 751
- powered narrowboat - 159
- sailing boat with an auxiliary engine - 21
- unpowered open boat - 44
- did not answer - 71

We also asked the type of unpowered open boat used and you said:

- canoe - 26
- rowing or sculling boat - 16
- kayak - 9
- sailing boat (no auxiliary engine) - 4
- paddle board - 4
- did not answer - 987

For those that said they operate their boats for 'commercial, business' use, we asked the type of boat operated, and you said:

- passenger or charter boats - 8
- powered self-drive day hire boats - 3
- powered self-drive holiday hire boats - 5
- tugs - 2
- powered maintenance boat - 1
- static letting or fixed location trading boat - 1
- unpowered open hire boats - 2
- did not answer - 1,024

We also asked the type of unpowered open boat operated, and you said:

- canoes - 5
- rowing or sculling boats - 3

- kayaks - 4
- sailing boats (no auxiliary engine) - 2
- paddle boards - 3
- punts - 2
- did not answer - 1,027

### 1.1.2. The 'about you' section

Within this section we wanted to get an idea of the age profile of our customers. We asked if you were within a specific age range and you said:

- under 45 - 70
- between 45 and 65 - 426
- over 65 - 468
- did not answer this question - 82

We also asked if you would like to take part in any a future workshops and you said:

- yes to attending a workshop - 348
- no to attending a workshop - 667
- did not answer - 31

### 1.1.3. Consultation feedback

For the respondents who completed the consultation on-line, we asked how satisfied they were with the on-line tool. We received the following responses:

- very satisfied - 46
- satisfied - 241
- neither satisfied nor dissatisfied - 288
- dissatisfied - 101
- very dissatisfied - 92
- did not know - 9
- did not answer - 269

## 2. Proposals for a consistent framework for charging across our waterways

### 2.1. Area-based charge mechanism

**Q1: Do you support our proposals to use an area-based charge for all powered and unpowered enclosed boats?**

- yes - 413

- no - 486
- did not know - 60
- not applicable - 16
- did not answer - 71

**Q2: Do you support our proposals to remove the sailing boats with engines category on the Anglian waterways?**

- yes - 174
- no - 319
- did not know - 158
- not applicable - 316
- did not answer - 79

**Q3: Do you support our proposals to remove the under 4 horse power engine category on the Anglian waterways?**

- yes - 205
- no - 339
- did not know - 138
- not applicable - 287
- did not answer - 77

## **2.2. Common charges across all waterways**

This section refers to the framework for common charges

**Q4: Do you support our proposals for not-for-profit organisations and charities?**

- yes - 631
- no - 139
- did not know - 115
- not applicable - 66
- did not answer - 95

**Q5: Do you support our proposals for tenders?**

- yes - 422
- no - 303
- did not know - 110
- not applicable - 118
- did not answer - 93

**Q6: Do you support our proposals for maintenance workboats and tugs?**

- yes - 435



- no - 165
- did not know - 155
- not applicable – 195
- did not answer - 96

**Q7: Do you support the new proposed approach for business boat charges?**

- yes - 368
- no - 251
- did not know - 142
- not applicable - 191
- did not answer - 94

**Q8: Do your support our proposals for short period registrations?**

- yes - 561
- no - 215
- did not know - 88
- not applicable - 75
- did not answer - 107

**Q9: Do you support our proposals for refunds?**

- yes - 832
- no - 46
- did not know - 33
- not applicable - 25
- did not answer - 110

**Q10: Do you support our proposals for part-year registrations charges?**

- yes - 837
- no - 54
- did not know - 27
- not applicable - 20
- did not answer - 108

**Q11: Do you support our proposals for exemptions from charge?**

- yes - 678
- no - 129
- did not know - 72
- not applicable - 48
- did not answer - 119

**Q12: Do you support our proposals for the boating trade?**

- yes - 626
- no - 79
- did not know - 93
- not applicable - 130
- did not answer - 118

**Q13: Do you support our proposals for these other charges?**

- yes - 443
- no - 370
- did not know - 82
- not applicable - 31
- did not answer -120

**Q14: Do you currently hold a Gold Licence?**

- yes - 52
- no - 789
- did not know - 25
- not applicable - 58
- did not answer - 122

**Q15: Do you understand that these proposals could impact on the future Gold Licence charging levels?**

- yes - 414
- no - 96
- did not know - 193
- not applicable - 213
- did not answer - 130

**Q16: Do you think the current Gold Licence offers value for money?**

- 102 said yes
- 145 said no
- 440 did not know
- 234 said not applicable
- 125 did not answer

### **Q17: Do you have any suggestions or comments about the Gold Licence in relation to these proposals?**

Of the 1,046 responses, 862 respondents did not answer or had no opinion.

On analysing the 184 comments made to this question, we have listed the main themes, then grouped the remaining based on the number of times the theme was identified.

The top 10 themes were:

- do not use or did not know what the Gold Licence is - 28
- Gold Licence is poor value - 26
- all or some charges are too high - 21
- more flexible registration options - 18
- have a consistent waterway charge - 14
- issues with the size of narrowboats in relation to locks and moorings - 14
- remove Gold Licence - 12
- Gold Licence charge should be proportional and relevant to the waterway - 10
- poor service or facilities, or both provided - 9
- other suggestions or comments - 9

Themes identified between 8 and 4 times were:

- all or some charges were too low; provide more information; consultation feedback and the Gold Licence is beneficial; do not support charge increase; maintaining waterway is essential; do not change - ok as it is and Gold Licence registration process

Themes identified 3 times or less were:

- suggestion for new framework; relate Gold Licence to similar passes; more and better compliance and enforcement activity; charge for river and or lock use; increase will reduce income; new technical and or digital service; if increase charge, then increase services; environmental impact; suggest a new Gold Licence scheme; all or some exempt from charges; be competent and efficient; if reduce the service, then reduce the charge; boaters will leave; issues with flood and or strong stream; businesses should pay more; no cross funding; all or some boaters pay more and ignoring customers

### **Q18: Overall do you support our proposals for a revised charge framework?**

- yes - 362
- no - 482
- did not know - 66
- not applicable - 11
- did not answer - 125

## Do you have any comments or suggestions on our proposals for the revised charge framework?

Of the 1,046 responses, 577 did not answer or had no opinion.

On analysing the 469 comments made to this question, we have listed the main themes, then grouped the remaining based on the number of times the theme was identified.

Themes identified more than 20 times were:

- did not support the charge increase - 100
- all or some charges were too high - 94
- poor service or facilities (or both) provided - 77
- did not support the framework specifically about using area - 68
- more and better compliance and enforcement activity - 56
- supported the framework - 50
- length is a better metric - 49
- maintaining the waterway is essential - 44
- did not support framework - 41
- boaters will leave - 38
- if increase the charge, then increase the services - 35
- more flexible registrations options - 27
- lack of field staff - 25
- boaters cannot afford increase - 22
- issue with base charge used - 21

Themes identified between 19 and 15 times were:

- provide information; consultation feedback; all or some charges were too low: the framework was too complex; other suggestions or comments; more and better compliance and enforcement activity specifically for unpowered boats and businesses to pay more

Themes identified between 14 and 10 times were:

- environmental impact; issues with the size of narrowboats in relation to locks and moorings; wanting a consistent waterway charge, a new scheme or approach; wanting more mooring sites; be more transparent and the increase in charge will reduce our income

Themes identified between 9 and 5 times were:

- if the service is reduced, then the charge should reduce; the charge should increase by inflation or Consumer Price Index (CPI); be competent and or efficient; do not change, it is ok; seek other funding streams; a new technical or digital service; a refund due to Covid-19; a charge for the river and or lock use; all users should pay; do not support the framework specifically about engine size; agreed with the percentage charge

increase; all or some should be exempt from charges; no cross funding and health and safety issues

Themes identified between 4 times and less were:

- all or some boaters use more services; do not support framework specifically about residential; flood and or strong stream; ignoring customers; join and or align with other navigation authorities; environmental impact specifically about use of fuel; all or some boaters pay more; boating is expensive; not all rivers are the same; keep simple; framework too complex specifically in use of area; mooring charges; good service and sailing boats with auxiliary engines

## 3. Proposed national navigation boat charges scheme starting on or after 1 January 2022

### 3.1. Common charges across waterways

#### Unpowered open boats

**Q19: Do you support our proposed charges for unpowered open boats on each waterway?**

- yes - 469
- no - 263
- did not know - 71
- not applicable - 109
- did not answer - 134

#### Common charges unpowered open boats

**Q20: Do you support the introduction of an explorer charge for privately owned unpowered open boats for each waterway where the boat is used?**

- yes - 499
- no - 244
- did not know - 75
- not applicable - 95
- did not answer - 133

**Q21: Do you support our proposed common charge for tenders across each waterway?**

- yes - 407
- no - 308
- did not know - 62
- not applicable - 122
- did not answer - 147

**Q22: Do you support our proposed common charge for tugs and maintenance boats across each waterway?**

- yes - 376
- no - 183
- did not know - 119
- not applicable - 217
- did not answer - 151

**Q23: Do you support our proposed common charge for not for profit organisations and charities?**

- yes - 426
- no - 257
- did not know - 103
- not applicable - 108
- did not answer - 152

**Q24: Do you support our proposed common charges for registering an event of unpowered open boats?**

- yes - 401
- no - 236
- did not know - 107
- not applicable - 146
- did not answer - 156

**Q25: Do you support our proposed common charges for trade plates and trade exemptions?**

- yes - 387
- no - 146
- did not know - 187
- not applicable - 176
- did not answer - 150

**Q26: Do you support our proposed common charge for out of service passenger boats?**

- yes - 434
- no - 123
- did not know - 113
- not applicable - 206
- did not answer - 170

**Q27: Do you support our proposed common charges for temporary transit registration for each waterway?**

- yes - 413
- no - 227
- did not know - 104
- not applicable - 125
- did not answer - 177

**Q28: Do you support our proposed common charges for these other charges?**

- yes - 455
- no - 259
- did not know - 81
- not applicable - 76
- did not answer - 175

**Q29: Do you support our proposed common business charges for business boats?**

- yes - 333
- no - 214
- did not know - 117
- not applicable - 206
- did not answer - 176

**Q30: Overall do you support our proposals to increase the common charges by 6% in 2022, 4% in 2023 and 0% in 2024?**

- yes - 269
- no - 531
- did not know - 52
- not applicable - 22
- did not answer - 172

## Please provide any comments or suggestions you have on our proposed 'common charges'

Of the 1,046 responses, 648 did not answer or had no opinion.

On analysing the 398 comments made to this question, we have listed the main themes, then grouped the remaining based on the number of times the theme was identified.

The top 10 themes were:

- did not support charge increase - 175
- poor service and or facilities provided - 65
- all or some charges too high - 62
- more and better compliance and enforcement activity - 43
- if increase the charge, then increase the services - 42
- maintaining the waterway is essential - 40
- increase by inflation and or CPI - 24
- do not change, it is ok - 19
- lack of field staff - 19
- boaters cannot afford the increase - 19

Themes identified between 18 and 10 times were:

- businesses pay more; boaters will leave; reduce the service, reduce the charge; agree the percentage charge increase; more mooring sites; all or some charges too low and length is the better metric

Themes identified between 9 and 5 times were:

- seek other funding streams; want a consistent waterway charge; provide more information; increase in charge will reduce income; be more transparent; more and better compliance and enforcement activity specifically for unpowered boats; be competent; do not support framework and want a refund for coronavirus (COVID-19)

Themes identified between 4 times or less were:

- all users pay; issues with narrowboat size relating to locks and moorings; environmental impact; issue with the base charge used; framework is too complex; health and safety issue; British Canoeing or British Rowing (or both) agreement; support framework; all or some boaters pay more; a new scheme or approach; flood and or strong stream; revise the proposal; all or some boaters use more services; no cross funding; boating is expensive; all or some exempt from charges; do not support framework specifically about residential; other suggestions or comments; good service; consultation feedback; ignoring customers; new technical or digital service and more flexible registrations options



## 3.2. River Thames waterway charges

In this section we present the number of responses received, and within those the respondents that use the River Thames as their main river.

### Q31: Do you support our proposed charges for powered boats on the River Thames?

Table 1: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use the River Thames

You said	Total number of responses	River Thames only
Yes	223	159
No	320	207
Do not know	61	24
Not applicable	216	8
Not answered	226	31

### Q32: Do you support the proposed charges for unpowered enclosed boats on the River Thames?

Table 2: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use the River Thames

You said	Total number of responses	River Thames only
Yes	224	159
No	236	137
Do not know	80	42
Not applicable	281	60
Not answered	225	31

**Q33: Do you support our proposed charges for passenger steamers from the tidal River Thames to register on the non-tidal River Thames?**

Table 3: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use the River Thames

<b>You said</b>	<b>Total number of responses</b>	<b>River Thames only</b>
<b>Yes</b>	325	239
<b>No</b>	106	40
<b>Do not know</b>	89	41
<b>Not applicable</b>	299	78
<b>Not answered</b>	227	31

**Q33a: Do you support our proposed charges for boats used solely for the carriage of goods on the River Thames?**

Table 4: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use the River Thames

<b>You said</b>	<b>Total number of responses</b>	<b>River Thames only</b>
<b>Yes</b>	281	183
<b>No</b>	117	53
<b>Do not know</b>	132	88
<b>Not applicable</b>	290	73
<b>Not answered</b>	226	32

**Q34: Overall do you support our proposals to increase the River Thames charges by 6% in 2022, 4% in 2023 and 0% in 2024?**

Table 5: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use the River Thames

<b>You said</b>	<b>Total number of responses</b>	<b>River Thames only</b>
<b>Yes</b>	213	138
<b>No</b>	361	240
<b>Do not know</b>	52	20
<b>Not applicable</b>	194	2
<b>Not answered</b>	226	29

**Please give us your suggestions and comments on our proposed charge scheme for River Thames.**

Of the 1,046 responses, 774 did not answer or had no opinion.

On analysing the 272 comments made to this question, we have listed the main themes, then grouped the remaining based on the number of times the theme was identified.

The top 10 themes were:

- did not support the charge increase - 88
- more and or better compliance and enforcement activity - 47
- if increase the charge, then increase the services - 33
- all and or some charges were too high - 30
- poor service and or facilities provided - 30
- lack of field staff - 26
- maintaining the waterway is essential - 22
- did not support framework specifically about use of area - 18
- increase by inflation or CPI - 16
- need more information - 14

Themes identified between 13 and 5 times were:

- if reduce the service then reduce the charge; want a consistent waterway charge; all or some charges (or both) too low; businesses should pay more; length is a better metric; issues with the base charge used; want more mooring sites; agree the percentage charge increase; seek other funding streams; framework too complex; other suggestions or comments; did not support the framework; do not change it is ok; want more or better compliance (or both) and enforcement activity specifically for unpowered boats; want a refund for coronavirus (COVID-19); a new scheme or approach; new technical or digital service (or both); environmental impact; boaters cannot afford the increase; supported the framework; issues with size of narrowboats relating to locks and moorings and be competent and efficient

Themes identified between 4 times or less were:

- no cross funding; a charge for river and or lock use; did not support the framework specifically about residential; want more flexible registrations options; all or some (or both) exempt from charges; consultation feedback; all users pay; environmental impact specifically about fuel; health and safety issue; increase in charge will reduce income; framework is too complex specifically about using area; be more transparent; all and or some boaters pay more; boaters will leave; boating is expensive; British Canoeing or British Rowing agreement (or both); revise the proposal; ignoring customers; did not support the framework specifically about engine size

### 3.3. Upper Medway charges

In this section we present the number of responses received, and within those the respondents that use the Upper Medway as their main river.

#### Q35: Do you support our proposed charges for powered boats on Upper Medway?

Table 6: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use the Upper Medway

You said	Total number of responses	Upper Medway only
<b>Yes</b>	90	13
<b>No</b>	172	21
<b>Do not know</b>	68	0
<b>Not applicable</b>	400	0
<b>Not answered</b>	316	4

**Q36: Do you support the proposed charges for unpowered enclosed boats on Upper Medway?**

Table 7: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use the Upper Medway

<b>You said</b>	<b>Total number of responses</b>	<b>Upper Medway only</b>
<b>Yes</b>	95	18
<b>No</b>	166	16
<b>Do not know</b>	68	0
<b>Not applicable</b>	399	0
<b>Not answered</b>	318	4

**Q37: Overall do you support our proposals to increase the Upper Medway charges by 6% in 2022, 4% in 2023 and 0% in 2024?**

Table 8: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use the Upper Medway

<b>You said</b>	<b>Total number of responses</b>	<b>Upper Medway only</b>
<b>Yes</b>	97	14
<b>No</b>	195	19
<b>Do not know</b>	55	1
<b>Not applicable</b>	378	0
<b>Not answered</b>	321	4

## **Please provide any comments or suggestions you have on our proposed charge scheme for Upper Medway.**

Of the 1,046 responses, 943 did not answer or had no opinion.

On analysing the 103 comments made to this question, we have listed the main themes, then grouped the remaining based on the number of times the theme was identified.

The top 10 themes were:

- did not support the charge increase - 36
- all or some charges (or both) too high - 12
- did not support the framework specifically about using area - 8
- increase by inflation or CPI - 8
- consistent waterway charge - 7
- poor service or facilities (or both) provided - 6
- agreed to the percentage charge increase - 5
- length is the better metric - 5
- more and better compliance and enforcement activity - 4
- issues with the base charge used - 4

Themes identified 3 times or less were:

- all or some (or both) charges too low; if increase the charge then increase the services; consultation feedback; provide more information; do not change it is ok; did not support the framework; a new scheme or approach; framework too complex; want more flexible registrations options; if reduce the service then reduce the charge; lock use; want more and better compliance and enforcement activity specifically about unpowered boats; no cross funding; all or some (or both) exempt from charges; want a refund for coronavirus (COVID-19); boaters cannot afford the increase; be competent and efficient and other suggestions or comments

## **3.4. Anglian waterways charges**

### **3.4.1. River Great Ouse and River Nene charges**

In this section we present the number of responses received, and within those the respondents that use the rivers in Anglian waterways as their main river.

#### **Q38: Do you support our proposed charges for powered boats on Rivers Great Ouse and Nene - Anglian waterways?**

Table 9: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use Anglian waterways

<b>You said</b>	<b>Total number of responses</b>	<b>Anglian waterways only</b>
<b>Yes</b>	106	57
<b>No</b>	478	391
<b>Do not know</b>	46	5
<b>Not applicable</b>	214	10
<b>Not answered</b>	202	40

**Q39: Do you support our proposed charge for unpowered enclosed boats on Rivers Great Ouse and Nene – Anglian waterways?**

Table 10: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use Anglian waterways

<b>You said</b>	<b>Total number of responses</b>	<b>Anglian waterways only</b>
<b>Yes</b>	125	74
<b>No</b>	353	268
<b>Do not know</b>	73	32
<b>Not applicable</b>	288	84
<b>Not answered</b>	207	45

### 3.4.2. Lincolnshire rivers charges

#### Q40: Do you support our proposed charges for powered boats on the Lincolnshire rivers – Anglian waterways?

Table 11: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use Anglian waterways

You said	Total number of responses	Anglian waterways only
Yes	64	24
No	226	145
Do not know	56	14
Not applicable	341	144
Not answered	359	176

#### Q41: Do you support our proposed charge for unpowered enclosed boats on the Lincolnshire rivers – Anglian waterways?

Table 12: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use Anglian waterways

You said	Total number of responses	Anglian waterways only
Yes	73	33
No	208	127
Do not know	57	16
Not applicable	349	149
Not answered	359	178



### Q42: Do you support our proposed charge for tidal boats for the rivers Welland and Glen – Anglian waterways?

Table 13: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use Anglian waterways

You said	Total number of responses	Anglian waterways only
Yes	83	38
No	190	116
Do not know	67	23
Not applicable	354	153
Not answered	352	173

### 3.4.3. River Stour charges

#### Q43: Do you support our proposed charges for powered boats on River Stour – Anglian Waterways?

Table 14: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use Anglian waterways

You said	Total number of responses	Anglian waterways only
Yes	67	29
No	188	107
Do not know	56	16
Not applicable	353	157
Not answered	382	194

**Q44: Do you support our proposed charge for unpowered enclosed boats on River Stour – Anglian waterways?**

Table 15: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use Anglian waterways

<b>You said</b>	<b>Total number of responses</b>	<b>Anglian waterways only</b>
<b>Yes</b>	73	35
<b>No</b>	179	95
<b>Do not know</b>	55	18
<b>Not applicable</b>	358	160
<b>Not answered</b>	381	195

**Q45: Overall do you support our proposals to increase the Anglian Waterway charges by 6% in 2022, 4% in 2023 and 0% in 2024?**

Table 16: number of responses received showing what all respondents said and also those who use Anglian waterways

<b>You said</b>	<b>Total number of responses</b>	<b>Anglian waterways only</b>
<b>Yes</b>	122	69
<b>No</b>	419	305
<b>Do not know</b>	38	12
<b>Not applicable</b>	172	3
<b>Not answered</b>	295	114

**Please provide any comments or suggestions you have on our proposed charge schemes for Anglian Waterways.**

Of the 1,046 responses, 728 did not answer or had no opinion.

On analysing the 318 comments made to this question, we have listed the main themes, then grouped the remaining based on the number of times the theme was identified.

The top 10 themes were:

- did not support charge increase - 146
- all and or some charges were too high - 97
- poor service and or facilities provided - 47
- maintaining waterway is essential - 45
- did not support framework specifically about use of area - 34
- if increase the charge then increase the services - 30
- length is the better metric - 23
- boaters will leave - 22
- agreed with the percentage charge increase - 22
- more and or better compliance and enforcement activity - 20

Themes identified between 19 and 10 times were:

- issues with base charge used; flood and or strong stream; consultation feedback; want a consistent waterway charge; want more mooring sites; increase by inflation or CPI; want more flexible registrations options; boaters cannot afford the increase; don't change it is ok and be competent and or efficient

Themes identified between 9 and 4 times or less were:

- no cross funding; if reduce the service then reduce the charge; all and or some charges too low; issue with size of narrowboats relating to locks and moorings; increase in charge will reduce income; framework too complex; did not support framework specifically about residential; seek other funding streams; provide more information; other suggestions or comments; be more transparent and did not support framework

Themes identified 3 times or less were:

- ignoring customers; a new scheme or approach; all users should pay; environmental impact; all and or some exempt from charges; want a refund for coronavirus (COVID-19); want a charge for river and or lock use; businesses pay more; want more and or better compliance and enforcement activity specifically for unpowered boats; supported the framework; environmental impact specifically about fuel; health and safety issue; good service; did not support framework specifically about engine size; want a new technical or digital service and lack of field staff

## 4. Business boat requirements

**Q46: Do you agree with our proposal to require compliance with the Code of Practice for Hire Boats from 1 January 2022 as set out in section 5.1?**

- yes - 443
- no - 39
- did not know - 62
- not applicable - 171
- did not answer - 331

**Q47: Do you agree with our proposal to require compliance with the Inland Waters Small Passenger Boat Code from 1 January 2022 as outlined in section 5.2?**

- yes - 443
- no - 41
- did not know - 62
- not applicable - 171
- did not answer - 329

**Q48: Do you agree with our proposal to require confirmation of compliance with the Merchant Shipping (Boatmasters' Qualifications, Crew and Hours of Work) Regulations 2015 as set out in section 5.3?**

- yes - 397
- no - 54
- did not know - 89
- not applicable - 173
- did not answer - 333

**Q49: Do you agree with our proposal to require a BSS non-private certification as outlined in section 5.4?**

- yes - 440
- no - 54
- did not know - 64
- not applicable - 156
- did not answer - 332

**Q50: Do you agree with our proposal to introduce the requirement for operators of all business boats to hold a public liability insurance policy covering liabilities of at least two million pounds for each claim?**

- yes - 518
- no - 27
- did not know - 31
- not applicable - 137
- did not answer - 333

**Q51: Do you agree with our proposal to introduce the requirement for all self-drive unpowered hire boats to be insured for a minimum sum of at least one million pounds for each claim?**

- yes - 492
- no - 38
- did not know - 55
- not applicable - 128
- did not answer - 333

**Q52: Please provide any further comments on our proposals for business requirements.**

Of the 1,046 responses, 966 did not answer or had no opinion.

On analysing the 80 comments made to this question, we have listed the main themes, then grouped the remaining based on the number of times the theme was identified.

The top 10 themes were:

- suggestions or comments about level of insurance cover - 15
- education of hire boat users - 11
- agreed to all or some of the business requirements - 9
- ensure public safety - 9
- hire boats cause problems - 6
- proposals are too harsh - 5
- businesses will close - 5
- commercial boats should pay more - 5
- more compliance and enforcement activity - 5
- Hire Boat Code should include unpowered boats - 4

Themes identified 3 times or less:

- ensure Hire Boat Code is enforced; suggestions for non-private British Safety Scheme (BSS); Royal Yachting Association training boats should be charged more fairly; Inland Waters Small Passenger Boat Code needs review; improve commercial registration; use of Article 16 powers should have been included; this is over regulation; Boatmasters Licence regulations too onerous; Environment Agency management does not respect business; regulations too stringent for small passenger boats; BSS not suitable for workboats; transparency of charge; Article 15 Inland Waterways Order should be implemented; other suggestions or comments; affects voluntary and or charity events; do not change as it is ok; include pollution requirements; if increase charges then increase enforcement; too complicated; lack of field staff; non-private BSS too onerous for static letting; speed and wash enforcement of commercial boats and suggestions for level of public liability insurance

## 5. Forward Look

**Q53: Would you support a move to a more flexible registration year in the future?**

- yes - 695
- no - 65
- did not know - 44
- not applicable - 18
- did not answer - 224

**Q54: Do you have any comments or suggestions about moving to a more flexible registration year in the future?**

Of the 1,046 responses, 868 did not answer or had no opinion.

On analysing the 178 comments made to this question, we have listed the main themes, then grouped the remaining based on the number of times the theme was identified.

The main themes identified more than 5 times were:

- agree or supported or said long overdue to a more flexible registration year - 56
- more flexible registration options - 47
- do not change it as it is ok - 17
- more flexible payment options - 14
- similar principle to car tax or TV licence or statutory off road notification - 10
- more flexible registration options specifically about sale or out of water boats - 10
- new technical or digital service - 8
- administration would be more efficient - 8
- other suggestions or comments - 7
- enforcement challenges - 5

- all waterways should pay the same or align with C&RT - 5
- be competent and or efficient - 5
- more and or better compliance and enforcement activity - 5

The remaining themes identified 4 times or less were:

- all and or some charges too high; did not agree or said do not change; consider the Gold licence; increase cost then increase service; poor service and or facilities provided; want more flexibility for trailered boats; consultation feedback and lack of field staff

### **Q55: Would you use an online digital boat registration service?**

- yes - 728
- no - 62
- did not know - 27
- not applicable - 7
- did not answer - 22

### **Where you answered 'no' we asked you to choose an option**

You chose:

- no access to the internet - 7
- prefer not to use online service or payments - 35
- other - 14
- did not answer - 990

### **Where you responded 'other' we asked you to leave a comment**

Of the 1,046 responses, 999 did not answer or had no opinion.

On analysing the 47 comments made to this question, we have listed the main themes, then grouped the remaining based on the number of times the theme was identified.

The top 9 themes were:

- agree or supported or said long overdue to on line digital boat registration - 14
- should offer non-digital options and or printed registration - 9
- learn from other online systems - 8
- ensure privacy and or security - 5
- did not agree - 2
- must be fully online - 2
- did not trust us - 2
- be competent and or efficient - 2

Themes identified only once were:

- have an App; also need to have digital BSS; consider the Gold Licence; efficiency is reflected in cost; asked a question; should not result in an automatic enforcement mechanism and have flexible payment options

**Q56: We will be engaging with customers to get input to the new service as the project develops. Would you be interested in getting involved?**

- yes - 291
- no - 509
- did not answer - 246

**Q57: Do you support a consistent approach to boat identification across our waterways?**

- yes - 674
- no - 87
- did not know - 55
- not applicable - 8
- did not answer - 222

**We asked if you selected 'no' please tell us why?**

Of the 1,046 responses, 966 did not answer or had no opinion.

On analysing the 80 comments made to this question, we have listed the themes identified.

The themes were:

- did not agree or said do not change - 31
- other comments and or suggestions - 17
- agreed but lots to consider - 8
- agreed - 6
- similar approach or link to C&RT or other systems - 5
- did not agree due to cost or regulation burden - 4
- did not agree to a name - 3
- agreed to using the registration number - 3
- not for unpowered boats - 3
- agreed and said better for enforcement - 3
- agreed but need better technology - 2
- agreed to using name - 1



### **Q58: What do you think should be used as the unique identifier for a boat?**

You chose:

- boat name - 197
- registration number - 582
- other - 34
- did not answer - 233

### **We asked you to tell us why you chose 'other'**

Of the 1,046 responses, 975 did not answer.

On analysing the 71 comments made to this question, we have listed the themes identified.

The themes were:

- name and or number - 24
- other comments or suggestions - 21
- registration number - 11
- boat name - 8
- similar approach to C&RT - 5
- did not agree or said do not change - 2
- did not agree due to historic or tradition - 2
- more and or better compliance and enforcement activity - 1

### **Q59: Do you agree that boat users on the Rivers Wye and Lugg should make a contribution towards the service we provide for their benefit?**

- yes - 376
- no - 36
- did not know - 59
- not applicable - 18
- did not have an opinion - 186
- did not answer - 371

### **Q60: Please tell us if you have any suggestions about funding of the service we provide for boat users on the Rivers Wye and Lugg.**

Of the 1,046 responses, 966 did not answer.

On analysing the 80 comments made to this question, we have listed the main themes, then grouped the remaining based on the number of times the theme was identified.

The top 9 themes were:

- all users should pay - 29
- other suggestions or comments - 16
- charge should be reasonable - 9
- what service do you provide? - 9
- public access and or free access - 8
- we should provide value for money - 8
- consistent waterway charge - 6
- what is the legal authority to charge? - 3
- business should pay the charge - 3

Themes identified 2 times or less were:

- have a national scheme through British Canoeing; why do they not pay?; provide more information; what benefit will this give?; how can you justify a charge?; enforcement costs?; ensure education and or clubs access; flooding grant; how will this affect launching fees? and if increase the charge then increase enforcement and or compliance activity

## 6. Email responses to the consultation

We received 105 responses about the consultation as emails. The emails did not answer the specific consultation questions, but did provide comments about the consultation.

On analysing the 105 comments submitted by email, we have listed the main themes, then grouped the remaining based on the number of times the theme was identified.

The main 9 themes were:

- all and or some charges too high - 57
- did not support the charge increase - 51
- maintaining the waterway is essential- 32
- poor service and or facilities provided -27
- feedback on the consultation - 23
- rivers are all different - 23
- did not support the framework specifically about using area - 20
- boaters will leave - 20
- if increase the charge then increase the services - 18
- length is a better metric - 15
- reconsider the proposals - 15

Themes identified between 14 and 5 times were:

- wanted more enforcement; want more mooring sites; provide more information; want more flexible registrations; be competent and or efficient; boaters cannot afford the increase; issues with base charge used; be more transparent; flood and or strong stream; health and safety issue; want more enforcement specifically for unpowered boats; issues with size of narrowboats relating to lock and mooring use; ignoring customers; lack of field staff; increase by inflation or CPI; increase in charge will reduce income; don't support all or some of the framework; completed the on-line consultation; want a consistent waterway charge; environmental impact; a new approach or scheme and supported the framework

Themes identified 4 times or less were:

- seek other funding streams; good service; make no changes; more engagement and or communication; agreed with the percentage charge increase; businesses should pay more; other suggestions or comments; don't support the framework specifically about engine size; agree with a rolling 12-month; want a refund for coronavirus (COVID-19); boating is expensive; framework is too complex specifically about using area; ignoring customers; environmental impact specifically about fuel; suggest a new technical or digital service; join or align with other navigation authorities; registration use boat names only; education about licence requirements; a charge for river and or lock use; maintaining river is essential; BSS; all and or some charges too low; framework is too complex; Don't support the framework; if reduce the service then reduce the charge

## 7. Businesses and organisations responding to the consultation

The names of the businesses and organisations that identified as a commercial group or as another organisation (such as a charity, not-for-profit organisation, trading body) when completing the consultation are reported.

Businesses and organisations were:

- 2nd Abingdon Scout Group
- 3D Marine (GB) Ltd
- 8th Holborn Scouts
- Arete Outdoor Centre
- Association of Thames Yacht Clubs
- Berkshire Boats Ltd
- Bisham Abbey Sailing and Navigation School Ltd
- Blackthorn Marina
- Boat Hire Company
- British Marine
- British Marine Inland Boating
- Broom Owners Club

- Buckden Marina
- Cambridge University Boat Club
- Canal & River Trust
- Combined Cadet Force (Royal Navy)
- Cotswold Boat Hire & GLS Marine
- Cotswold Canals Trust
- East Anglian Waterways Association (EAWA)
- Elton Boat Club
- Ely Marine Ltd
- Fox Narrowboats
- Goring Gap Boat Club
- Great Ouse Boating Association Ltd (GOBA)
- International Yachting Fellowship of Rotarians (Thames Fleet)
- Maritime Volunteer Service
- Maritime Volunteer Service
- Medway River Users Association
- National Association of Boat Owners (NABO)
- National Barge Travellers Association (NBTA)
- Northern Exposure Rescue
- Ouse on Board
- Paxmead Riverside Base, Girlguiding (Surrey West County)
- Peterborough Yacht Club
- Residential Boat Owners Association
- Scout Association Scout Group
- Small Boat Club Kingston Surrey
- South Wales Outdoor Activity Providers Group
- Thames Boat House Ltd
- Thames Motor Boaters Association
- Thames Scout Cruising Club
- The Barge Association (DBA)
- Tonbridge River Trips
- Upware Boat Club
- W&S London Ltd (trading as GoBoat)
- Weybridge Mariners Club
- Wye Navigation Advisory Committee

# Would you like to find out more about us or your environment?

Then call us on

03708 506 506 (Monday to Friday, 8am to 6pm)

Email:

Or visit our website

[www.gov.uk/environment-agency](http://www.gov.uk/environment-agency)

## incident hotline

0800 807060 **(24 hours)**

## floodline

0345 988 1188 **(24 hours)**

Find out about call charges (<https://www.gov.uk/call-charges>)

## Environment first

Are you viewing this onscreen? Please consider the environment and only print if absolutely necessary. If you are reading a paper copy, please don't forget to reuse and recycle.