

Category	Issue or Comment	Sector affecting	Weighting	Issue	Response
Boat Sale Charge	Comment	Common	1	No charge - boat belongs to customer and so does mooring contract	This remains a controversial issue. As mooring values vary by location, it is not right for a public body to support anyone making money on the sale of their boat because it is moored at a desirable location. Therefore, to ensure fairness and simplicity, residential boaters will not be able to transfer their mooring when they sell their boat from 1st June 2017. Leisure boaters are already prohibited from transferring their mooring. Scottish Canals will try to accommodate new purchasers of existing boats at their preferred location, subject to our application process and compliance tests. However where the mooring is in an area of high demand it may not be possible to do so. Scottish Canals advises all buyers to speak to Scottish Canals before any sale is made binding and asks sellers to signpost purchasers to Scottish Canals during early negotiations. This is in line with the approach taken elsewhere, including by the Canal & River Trust.
Boat Sale Charge	Comment	Leisure	1	Leisure should be prohibited as this impacts on waiting lists	We agree. As per above leisure moorings will continue to be excluded from any boat sale.
Boat Sale Charge	Comment	Common	1	May not be possible for boat to be moved in short term	This will only be an issue for leisure boaters selling a boat where we have a waiting list for the leisure moorings. In this circumstance we would expect our customers to take this into account as part of the sale process.
Boat Sale Charge	Comment	Common	1	What is charge and when introduced?	The charge was based on a percentage of the sale price for residential boats, the transfer of leisure moorings is not currently permitted. However, a recommendation has been made to the Board of Scottish Canals on this issue.
Boat Sale Charge	Comment	Common	1	Small charge if customer is on waiting list, if not then will need to move mooring	A decision has been taken that no moorings will be transferred with the sale of boats. This will be effective from 1st June 2017.
Boat Sale Charge	Comment	Common	1	If no waiting list then mooring should be offered at going rate	A decision has been taken that no moorings will be transferred with the sale of boats. This will be effective from 1st June 2017.
Boat Sale Charge	Comment	Common	1	reasonable that a customer cant sell mooring with boat	As mooring values vary by location, it is not right for a public body to support anyone making money on the sale of their boat because it is moored at a desirable location. Therefore, to ensure fairness and simplicity, residential boaters will not be able to transfer their mooring when they sell their boat from 1st June 2017. This is in line with Canal & River Trust approach.
Boat Sale Charge	Comment	Common	1	no automatic right as this will make it difficult for existing boaters to move to a popular location	A decision has been taken that as of 1st June 2017 no moorings will be transferred with the sale of boats.
Canal Revenue	Comment	Other	2 + G	Can walkers, cyclists and other users of towpath contribute by way of charges?	Charge for organised walking/cycling events v. open access?
Canal Revenue	Comment	Commercial	1	charge for car parking for canal users including cruise ship and hire boats customers	Not material to the consultation. However, Scottish Canals is committed to ensuring open access to the nation's inland waterways for all of Scotland's people as it helps to create tourist destinations, stimulate business growth and benefit local communities.
Canal Revenue	Comment	Common	1	SC can grow revenue by good governance and facilities improvement	Not material to the consultation. However, Scottish Canals is focused on generating income through multiple means and charging fair, reasonable and consistent prices for the products and services we provide is part of this.
Canal Revenue	Comment	Transit	1	explore price elasticity of transit licence, would a significant reduction encourage greater use, generating more revenue	Transit numbers have remained fairly static in recent years, despite price changes and therefore Scottish Canals has no reason to believe that price reductions would stimulate more transits.
Canal Revenue	Comment	Commercial	1	its not fair that leisure and liveabords should have to make up the short fall in the cost of maintaining damage to the canal caused by their commercial customers	Not material to the consultation.
Canal Revenue	Comment	Common	1	Fees paid by canal users are assumed to be the main non public funded money for running the canals so this should be fully taken into account in all changes made or developments proposed	Not material to the consultation. However, boating generates £1 million for Scottish Canals each year but this is part of £7 million annually which Scottish Canals earns through the Falkirk Wheel, utilites, canalside cottages and commercial lettings. A further £10 million Grant in Aid is received from the Scottish Government.
Canal Revenue	Comment	Other	1	SC have seen increased staffing costs, could there be an efficiency drive to look at savings here rather than "tax" boaters.	Not material to the consultation

Canal Revenue	Comment	Commercial	1	Low level of income generated from commercial activity - £160k, is there not scope to increase revenue here	Not material to the consultation
Canal Revenue	Comment	Other	1	SC spend time and money promoting canal activities which bring in no revenue, canoeists can use facilities for small charge, boaters pay increased charges for use of facilities , can this not be exploited?	Not material to the consultation
Canal Revenue	Comment	Common	1	Has SC assessed the context of boaters lives or is it a narrow and only economic assessment of how to make a profit, a dilemma is how does SC break even and then make little profit but how this is done and how quickly is very important	This consultation is about what is fair to all boaters as well as the public purse
Canal Revenue	Comment	Transit	1	There are 29 berths free kept for transit boaters, these are never really used to capacity, more could be done to bring in more revenue from these	Scottish Canals wants to see more boats on and moving along the nation's inland waterways and therefore berths need to be kept available for transit customers to use
Canal Revenue	Comment	Residential	1	SC will have moorings with an average cost of £2605 p.a.. In 2016 CRT managed 3604 moorings at an average of £1613 per boat and running at 95% occupancy	Gerald Eve/GVA made clear distinctions between England/Wales and Scotland and therefore comparisons such as these are subjective
Canal Revenue	Comment	Residential	1	BWML whose marinas were used for comparison in 2015 managed 3232 moorings with an average cost of £1607 per year at 76% occupancy	Gerald Eve/GVA used many different comparables to come to their conclusions, including BWML.
Communication	Comment	Common	1	GE recommend further consideration of the problems encountered with selling boats on Scottish canals. Further discussion between SC and boaters on this issue would be welcome	This remains a controversial issue. As mooring values vary by location, it is not right for a public body to support anyone making money on the sale of their boat because it is moored at a desirable location. Therefore, to ensure fairness and simplicity, residential boaters will not be able to transfer their mooring when they sell their boat from 1st June 2017. Leisure boaters are already prohibited from transferring their mooring. Scottish Canals will try to accommodate new purchasers of existing boats at their preferred location, subject to our application process and compliance tests. However where the mooring is in an area of high demand it may not be possible to do so. Scottish Canals advises all buyers to speak to Scottish Canals before any sale is made binding and asks sellers to signpost purchasers to Scottish Canals during early negotiations. This is in line with the approach taken elsewhere, including by the Canal & River Trust.
Communication	Comment	Common	1	No avenue for anonymity	The online tool offered people the opportunity to submit a response without providing a name and some respondees took advantage of this. However, for feedback to be constructive, it is far more useful if the responses are attributable as part of wider efforts to build on the positive relationship Scottish Canals has with the majority of our customers.
Communication	Comment	Common	1	Rather than survey monkey tool, could have allowed a minute taker to attend a directors meeting to show open and fair discussion	This was not deemed appropriate. By conducting this consultation process in an open, transparent and professional manner, all customers have had the opportunity to participate.
Communication	Comment	Common	1	Completed survey response but looking for CE response, not unsigned anonymous reply	Scottish Canals is unsure what the issue is here.
Communication	Comment	Common	1	Disputing many opportunities to review consultation with members of SC staff and GE. No meaningful discussion option since report published, at a meeting with SCBG, Andrew Thin and Martin Latimer they refused to engage in discussion on content	Having tasked Gerald Eve/GVA, as independent reviewers, to design a methodology for setting and reviewing mooring and licence prices, it would not have been appropriate for Scottish Canals to meet a small group of customers and discuss its content prior to the wider public being invited to feedback their views.
Communication	Comment	Common	1	Feeling that purpose of the consultation is only to review how the recommendations have to be implemented rather than give review of content and conclusions, feeling that GE report is irreversible and a fait accompli	Having tasked Gerald Eve/GVA, as independent reviewers, to review current mooring and licence prices and design a methodology for setting and reviewing them going forward, would not be a good use of public money or personnel to review their review. Gerald Eve/GVA have set out clear recommendations in their report, which Scottish Canals committed to adhering to at the beginning of this process and therefore the consultation focuses primarily on the fairest way to introduce their recommendations.

Communication	Comment	Common	1	Boaters want value for money and fairness, this report compounds issues	We don't agree. We believe this consultation sets out how anomalies in pricing should be addressed in a fair, reasonable and transparent manner.
Facilities	Comment	Transit	1	No fuel at Banavie, nothing between Corpach and Caley, something in the middle would be good even at a small charge	It is correct that there is no fuel at Banavie. However, we believe existing provision is sufficient. However, we will look at the option of introducing a customer helpline which assists boaters.
Facilities	Issue	Residential	1	Dochgarroch toilet facilities inadequate (Jacobite cruisers passengers use)	Scottish Canals is already working with Jacobite and the local authority to develop a project which enhances provision at Dochgarroch facilities.
Facilities	Issue	Leisure	1	Crinan opens 90 mins later, Ardrishaig unmanned when bridge operating, lack of electricity terminus, dangerous use of daisy chains	Local Scottish Canals' team has been asked to investigate this issue to ensure that any connections are of no more than 25m in length and of continuous cable. Scottish Canals is also planning to bring greater consistency in operations of Ardrishaig and Crinan sea locks for the 2017 season.
Facilities	Issue	Transit	1	Grangemouth lock levels varying during mast lowering	Not material to this consultation
Facilities	Issue	Transit	1	Bowling crane not working	Not material to this consultation
Facilities	Issue	Transit	1	Reluctance to adopt user operation on F&C has caused concern	Scottish Canals agrees that boater operations should be the norm where possible. However, it requires a review of how it would work as locks can be user operated while bridges can't. Consideration would also need to be given to the training that would be required and whether the cost of licences would be impacted. Scottish Canals has committed to working with customers in order to design a feasible user operation system for implementation on the Lowland Canals by 1st April 2018.
Facilities	Comment	Residential	1	Seaport - Can a deal with Diageo be looked at for pump out option?	A review is currently being undertaken of the options to provide pump out at this location. The cheapest option to connect the system is likely to be across the Threadneedle property and as such a wayleave is required to be negotiated.
Facilities	Comment	Transit	1	Seaport - Slow transit times due to operating and working hour restrictions, increasing equipment failure and lack of safe cramage has led to decline in canal use	Scottish canals is bound by road and rail bridge restrictions which have been agreed with local authorities and the emergency services to minimise the impact of canal operations on other transport networks.
Facilities	Issue	Residential	1	Seaport - if standpipes freeze there is no water supply	Scottish Canals will consider providing a water supply to residential customers in the event of a freeze within 24 hours.
Facilities	Issue	Common	1	Disabled user so only option is to moor at Seaport which is the most expensive location on the Caledonian Canal and there are no other easily accessible facilities along the canal. Dochgarroch disabled toilet is not bolted to the floor, Fort Augustus showers have no grab rails, stones around Gairloch make it difficult for wheelchair use, Banavie you have to get off and go all the way to the bottom and back up again	Scottish Canals will explore this issue more fully with the customer concerned and review what steps can be taken to improve disabled access at Seaport.
Facilities	Issue	Common	1	There was a disabled review carried out in 2009 and maybe this should be reviewed or update as facilities have deteriorated not improved since, as a start the locks on the disabled facilities should be radar keys to prevent people from using them.	Scottish Canals will carry out a review of disability access across Scotland's canals by March 2018
Facilities	Issue	Residential	1	Seaport - Lack of car parking and public using facilities causing lack of availability for boaters	Facilities and car park provision at Seaport are available for residents and members of the public to use and not solely for boaters. When residential moorings were first created here, all residents were offered the opportunity to pay extra for a dedicated parking space but no-one came forward and therefore the 30 spaces are allocated to residential boating customers, members of the public and Scottish Canals' staff on a first come, first served basis. However, Scottish Canals is currently progressing a project which will provide further substantial car parking for Seaport and have applied for third party funding to help with construction costs.
Facilities	Issue	Residential	1	Should take into account no phone line, this means no high speed WI-FI. Costs thousands of pounds to have phone line to boat	Not material to this consultation. However, while Wifi is available in some residential locations, Scottish Canals is currently reviewing the costs of providing it in remaining locations.

Facilities	Issue	Residential	1	Ratho - Poor laundry facilities, paving area dangerous, pump out situated on main canal so issue if canal freezes, lack of shops nearby and poor public transport links	The matrix developed by Gerald Eve was based on detailed information provided by Scottish Canals about the range of facilities available at each location. However, Gerald Eve also conducted site visits to all residential locations. The ratio between residential boaters and washing facilities is adequate in Ratho and is superior to the majority of other locations on the network. Cala have repaired the paving. The canal freezing is an issue for pump out at any location, and boaters should undertake regular pump outs during winter months to ensure a freeze does not provide problems for them.
		Common	1	Bellanoch - No village facilities in walking distance, poor laundry facilities, poor quality toilets, refuse area not cleared for 2 months, no 32 amp power points, no protected water stand, shared between 8 not 2 users, safety ladders not sufficient in quality and quantity,	Gerald Eve/GVA's scoring reflected the provision of local services and Scottish Canals has committed to developing a Customer Facilities Charter setting out the range and volume of facilities it is reasonable for boating customers to expect by 1st September 2017.
Facilities	Issue				See Scottish Canals' consultation response for details here.
Legal Agreement	Comment	Common	1	Transit /short term users should not have onerous conditions applied	Agreed. Scottish Canals is committed to keeping conditions simple.
Legal Agreement	Comment	Common	1	More thought needs to be taken over longer term customers.	Longer term agreements are available for residential mooring customers on request. In order to ensure fairness Scottish Canals cannot treat customers differently due to the length of time they have been on the canal.
Legal Agreement	Comment	Common	1	Are bird watchers and fishermen included in the all customers term?	This falls outwith the scope of the review
Legal Agreement	Comment	Common	1	Different locations have different requirements so agreements should reflect this	Scottish Canals will adopt standard T&Cs for all residential and uniform T&Cs for all leisure customers from 1st June 2017 to ensure fairness and clarity.
Legal Agreement	Comment	Common	1	SC fail to treat all equally as Jacobite do what they want	All customers are bound by the same terms and conditions relative to use.
Legal Agreement	Comment	Common	1	Jacobite seem to be exempt from speed limits	All customers are bound by the same terms and conditions relative to use.
Legal Agreement	Comment	Common	1	Ultimately agree with the same agreement in the long run but due to the current discrepancy between the older and living on water agreements would be unfair to implement to quickly	Agreements will be standardised so that all customers are bound by the same T&Cs as this ensures fairness and clarity.
Legal Agreement	Comment	Common	1	If mooring holders are subject to BSS then all transit users should be too otherwise it is a mockery	Scottish Canals carries out random gas checks on approximately 10% of transit vessels per year but recognises the inherent level of boat safety for those vessels which arrive on the canal from overseas. Furthermore, as boats in the canal network remain on the inland waterways for the vast majority of the year, they pose a higher risk and therefore it is only right that they are subject to the Boat Safety Scheme.
Legal Agreement	Comment	Common	1	SC should have flexibility to negotiate special terms in some circumstances	A recommendation has been made to the Board of Scottish Canals regarding this issue.
Monopoly	Comment	Residential	1	On canal no choice of landlord, but at Edinburgh Quay surrounded by mix of social housing and private serviced apartments, none of which are comparable	Scottish Canals commissioned this Pricing Review to establish fair charges for all boating customers as well as a fair return for the public purse. Gerald Eve/GVA were tasked with ascertaining market prices and therefore they focused on the private housing market but this was solely as a benchmark.
Monopoly	Issue	Residential	1	Original mooring fees were same as 4 bed house in Kirkintilloch. Council tax has been frozen for the last few years but mooring fees have doubled and if the proposed figures are implemented it would be a 300% increase, SC have monopoly and are acting like rogue Landlords	Mooring fees are not comparable to council tax payments. Scottish Canals is required to operate the canal on a financially sustainable basis to ensure best value is obtained
Monopoly	Comment	Common	1	SC have monopoly on water use and moorings, boaters may not want to rock the boat due to possible negative consequences in the future	Scottish Canals invests significant time and resource in customer engagement and all customers had the opportunity to feedback prior to and during this consultation. Furthermore, there was the option for customers to respond to the consultation anonymously should they choose. Therefore Scottish Canals does not accept that customers were precluded from making their voices heard.

Monopoly	Comment	Common	1	Only want to consult on when increases will take place, exploiting monopoly position	Scottish Canals commissioned the Pricing Review following customer feedback. Furthermore, as all customers had the opportunity to input to the process and it was carried out by independent third party reviewers in an open and transparent manner, it was agreed at the outset that all parties would need to accept the methodology proposed and that the consultation would focus on how this methodology should be implemented. This is exactly what happened.
Monopoly	Comment	Residential	1	Due to monopoly of Scottish Canals only one approach was considered equitable in the pricing review - benchmarking to the housing market	Customers had the opportunity to present their views/alternate approaches. However, it was left to independent consultants to design a methodology that would both benefit boaters and Scotland's canals. Gerald Eve/GVA devised a methodology which they set out in their Pricing Review with recommendations on how this methodology should be implemented. As they have stated in their report, Gerald Eve/GVA opted for residential moorings to be benchmarked against the price of locally rented two-bedroom properties as this provided the best vehicle for identifying prices across Scotland. Alternative methods they considered had a lack of comparable information to value mooring charges.
Monopoly	Comment	Residential	1	Disagree that boaters have agreed to pay the same rate at the same location which underpins GE findings. SC have monopoly and results in customers having to pay the prices set by SC, there is no market competition and no where else to go.	The evidence of recent lettings indicates that customers are prepared to pay the same rate at the same location. Scotland's canals are not the only place to moor or enjoy boating in Scotland and Scottish Canals provides a range of prices at many different locations so customers have the option of where they are based and how much they pay.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Leisure	1	Seems strange that fees are higher for a village location than for one with direct access to sea	This is the result of the independent valuation.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Common	1	Methodology should be left in place for longer period than 3-5 years	Agreed. Scottish Canals will carry out a simple market review using the methodology produced by Gerald Eve / GVA every five years to take into account market changes and investment in infrastructure. This review will set new market rates for all moorings that will prevail for a further five years and the results will be publicised on the Scottish Canals' website.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Leisure	1	To charge £225 pm for narrowboats is not robust. This would drive boaters off Scottish canals, the affordability in Scotland is an attraction compared to the canal restrictions.	This pricing is the result of the independent valuation using market comparables
Mooring Charges	Comment	Leisure	1	In Southbank council capped mooring calculation at 15m. As an owner of a longer boat this was encouraging as they also find the canal here difficult to navigate and has limited turning opportunities. Could this policy be adopted or may look to sell boat down south or ask for longer time to transition to new costs	Residential rates are per berth and as such size has to be within a certain range, but does not dictate the price paid. Leisure boats are charged per metre as many don't have the benefit of an electric bollard and so spare pontoons can be used to accommodate other boats. As such it seems fair to charge leisure on a per metre basis.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Transit	1	Is there a need to review prices in the future due to the quality of service and man hours available to boaters transiting the canal	Scottish Canals will monitor transit prices annually to ensure that the offer reflects established pricing and the range and volume of facilities it is reasonable for a transit customer to expect will feature within the development of a Customer Facilities Charter by 1st September 2017.
Mooring Charges	Issue	Transit	1	Caledonian is reasonably under-priced relative to length, staffing and alternative options. Crinan is overpriced and transit has got slower recently, hence many are diverting away from using Crinan due to poor reports of delay and high costs. Crinan should be reduced accordingly.	The transit figures in the Crinan this year are the highest ever experienced and as such Scottish Canals believes that the pricing is in place and that the Crinan provides value for money.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Common	1	Methodology is flawed so the question whether to review annually or every 3-5 years is irrelevant	Scottish Canals confirms that the methodology developed by Gerald Eve/GVA is robust, transparent and fair and therefore will adopted going forward. In addition, every 5 years Scottish Canals will carry out a review of the inputs/comparables and market data used with this methodology to set rates as this will pick up any significant changes.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Leisure	1	Charging liveaboards and leisure boaters more than commercial users is unfair	Commercial users pay through a Trading Agreement which is generally a percentage of turnover. Their minimum pricing is the leisure rate, unless they are a charity where special discounts can be applied.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Common	1	Facilities are lumped on a per site basis there are variances within each site	Scottish Canals will develop a Customer Facilities Charter setting out the range and volume of facilities it is reasonable for boating customers to expect by 1 st September 2017.

Mooring Charges	Comment	Common	1	Once set why should the methodology need to be reviewed again?	Agreed. The methodology will not be reviewed again as it is being adopted by Scottish Canals for being fair, robust and transparent. However a review of market data, comparables/inputs will take place every 5 years to set prices for the next five years to ensure that market changes are captured. New prices will be publicised on the Scottish Canals' website.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Common	1	Review when statistical data suggest it is relevant	A simple market review will be carried out every 5 years to be used with Gerald Eve/GVA's methodology to set new prices for the next five years.
Mooring Charges	Issue	Leisure	1	Last year the mooring fees at Southbank rose by 20% and now set to increase by another 42%, this is unacceptable and will lead to a number of boats leaving. A marina previously berthed at in England would charge £998.40 as of today, right in the heart of the waterways network, fees likely to rise to well over £1700 from £1200. England offers more network length, the report does not take any of this into account. SC will price themselves out of the market	Gerad Eve/GVA's recommended prices are the result of an independent valuation using market comparables. Gerald Eve/GVA did consider a range of variables when identifying prices at each location, including access to the sea.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Common	1	Need to be set in fair way initially	Agreed. Scottish Canals believes Gerald Eve/GVA's methodology for setting and reviewing mooring and licence prices does this in a fair, robust and transparent manner.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Leisure	1	a fairer calculation would be based on the size of the boat, the desirability or the location for boats, the amenities available and the navigability of the mooring	All of these variables have been taken into account in the pricing recommendations set out by Gerald Eve/GVA.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Common	1	Should be reviewed bearing in mind the cost of the review every 7 to 10 years	The methodology has been adopted but a simple market review will be carried out every five years to ensure that
Mooring Charges	Comment	Common	1	Prices should be reviewed now as the current exercise is flawed in many areas	As stated previously, it would not be good use of public money and resource to carry out a further review of this independent review
Mooring Charges	Comment	Commercial	1	Elephant in the canal is the number of berths a licensee can command for his licence fee. A berth at Dochgarroch allows you to berth at several locations throughout the canal system. GE should have looked at the possibility to allow marina berthers to remain at their marina but to require a different cruising licence in order to use a certain number of locks. This could be monitored by lock keepers, smart phones etc.	The validity of the navigation licence was not part of the review. A different licence for Caley marina is not something SC are considering at the current time.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Common	1	All private boats should be based on similar meterage based charge, commercial vessels on standard rate for commercial and touring boats should pay a surcharge to contribute to the upkeep of the waterway, unless that are of charitable status	The independent review recommended leisure boats are charged per metre and residential boats are per berth. This recommendation will be adopted. Commercial boats were not part of the consultation.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Leisure	1	Should be based on meterage plus 5% if live a board to cover the services they use. Many services used by boaters such as laundry and pump out are paid in addition therefore these cannot be added into the mooring fee calculation	Liveaboards will move to the recommended residential rates as per the independent report. To ensure fairness liveaboards need to pay residential berths as they enjoy all the same rights.
Mooring Charges	Issue	Common	1	disappointed that security is not part of matrix, boater has issues with break ins, damage and diesel theft	Security was part of the review
Mooring Charges	Comment	Common	1	should not be reviewed unless SC think the GE report is wrong	Agreed. Scottish Canals believes Gerald Eve/GVA's independent review is robust, fair and transparent and therefore will be adopting their methodology and subsequently their recommended prices.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Residential	1	If left to SC to market new moorings for what price they can achieve will lead to never ending levels of discrepancies which the report was supposed to resolve	New moorings will be marketed at the recommended rates, plus CPI. The proposed five year review process will ensure that discrepancies are dealt with at this point.

Mooring Charges	Comment	Leisure	1	should be based on 2004/5 prices with inflation rises since then	The market did not have enough evidence in 2004/5 to provide a fair and reasonable outcome This independent review was robust, fair and open to everyone to contribute to.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Common	1	If methodology right then no need to review the process	Agreed. Gerald Eve/GVA's methodology will be adopted in full.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Residential	1	report makes no distinction between true leisure moorings and liveaboards. Whilst justifiable to try and get as much money from true leisure uses long stay moorings should be treated as community moorings, they bring social and economic value to canal as should be treated in same ay as social housing tenants, making costs secure and affordable	As a result of this independent review and consultation, liveaboards will move to the recommended residential rates set out in Gerald Eve/GVA's report. To ensure fairness, liveaboards need to pay residential berth fees as they enjoy the same rights as residential berth holders. By doing so, Scottish Canals will address the pricing anomalies and differentials and help make them fairer for all.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Common	1	should not be changed, this is very insecure and prevents planning for the future	The aim of the Pricing Review and Consultation is to provide a fair pricing system which gives boaters clarity over the way in which their prices have been derived and how they will be assessed in the future.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Common	1	projected fees stem from an inequitable starting point, the higher end of the new bidding system followed but a cap and collar which can be overridden	Gerald Eve/GVA's methodology is fair, robust and transparent both from the perspective of customers and the canals.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Common	1	its not about discontented boaters who have been used to paying low prices, boaters have real concerns about exponential price increases that may not be sustainable, some may lose homes/businesses, most boaters are passionate about the canals and do have a real fear, as they are not protected by laws such as the property sector the consultation matters to their future	The aim of the Pricing Review and Consultation is to provide a fair pricing system which gives boaters clarity over the way in which their prices have been derived and how they will be assessed in the future. Scottish Canals is committed to ensuring any price increases are introduced fairly and over a reasonable period of time to ensure that no boater is forced off the canal. This is why Scottish Canals has take additional steps to say that no boater will pay more than an extra £100 per year plus CPI until they reach Gerald Eve/GVA's recommended rate for their location. This gives full visibility around all future price changes so customers can plan their finances accordingly. Any residential customer facing financial hardship can also claim housing benefit towards the cost of their mooring fees.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Residential	1	residential mooring charges set following ebay bidding customer could just afford this assuming increases no more than inflation	The aim of the report is to provide a fair pricing system so anomolies around eBay pricing will be removed. Only 14 berths were allocated through eBay.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Residential	1	given salaries paid to CE and senior management more thought should have been given to LOW initiative and its pricing structure at the outset	Living on Water was a relatively new concept in Scotland as residential boating is not as established as elsewhere in the UK. Pricing was a set to what Scottish Canals believed was the demand for this new offer and the majority of Living on Water moorings are now let. As such Scottish Canals believes that the prices reflect the market.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Residential	1	happy with decision to moor at Ratho but naive to letting process and costs and letting via Click Let was heavy handed sell, had to pay deposit and sign lease within one month or risk losing both, discovered he was paying £500 more than others, this has been adjusted by SC	The management of all Living on Water moorings is now dealt with by Scottish Canals rather than Click Let. The deposit of £500 to secure a berth remains in place and is thought to be fair. This payment is deducted from the customer's lease once they go ahead. Leases commence within 3-days of the deposit being paid and this ensures that there ins't a time lapse before a lease is signed.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Residential	1	happy full time boater but does not want to be priced off the canal	The aim of the report is to provide a fair pricing system to all
Mooring Charges	Comment	Residential	1	SC had said after 3 years mooring fees would be adjusted to the average of what the individual moorings were auctioned for. Suggestion now is to the maximum increase in one step	Scottish Canals offered this in good faith. However, a number of boaters requested an independent review and after listening to customers, we commissioned this independent review and subsequent consultation. The outcome of this process supercedes any earlier decisions or offers.
Mooring Charges	Comment	Residential	1	eBay auction did not create fair prices, minimum prices were set and auctions staged in time to create uncertainty , artificial scarcity and competition	The aim of the report is to provide a fair pricing system so the anomolies of eBay pricing will be removed. Only 14 berths were allocated through eBay.

Mooring Charges	Comment	Residential	1	auction process unfair due to mystery bidder bidding high and then retracting, the winner of the bid then had to pay the maximum amount rather than a lower bid which would have won the auction. Eventual winner was the only bidder so should have got at price of minimum bid as the only bidder remaining	The aim of the report is to provide a fair pricing system so the anomalies of eBay pricing will be removed. Only 14 berths were allocated through eBay.
Mooring Charges	Issue	Residential	1	cannot charge premium rate for berth without pump out facility and to deduct £250 from the annual cost is not acceptable. Mooring lacks sanitation for permanent residents.	The report has reviewed the provision of services at Muirtown and assessed the relevant pricing. Scottish Canals is currently investigating the opportunity to provide pump out at Muirtown but this will need to be reported back at a later date. Scottish Canals has also committed to developing a Customer Facilities Charter by 1st September 2017 which sets out the range and volume of facilities it is reasonable for boating customers to expect.
Mooring Charges	Issue	Residential	1	in 4 month gap the price for mooring rose from £2700 - £3700 with no difference in service levels and no explanation on price increase, this has been appealed and the customer told to wait until the outcome of the consultation is known	The aim of the report is to provide a fair pricing system so the anomalies of eBay pricing will be removed. Only 14 berths were allocated through eBay.
Mooring Charges	Issue	Residential	1	if the report was to bring prices in line but yet allow SC to endeavour to seek the best price they can for new moorings, making it clear that every few years there will be a further review of mooring costs and further upward price increases.	Agreed. Scottish Canals will phase in price increases so that no customer pays more than an extra £100 per year plus CPI with a simple market review carried out every 5 years takes into account changes in the market, investment levels and prices of comparables.
Mooring Charges	Issue	Residential	1	Scottish Government looking to encourage SC and other parties to work together to encourage more boats onto the canal but never ending uncertainty over pricing may put existing boaters off the canal	The aim of the report is to provide a fair pricing system to give boaters visibility about over the way in which their prices have been derived and how they will be assessed in the future
Mooring Charges	Issue	Residential	1	At Bridgewater canal customer can get a town centre mooring with all facilities for £663 per annum but GE report suggest current mooring should be £1069 p.a.	GVA/Gerald Eve have responded to challenges over their methodology and this is visible in the main consultation document
Navigation/transit charges	Comment	Transit	1	The increases to date have been out of proportion to rpi which will force customers to take the long way round	Transit charges on the Caledonian and Crinan (which make up 97% of our transits) have only increased by c. 25% in the last 10 years i.e. 2.5% p.a. However Scottish Canals would agree that transit charges on the Lowlands have increased by 250% in the same period - (approximately an additional £130 for the average boat). However, this reflects the staff hours required to offer passage to a relatively small number of transits on the Lowlands, which has remained fairly static at approximately 80 per year for the last few years.
Navigation/transit charges	Issue	Transit	1	What is cost of alternative transport?	We aren't entirely clear on what is being asked here. If it is in respect of the alternative cost of transporting the vessel by road - then this would obviously depend on the length and tonnage of the vessel in respect of both transport and craning in/out, as well as the road miles involved.
Navigation/transit charges	Comment	Transit	1	There is no methodology for setting transit prices so why review?	Gerald Eve/GVA looked at transit prices in Scotland compared to elsewhere and believed that the prices reflected market rates.
Navigation/transit charges	Issue	Transit	1	why is price based on length as you still have to open and shut gates	Length of vessels impact on the length of visitor moorings required overnight and the number of vessels that can fit in a lock at any one time. These are both operational considerations.
Navigation/transit charges	Issue	Transit	1	real issue is the efficiency of the canal, must be as advertised, clean and dredged	We would agree that all of these will impact significantly on the attraction of any of the canals as a transit canal and the challenges in the Lowlands of the number of structures and of keeping on top of weed management and dredging. In recognition of this, we have dedicated significantly more resource (equipment and man hours) to weed management and dredging on the Lowlands in 2016 and will continue to do so in 2017.
Navigation/transit charges	Comment	Transit	1	Bellanoch transit times are slow due to time taken to sort out licences	This has been noted and will be flagged up with the local team to assess what we can do to improve or remove some of the impact of administering licences.
Navigation/transit charges	Issue	Transit	1	GE are ill advised to ignore boat travel distance	Transit charges reflect a number of influencing elements, number of structures through which passage is required, number of days/nights berthing offered with the licence, cost of providing the service, and the length of waterway.
Price Increases	Comment	Common	1	decreases should be effective immediately	Scottish Canals has agreed that any price changes, up or down, would be introduced following a suitable notice period.

Price Increases	Comment	Transit	1	increase prices only once more boats on water	This was not the recommendation of the independent review.
Price Increases	Comment	Common	1	0.5 % above RPI is ok	A decision has been taken to use CPI and not RPI. This will be calculated as an monthly average over the previous calendar year (1st Jan to 31st Dec) using statistics published by the Office for National Statistics.
Price Increases	Comment	Residential	1	not justifiable, boat is not a luxurious way to live	By moving towards market prices, Scottish Canals is addressing the discrepancies which have crept into charges over the years and that see some residential boaters paying significantly less than their neighbours for the same product.
Price Increases	Comment	Residential	1	based on canal length increase should be $47\% \times 138/2000 = 3.2\%$	The 47% does not relate to the number of miles in a canal network but instead to the cost of renting a two bedroom flat locally as it is solely a way of benchmarking the value of different locations effectively.
Price Increases	Comment	Transit	1	offer on the canal is declining, are consultants aware of this and also the damage to boats using Crinan due to weeds and obstructions?	Gerald Eve /GVA met customers at three public meetings and followed this up with site visits to all residential boating locations and engagement with Royal Yachting Association Scotland and British Marine prior to producing their report which sets out clear price recommendations for each area. In 2016 Scottish Canals invested £250,000 to buy additional weed cutters and they are following a continual programme of weed cutting on the canals, targeting hotspots which have been identified by boaters via our app and dedicated reportanavissue@scottishcanals.co.uk email address.
Price Increases	Comment	Common	1	increases are irrelevant when existing charges are too high to start with	Gerald Eve/GVA's report does not indicate that prices are too high.
Price Increases	Comment	Common	1	Any charge for major infrastructure should be over 3 years	Scottish Canals is not sure what is being asked here.
Price Increases	Comment	Common	1	If SC costs do not rise in line with inflation then why should prices increase at this rate	Scottish Canals faces continual upward pressure on costs and Scottish Canals thinks it is reasonable that some of these costs are passed to customers.
Price Increases	Comment	Common	1	deterioration of canal should mean there is no minimum increase	We note this point but as the consultation set out to determine how prices should be set and reviewed Scottish Canals is committed to adhering to the recommendations in the independent report.
Price Increases	Comment	Common	1	no increases are justifiable given the number of increase there have been since BW became SC	The consultation set out to determine how prices should be set and reviewed and Scottish Canals has committed to adhering to the recommendations in the independent report.
Price Increases	Comment	Common	1	no increase justifiable based on current economic climate	As above
Price Increases	Comment	Residential	1	if prices set are market rents the better off can afford to pay more which will price ordinary boaters out of the water	This independent review set out to identify fair and reasonable charges, not just for boaters, but for Scottish Canals, which has a duty, as a public body, to spend tax payers' money responsibly. Scotland's canals are there for all of Scotland's people to enjoy and with limited resources, Scottish Canals must be careful not to subsidise their use by a small number of people at the expense of the many millions of other users.
Price Increases	Comment	Common	1	High increases show poor management by SC	Disagree. It shows market changes over the years.
Price Increases	Comment	Common	1	RPI between 1-5% acceptable	A decision has been taken to use CPI. This will be calculated based on a monthly average of the last calendar year using figures published by the Office for National Statistics.
Price Increases	Comment	Common	1	don't implement increases	The independent review carried out by Gerald Eve/GVA has set prices fairly and as a result of this process, some customers will see fees go up while others will see them go down.
Price Increases	Coment	Common	1	customer cant afford increases	Customers who face financial hardship as a result of Gerald Eve/GVA's recommended prices have the option of moving to a cheaper location on the canal, availability depending. This provides the opportunity to choose a mooring by both location and price. Residential boaters who are unable to move to a cheaper location, for example because they have children in a local school, can claim housing benefit towards the cost of their mooring fees. Scottish Canals has looked into the matter and not only are residential customers eligible for housing benefit, there are already customers on Scotland's canal who receive it.
Price Increases	Commet	Common	1	price increases make on shore living more attractive	Living on a boat is a lifestyle choice and it is not Scottish Canals' responsibility to provide affordable housing. However, we are committed to charging prices which are both fair to customers and the public purse.
Price Increases	Issue	Residential	1	GE using higher rates which masks the actual increases likely once the new figures are adopted	Gerald Eve/GVA's set out the range of prices which customers paid and this has been articulated in the main body of the report

Price Increases	Comment	Residential	1	some areas set to see 50% + increases	Price increases will be phased over a period to time to reduce the financial impact on customers. Customers so that no customer pays more than an extra £100 per year plus CPI until the recommended rate is reached. Thereafter fees will be subject to CPI.
Price Increases	Comment	Common	1	if annual licences are used potential for 5% year on year increases which will force boaters off the water	See above.
Price Increases	Comment	Common	1	the supply and demand ratio is nonsense, the rate can go up by 35% on the last berth is occupied	This is the recommendation of the independent report
Price Increases	Comment	Common	1	the new rates are already being charged which contradicts the consultation review	The new rates will be amended to reflect the report
Price Increases	Comment	Residential	1	30% in Inverness is difficult to reconcile against the SG policy of provided affordable housing	Scottish Canals is not an affordable housing provider
Price Increases	Comment	Residential	1	the price set for Muirtown happens to be the price the customers are paying - is this coincidence?	Gerald Eve/GVA assessed all the information and set prices accordingly. The fact that their recommended prices are broadly in line what what Scottish Canals was charging validates the approach we had taken. However, Gerald Eve/GVA have now provided a robust methodology for setting and reviewing these prices now and into the future.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	SC have changed – grab all available grants from poorest areas in Scotland to increase the sell ability of a public asset to developers	This is a subjective view.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	Maintenance and state of canal at alarming low – prices should reflect this	Prices are not linked to the condition of the canal.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	SC do not own the canal they just manage for Government and people of Scotland	Agreed
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	the purpose of the consultation is to determine how the independent review is to be implemented. If questions are raised concerning the accuracy and content of the review will they be taken into account and the proposed rates adjusted accordingly.	All challenges made in feedback during the consultation have been presented to Gerald Eve and GVA, who have checked their methodology and input data. Both the reviewers and Scottish Canals are content that they are robust, transparent and fair. As a result both parties stand by the recommended prices. However, Scottish Canals has made a number of recommendations to its Board about how these price changes, particularly increases, can be introduced in a sensitive manner.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Residential	1	SC have said at boating surgeries that they would let a resi berth to a leisure customer rather than it sit vacant but boaters not happy if the 10% demand matrix would apply	This is not the case
Scottish Canals	Comment	Residential	1	SC sold the LOW initiative as a cheaper way to live. Given exec salaries they should not have been trusted to make such skewed statements	Scottish Canals believes that residential boating does provide a cost effective housing solution
Scottish Canals	Comment	Residential	1	Disgusted to be associated with LOW after reading report and treatment of boaters, once lived and worked on canal and promoted as a place to live	Noted
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	Disgusted that SC are allowed to function so recklessly, paying overinflated salaries and running canals at a loss, demanding money from people fooled into an impossible situation	Noted
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	Since 2008 more degeneration than regeneration, no one accountable and wait till it breaks attitude	Noted
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	Since Jim Sterling left, present management are more akin to letting agency	Noted
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	SC have said they must operate a commercial business model but this must include commercial competitiveness and awareness of the efficiencies applied within private commercial organisations.	Noted
Scottish Canals	Comment	Transit	1	Did promote transit, not since price rise	Scottish Canals has limited funds and therefore has not been able to promote transits as much as it would like in recent years. However, a targeted marketing campaign is currently underway to encourage more boaters to enjoy the delights of Scotland's canals.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	Gulf between what senior management at SC get paid and the boating community	This is not material to the Pricing Review.

Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	Internal cost control, staff efficiencies and salaries must be reviewed as frequently as charging to customers	Scottish Canals has a robust cost control system in place and always seeks best value for every pound we spend. Salaries of the Executive team are set by Scottish Ministers.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Transit/Leisure	1	Bank staff are great but diminishing in numbers, using volunteers to man locks is not safe	Volunteers receive training in the safe operation of locks just as Scottish Canals' seasonal staff do. However, additional requirements have been placed on the Volunteer Organisations for 2017 to ensure this training is robust and documented.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Transit/Leisure	1	English boating is flourishing with consistent pricing structures in place	This is a subjective view.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Transit	1	FA is a transit location and expansion of the transit pontoons would be beneficial. Removal of Scott II would mean this could be done cheaply	Agreed. Scottish Canals recognises the heavy demand on transit moorings at Fort Augustus in the height of the season. We are investigating opportunities for additional (unserviced) transit pontoons at Fort Augustus Top and continue discussions with Scot II on their long term plans for the vessel.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	SC board must identify social based services and activities and treat differently to those that are purely commercial. This should then be made clear to management as they put money before everything else which is not acceptable	It is not within Scottish Canals' remit to provide social based services or activities. Any business which does provide these on the canal are managed through a Trading Agreement but what these Trading Agreements look like is not material to this consultation.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Residential	1	Mooring numbers are limited and SC had promised more moorings would be available once the pricing structure was implemented, this backs concern that older customers will be moved out to allow higher paying customers in	Scottish Canals is not aware of any promise made to increase mooring numbers as there are limits to the amount of available capital which would be needed to provide additional moorings.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	Service provided by SC is poor, with navigational, maintenance and security issues which do not command high end prices	Our customer survey reflects a good deal of satisfaction with Scottish Canal's service and experience of the nation's canals.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Residential	1	Will new boaters paying higher prices force families with boaters off the water, they do not want to become an agent for social or economic clearance?	The aim of the report is to provide a fair pricing system to allow boaters to have clarity over the way in which their prices have been derived and will be assessed in the future. The price increases will be managed over longer periods than recommended in the report to allow boaters to adapt to market prices in the fairest way possible.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Leisure	1	Credibility of report questionable due to use of BSC report	The Blue Sea Consulting report was fully reviewed by GVA but was among a wealth of different information and data they researched and, as such, did not unduly influence the outcome.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	If pricing strategy implemented, SC have won the battle but lost the war. No longer have the trust of the long term users who have battled to being the canal back to life, generating millions for the public and private purse	Noted
Scottish Canals	Comment	Transit	1	Lowest cost option on English canals is Continuous cruising licence at £1000 p.a., SC has ruled this out even though it would work on Lowlands Canal. As SC have banned this option they should offer similarly priced option or lose long term boaters to England (England and Scotland subject to same acts of Parliament). This should have been the starting point for GE costs	Scottish Canals does not provide continuous cruising. Should someone want to bring a boat onto the canal for residential use they will need to occupy a residential berth. This ensures that there is fairness across all residential boaters.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Residential	1	a mortgage would have been less and would have had £120k real estate to show for it	Noted
Scottish Canals	Comment	Residential	1	Concerned that as a consequence of the pricing review number of boaters have put boats on the market for sale at Auchinstarry, 14 out of 46 were for sale and concerned that this will become widespread across the canal network	Price increases will be phased over a period to time to reduce the financial impact on customers. Customers will pay no more than an extra £100 in any given year (plus annual CPI uplift) until the recommended rate is reached. Thereafter fees will be subject to CPI.

Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	can the consultation process be appealed if it seen to be unfair or undemocratic?	The process cannot be appealed as it was independent, invited public input before and during the process and cost £19,000 and over 250 hours of staff time. It would not be an appropriate use of public resources to delay implementation of Gerald Eve/GVA's methodology and pricing any longer. Furthermore, Scottish Canals has taken additional steps not recommended by Gerald Eve/GVA to phase any price increases in sensitively and fairly in order to minimise the financial impact on customers.
Scottish Canals	Issue	Residential	1	LOW mooring sales by auction set to maximise bidding, slow release of sites, heavy marketing campaigns and dubious bidders caused highest rates to be payable and set high benchmark across the network	The aim of the report is to provide a fair pricing system so anomalies between those whose prices were set by eBay and other customers are removed. It is important to note that only 14 berths were allocated through eBay.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Residential	1	Boaters skimming boats when SC staff not present, SC do not deal with after hours	Not sure what this comment refers to.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Residential	1	Scottish Highlander refit noisy works, unacceptable, complaint raised but no action	Please resend the complaint to enquiries@scottishcanals.co.uk
Scottish Canals	Comment	Residential	1	Stones thrown at boat - SC not action taken	This is antisocial behaviour and should be reported to the police.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Residential	1	Shetland Transport park refrigerated vans adjacent to customer boat - disturbing sleep	Please send the complaint to the estates department to action via enquiries@scottishcanals.co.uk
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	there is no independent arbiter between SC and its customers, SC customers are not in a position to conduct their own survey, would SC agree to a truly independent intermediary to negotiate a suitable conclusion to the pricing structure	This was a wholly independent review and was not carried out by Scottish Canals. Boating customers had the opportunity to contribute at various stages during the process, as did Scottish Canals. Give the money and time that has already been invested in delivering an independent, open and robust methodology for setting and reviewing mooring and licence prices, it would not be appropriate to carry out any further review. Scottish Canals is committed to adopting the methodology set out by Gerald Eve/GVA along with their prices.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Residential	1	SC can use the lease length as a method to remove boaters who do not comply with terms and conditions so that we can let berth out at highest possible rate, then this can be used to justify higher prices for other customers	Should boaters not comply with the terms and conditions, Scottish Canals should have the right not to renew their lease. This protects Scottish Canals but also protects the neighbours of any new customer.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	due to director remuneration was the report necessary could we not have formulated a pricing policy in-house without spending significant funds?	Scottish Canals attempted to formulate the pricing policy in house, but following customer feedback, it felt right to commission an independent review which all parties could contribute to.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	uncertain of value of spending £30k to commission report when saving and making money is so crucial to SC	Scottish Canals attempted to formulate the pricing policy in house, but following customer feedback, it felt right to commission an independent review which all parties could contribute to. This has now been carried out and the Pricing Consultation response from Scottish Canals is the outcome of this process
Scottish Canals	Comment	Residential	1	SC akin to landlords and should comply with legislation and at least provide a minimum level of security of tenure to tenants	Boating is not governed by legislation. Scottish Canals originally offered 3 year leases, but the feedback has been that one year leases were suitable. Should a tenant want a longer lease Scottish Canals is happy to negotiate a longer lease with the customer on a case by case basis.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	why did SC did not provide cost detail - this would have been most obvious way to fulfil SC requirement and more valid	Costs for the maintenance of each specific site are not recorded by that locality and as such it was not possible for Scottish Canals to provide detailed breakdowns required by GVA/Gerald Eve
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	SC should answer why there is not a price reduction due to the deterioration of the system, in particular the Union Canal	All relevant factors were taken into account by Gerald Eve/GVA during their Pricing Review and this is reflected in their recommended prices.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Transit/Leisure	1	the opening of the millennium link suggested a number of socio-economic benefits of a vibrant canal but if the prices in the report are adopted the number of boats prepared to cruise will not reach this, there is also nowhere for them to moor or make a cup of tea	Recent evidence suggests that market prices have not impacted upon boater numbers.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	The Scottish budget states £10million to SC - customer hopes that SC uses all of the £10 to maintain and operate the canal	Every pound of public money is used to fund the operation and maintenance of Scotland's canals and ensure their long term financial sustainability. Scottish Canals also works hard to generate other income which can also be invested in maintaining these valuable heritage assets.

Scottish Canals			1	report states that the canal is a commercial enterprise, if this were true then it should function far more successfully, focus on being more customer friendly in order to bring some revenue in rather than being restrictive and drain customers to point of defect	Scottish Canals's customer base is far wider than those boating customers who live or spend their leisure time on Scotland's canals. Every year the nation's inland waterways attract 22 million visits from walkers, cyclists, anglers, paddlers as well as boater and therefore it is only right that Scottish Canals should focus on all customers. While all customers contribute to the maintenance of Scotland's canals through general taxation, boating requires far more services, such as opening lock gates and bridges, dredging, weed cutting and repairing of pontoons or mooring rings to take place. This forms the foundation of Scottish Canals' belief that it is fair to ask boaters to pay a reasonable contribution towards these costs, thereby ensuring that the majority of its spend benefits all of Scotland's people, as well as the few who choose to live or enjoy leisure time on the water.
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	general lack of trust and relations have deteriorated with SC and their operation of the Canals	Noted
Scottish Canals	Comment	Common	1	SC does not operate as a commercial enterprise as it does not look at both income and expenditure when balancing the books	Scottish Canals reviews income and expenditure on a regular basis.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Residential	1	assessment of services provided at Muirtown is inaccurate and in breach of sale of goods and services act, also Scots contract law	Scottish Canals recognises that customers expectations at Seaport have not been fulfilled. The recommendations set out in Gerald Eve/GVA's Pricing Review reflect the current level of services and Scottish Canals is working to provide pump out in the lower basin.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Leisure	1	some locations defined as marinas in error, no security or slips to maintain vessels, this is needed and without it is mis representation (Forth + Clyde)	The constituents of "marinas" will vary and will not always offer the same types of facilities.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Leisure	1	agree with report and happy customer based at Gairloch but is aware other locations are not as well equipped with services and not always fit for purpose, following recent travels of canals	Noted
Report Format/Content	Comment	Residential	1	too many recommendations they don't agree with to mention	Noted
Report Format/Content	Issue	Transit	1	lack of any meaningful consideration of transit use	Noted
Report Format/Content	Comment	Transit	1	exercise a waste of time, report produced poor effort and methodology badly conceived	Scottish Canals does not agree. We believe that the consultation has designed a methodology for setting and reviewing prices in a fair, robust and consistent manner following consultation with a wide group of stakeholders, including our boating customers, marine organisations and Scottish Canals. This is no simple task and one that all canal authorities face but Scottish Canals has committed to adopting Gerald Eve/GVA's methodology, and therefore their recommended prices.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Residential	1	some information is wrong on table, the charge of £3500 was in place and also missing is £200 pa fee which never featured on any pricing structure if you took a yearly lease table 3.7.4. (Caley)	Scottish Canals raised issues of inaccuracy with Gerald Eve/GVA, who have since republished some of their tables. However, as these were administrative errors (ticks being applied to the wrong box) rather than inaccurate reporting of information, this has had no material impact on prices. In addition, as longer leases will be available, the £200 fee will no longer be applied.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Leisure	1	Moor at Bellanoch, classified as RB3, not close to village amenities, matrix is a good idea but wrong classification	Scottish Canals has raised this with Gerald Eve/GVA and they have re-evaluated Bellanoch accordingly. Details are visible in Scottish Canals' public consultation response. See Scottish Canals' consultation response for details here.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Transit	1	transit should be looked at by people who understand the transit/yacht market rather than property consultants	Gerald Eve/GVA had the necessary skills to carry out the work and they engaged a number of marine experts, including RYA Scotland and British Marine. GVA also has a track record of working in the leisure and marine sector and therefore both parties made sure they understood the marine context for this particular task.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Transit	1	this report is a cop out, appalled that SC would pay for this. Poor exercise, need to think differently about resi, transit or live aboards. If you are tracking social media you will see that Crinan Canal is getting a bad report.	Scottish Canals does not agree and is confident that the consultation has set the methodology for pricing in a fair, reasonable and transparent manner. Social media activity is monitored and responded to on a daily basis and while there are occasionally negative reports, these account for a very limited percentage of the 1400 transit customers that pass through Crinan each year and an even smaller percentage of all the other customers who enjoy Britain's Most Beautiful Shortcut by boot, bike and boat.

Report Format/Content	Issue	Leisure	1	report fails to understand the concept of lowland cruising and does not make allowance for the restrictions to boat movements, book passages. GE have based a lot of the report on the BSC findings which uses high end of the market marina. Report is seriously flawed	Scottish Canals disagrees. The scope of Gerald Eve/GVA's independent report was to consider an equitable, reasonable and transparent pricing structure for leisure and residential moorings. They were also tasked with reviewing the cost of transit and navigation licences. Gerald Eve/GVA independently concluded that the approach adopted by Blue Sea Consulting in 2014 was robust and defensible. Therefore they adopted the Blue Sea Consulting matrix but adjusted it based on their own research and site audit.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Common	1	not an independent review as he works for Scottish Canals	Gerald Eve/GVA are wholly independent of Scottish Canals. If this refers to the initial report carried out by Blue Sea Consulting, this was one of many bits of information that was subsequently reviewed and researched by Gerald Eve/GVA.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Residential	1	Info given to GE was wrong, some moorings were overpriced and directors should never have been involved with the consultants	Gerald Eve/GVA were given full disclosure to mooring charges for all of our customers. This was necessary to allow the consultants to conduct the independent review. However, Gerald eve/GVA were instructed to carry out the Pricing Review as they saw fit. This is evidenced by the initial scope of their brief being expanded following customer feedback to include a site visit to residential locations and meetings with customers on each of the canals. Scottish Canals was one of a number of stakeholders that Gerald eve/GVA engaged with.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Common	1	resi and business customers have different needs, business need to react to customer needs, resi don't need access to sea. Increases may result in business closures	This is not material to the consultation
Report Format/Content	Issue	Residential	1	no hypothesis for applying 40% rather than 47% to house price comparable	This is not true. Gerald Eve discounted the ratio between rental prices for a two bed flat in Scotland (40%) compared with England (46%) for a number of reasons, including the fact that residential boating in Scotland is not as well established and that there are fewer miles of canals for boats to cruise.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Residential	1	did not take into account canal length differences, lack of visitor moorings, limited maintenance facilities, lack of competition	This is not true. Canal length and access to the sea was one of the many factors which Gerald Eve/GVA considered as part of their methodology. Furthermore, the mooring rates that Scottish Canals has been achieving over the past 12 months generally support the figures proposed by Gerald Eve/GVA.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Transit	1	nonsense to suggest that rates have increased at a constant rate	Rates have risen but level of increase has varied from location to location.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Leisure	1	GE report states that they pay £107 pm but they pay £52. Basis for review was flawed and the price increase would be 103% This is not reasonable. Are GE aware of this? (Forth & Clyde)	Gerald Eve/GVA was given the full range of prices that customer currently pay and have collated this into an average in the report for each location. Both Gerald Eve/GVA and Scottish Canals confirm that the methodology and the data used to benchmark and determine prices is as robust as possible. As a result, both parties stand by the recommended prices.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Leisure	1	Report cannot be considered independent as SC are paying for it, some of the report is also based on a previous report which was previously questioned, indicating a conflict of interest. There is insufficient room in the survey monkey to list all of the objections in detail.	Scottish Canals had to commission an independent review of pricing following boater feedback therefore this was always going to be at a cost and no independent authority would carry out such task free of charge. Having reviewed all the data, Gerald Eve/GVA independently concluded that the approach taken by Blue Sea Consulting in 2014 to set leisure mooring rates was a sensible way of setting charges structure for Scottish Canals. Therefore they adopted the BSC matrix but adjusted these based on their own research and facilities audit. Blue Sea Consulting does not benefit in any way financially from price changes recommended in Gerald eve/GVA's report. Scottish Canals believed that 1000 words, plus additional comments boxes was sufficient space for consultation respondents to air their views. Furthermore, we considered any additional emails that were submitted during the evaluation process.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Common	1	The report is based on flawed data, incorrect assumptions re site visits, people who know nothing about boats, incorrect local property prices and basis for berthing fees. Sensible equivalent would be that of a mobile home, local to Inverness can be sought for less than £1100 p.a.	Scottish Canals does not accept that the report is based on flawed data, local property prices or that the reviewers themselves did not take suitable account of the marine sector. Mobile homes are not a strong enough comparable as they tend to exist in holiday locations and are not situated near to every canal thereby making mobile homes impossible to use as a benchmark across the country.

Report Format/Content	Issue	Common	1	Report does not list recommendations and difficult to go through, arduous task and does not take into account provisions for those struggling to pay mooring fees. SC as a Landlord have responsibilities to tenants, how will they achieve this?	Scottish Canals commissioned an independent review of current mooring and licence prices, the format of the report was at the discretion of the authors. Scottish Canals is committed to implementing Gerald Eve/GVA's recommended pricing as it is the result of a robust, fair and transparent process. However, we have also committed to phasing in any price increases so that no customer will pay more than an extra £100 per year plus CPI.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Common	1	survey unfair to those without internet, a hard copy should be available to allow you to read and respond at the same time	Scottish Canals does not agree. We wrote to all leisure and residential customers advising them of the public meetings which Gerald Eve/GVA were organising, inviting written feedback via a dedicated email for those who couldn't attend and followed up with emails promoting the opening of the consultation, reminders and deadline. Scottish Canals also engaged with British Marine, RYA Scotland and SailScotland to publicise the consultation via their newsletters/emails/social media channels. Scottish Canals issued five press releases which generated 20 items of coverage and 10 social media posts to 12,500 people as well as updated info on the front page of www.scottishcanals.co.uk website for months. Details of the consultation were also presented at the Lowlands Customer Forum on 23rd April 2016 and 24th October 2015, Caledonian Customer Forum on 14th May 2016.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Residential	1	disagree with mooring fees proposed and rationale used to arrive at them	We believe that the consultation has developed a methodology for setting and reviewing mooring and licence prices in a fair, reasonable and transparent manner.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Residential	1	GE refused to consider cost recovery even though that is the Government guideline for provision of services. Costs must be available	Gerald Eve/GVA decided that the cost would vary from location to location and it would cost more to provide facilities in remote locations than in more central locations which would make it uneconomical to provide in some areas and in the city locations it would not reflect the true value of the moorings. It would also be difficult to attribute a true staff cost as these will vary from location to location and canal to canal.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Residential	1	the 40% figure applied has been done to meet the charges that are required by SC. Using Edinburgh figs this gets you a mooring fee of £4680 which just happens to be the highest fee at Leamington - what a con!	This is not correct. It is based on a robust methodology, market data and the provision of local facilities, as well as demand and prices that have already been achieved.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Residential	1	LOW auction system skewed existing prices	Scottish Canals does not agree, There were 14 LOW moorings sold by auction, the remaining 75+ were based on market rates at that time.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Residential	1	flawed information has been used. SC has decided its price increases already and the consultation was instructed to justify this rather than properly analyse the situation	This is incorrect. The report was produced independently and Gerald Eve/GVA have devised a methodology that not only takes into account market changes locally but reflects facilities that are provided as well as prices people have been willing to pay. This was no simple task and is one that many canal authorities are grappling with. However, Scottish Canals is confident that Gerald Eve/GVA have developed a robust, fair and consistent methodology which will be accepted, along with the recommended prices.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Residential	1	private rented market in Inverness does not generate the price of £625 in the report. Highland council class liveaboards as bedsits , social prices are more like £285 per month and Merkinch is an area of deep rooted deprivation	Gerald Eve sourced rental prices from Rightmove and Zoopla for properties near to mooring sites and where this was not available, they spoke to local agents. These prices were used to help benchmark mooring prices in a fair and transparent way that could be applied in Linlithgow as easily as Inverness.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Residential	1	disagree with GE pricing structure, cannot compare to English network as entirely different	We do not agree. Scottish Canals believes that the consultation has developed a methodology for setting and reviewing mooring and licence prices which is fair, robust and transparent.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Residential	1	report states prices were kept low to attract public interest which is a lie as at the time rates were at going rate in most marinas. Now living on a pension and having to claim housing benefit whilst SC exec have £48k pension pot	As residential boating was not established in Scotland at the time, Scottish Canals offered a discounted rate initially to stimulate market interest. However, as a public organisation, Scottish Canals can't discount forever. Scotland's canals are there for everyone to enjoy and any products and services they do provide should have charges applied which are fair to both the customer and the public purse.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Common	1	do not agree with pricing recommended, the report has too many inaccuracies and flaws to be credible, for example incomplete and inaccurate pricing matrices	We do not agree. Scottish Canals believes that the consultation has developed a methodology for setting and pricing in a fair, reasonable and transparent manner. Having checked any inaccuracies raised during the consultation with Gerald Eve/GVA and received their feedback, Scottish Canals is committed to adopting the methodology and recommended prices.

Report Format/Content	Issue	Common	1	claim that Kelpies is attractive rural setting, however near Grangemouth and under M9 with constant flow of tourists, so not tranquil	This was the opinion of the independent consultants and it also reflects how Scottish Canals would assess this location.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Residential	1	the comment in the report that SC can be left to market any vacant moorings with the intention of securing the best figure that the market is prepared to pay is against the aim of moving towards fairness, transparency and standardisation. Prices should be on the website so that people can see what moorings they can access and at what price. There should be no possibility of SC securing higher fees with new potential customers	Scottish Canals will market new berths at Gerald Eve/GVA's recommended rates, plus annual CPI uplift. These prices will not be reviewed until 2023 when a 5 year market review will be carried out. All prices will be published on the Scottish Canals' website.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Common	1	pricing review is flawed and not fit for purpose, need to revisit in a fair manner which looks at long term viability of the barges	Scottish Canals does not agree. Both Gerald Eve/GVA and Scottish Canals believe that the methodology and data that was used are robust and fair and therefore stand by the recommended prices. This process was never going to please everyone and Scottish Canals knew that. However, it would not be best use of public resources to carry out a further review.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Common	1	complex to read and taking time to review, need to seek professional advice on some points	Scottish Canals commissioned an independent review of current mooring and licence prices, the format of the report was at the discretion of the authors.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Common	1	wording within and questions raised imply findings of report are a done deal and only look at consultation on implementation	This is correct. Boating customers were among numerous groups that were consulted by Gerald Eve/GVA prior to the methodology being designed. Furthermore, Scottish Canals had stated at the outset that all parties would need to adhere to the methodology given it was carried out independently, all could input to it and given the level of cost and resource it required, the consultation only invited feedback on how this methodology would be implemented.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Common	1	no checks or balances to ensure independent overview	Scottish Canals does not agree. We believe that the consultation has detailed a fair, equitable and transparent methodology for setting and reviewing mooring and licence prices on Scotland's canals.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Leisure	1	Bellanoch renamed as pontoons not marina as it does not have marina facilities	All available services were taken into account in the pricing
Report Format/Content	Issue	Leisure	1	Bellanoch pontoons not listed as being inspected	Gerald Eve/GVA carried out site visits to each location to undertake an audit of the facilities as detailed in the report
Report Format/Content	Issue	Leisure	1	Facilities at Bellanoch incorrectly appraised as RB3, should be RC4 - blatant error and should be changed until facilities are improved to categorise	Scottish Canals has raised this with Gerald Eve/GVA and they have re-evaluated Bellanoch accordingly. Details are visible in Scottish Canals' public consultation response. See Scottish Canals' consultation response for details here.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Leisure	1	Report states limited car parking at Bellanoch but BSC states ample and convenient parking as part of matrix calculation	Scottish Canals has raised this with Gerald Eve/GVA and they have re-evaluated Bellanoch accordingly. Details are visible in Scottish Canals' public consultation response.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Residential	1	Did SC need to spend £30k on report to realise a price increase of £3,700 per annum, (Caley) same figure as customer was invoiced for in error at last renewal, CE email to confirm this was a clerical error but coincidence that this is the figure new arrivals are being charged and the same conclusion consultants came to.	This was an independent review which looked at all market data, comparable information and feedback from customers, partners and Scottish Canals.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Common	1	Report too long, consultants paid money to produce/publish but boaters have to read it and attend meetings for no remuneration	Scottish Canals commissioned an independent review of current mooring and licence prices, the format of the report was at the discretion of the authors.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Common	1	Report difficult to understand and parts seem irrelevant	We do not agree, we believe that the consultation has set the methodology for pricing in a fair, reasonable and transparent manner
Report Format/Content	Comment	Residential	1	Not got time to study the report but seeking clarification that a respected property consultant is comparing a mooring fee with the rental of a 2 bed property, if so not worth the time to scrutinise the report and comment in detail	We believe that the consultation has set the methodology for pricing in a fair, reasonable and transparent manner. The comparable of a 2 bed flat was adopted as GE considered that the only equitable way was to benchmark pricing to the relevant housing market

Report Format/Content	Comment	Residential	1	the report sets out new pricing structure but only new tenants have the option to accept this or not, existing customers did not agree to this when they joined the canal.	By moving towards market prices, Scottish Canals is addressing the discrepancies which have crept into charges over the years and that see some residential boaters paying significantly less than their neighbours for the same product.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Common	1	reports are like statistics they can be seen to prove anything SC want but the human litmus test is equally as important, doesn't feel fair or take into account the lifestyle and lives of these on the receiving end.	It is fair for customers to pay comparable prices at the same location and as Gerald Eve/GVA's Pricing Review details a transparent and robust methodology for setting and reviewing prices, Scottish Canals believes it is only right that these fees are adopted. However, Scottish Canals is committed to ensuring that prices will be introduced sensitively and where customers face financial hardship, will consider phasing any increases in over a suitable period of time. A recommendation is going to the Board of Scottish Canals regarding this issue.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Common	1	to comment on a 102 page report is onerous, will put people off commenting even if they have time and capability to digest the report	Scottish Canals commissioned an independent review of current mooring and licence prices, the format of the report was at the discretion of the authors.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Common	1	this is not a consultation as we are asking for opinion on only one option, and how to implement it, not offering alternative options	Scottish Canals commissioned the independent review following boater feedback on previous price increases. As part of this process, boaters had the opportunity to influence the direction that Gerald Eve/GVA took as much as any other group that was consulted. This is a very complex issue which many canal organisations are wrestling with and therefore designing a methodology which was fair to all concerned, applicable to all locations, customers and vessels was challenging. Gerald Eve/GVA ultimately made an independent decision to come up with the methodology they did and therefore this is what the consultation focused on.
Report Format/Content	Issue	Common	1	report states that berths at Bellanoch are within walking distance of a shop which customer does not think it is	Scottish Canals has raised this with Gerald Eve/GVA and they have re-evaluated Bellanoch accordingly. Details are visible in Scottish Canals' public consultation response here.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Common	1	report is very long and not accessible - precludes a vast proportion of potential responses	Scottish Canals commissioned an independent review of current mooring and licence prices, the format of the report was at the discretion of the authors. We do however believe that the consultation has set the methodology for pricing in a fair, reasonable and transparent manner
Report Format/Content	Comment	Residential	1	LOW water scheme attraction targeted occupiers offering a cheaper alternative to living on land, people doing so invested in boats with the expectation they could afford to live their. Customer told on may occasions that mooring costs after the initial 3 years would be based on ave of what the moorings were auctioned for. This is now not the case	This was Scottish Canals initial recommendatuion. However, a number of boaters requested an independent review of mooring prices and Gerald Eve/GVA were commissioned. As such, Scottish Canals agreed at the start of the process to adopt their methodology and stated that all parties would need to do likewise. Scottish Canals also agreed to adopt all recommendations but promised to invite boater feedback on how these recommendations should be implemented. The consultation addressed this point.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Residential	1	to summarise the report is flawed, incorrect information used and followed questionable method	We do not agree. Scottish Canals believes that the consultation has developed a methodology for setting and reviewing prices in a fair, reasonable and transparent manner.
Report Format/Content	Comment	Common	1	Large document has taken hours to read, designed to baffle and beat customers into submission so they wont respond	We do not agree, we believe that the consultation has set the methodology for pricing in a fair, reasonable and transparent manner
Report Format/Content	Issue	Residential	1	Muirtown is not full so this is an inaccurate statement	Muirtown was full on the date of the assessment. On writing this consultation report, all residential berths at Muirtown are now fully let
Report Format/Content	Comment	Leisure	1	use of unpublished BSC report is unacceptable due to clear conflict of interest	Gerald Eve/GVA independently concluded that the approach adopted by BSC in 2014 to set mooring rates is the only way of setting a charging structure for Scottish Canals. Therefore they adopted the BSC matrix but adjusted these based on their own research and facilities audit
Report Format/Content	Issue	Residential	1	incorrect information detailed in this table 7.2.1 and 7.3.3 , states 3 LOW customers and no vacant berths thus no demand adjustment. According to SC website there are 11 berths at Kelpies and 16 residential huts. Are other figures on the tables incorrect	Scottish Canals changed Living on Water berths at Grangemouth to leisure moorings but is currently investigating this matter. If the information detailed in the report is incorrect, Scottish Canals will look at applying an additional discount, as per Gerald Eve's methodology.
Report Format/Content	Issue		1	table 8.4.10. matrix is incomplete, only 3 moorings on the pricing list, missing out Linlithgow, Leamington East and West and Lochrin basin	If the information detailed in the report is incorrect, Scottish Canals will look at applying an additional discount, as per Gerald Eve's methodology.

Report Format/Content	Issue		1	In appendix c, Forth and Clyde Canal facilities matrix is incomplete and incorrect, apparently Kelpies has no facilities which should make mooring there very cheap	If the information detailed in the report is incorrect, Scottish Canals will look at applying an additional discount, as per Gerald Eve's methodology.
Report Format/Content	Issue		1	Appendix d, Union Canal facilities matrix is incomplete and wrong. Linlithgow does not have a laundry, it does not say there is power or refuse collection when there is. Causewayend has refuse and car parking and these are not indicated on the pricing matrix	If the information detailed in the report is incorrect, Scottish Canals will look at applying an additional discount, as per Gerald Eve's methodology.
Report Format/Content	Issue		1	Falkirk - the facilities matrix applied to customers mooring are wrong. No water supply, no restaurant nearby outside the hours of 10am - 4pm, no shop or pub, and is beside a busy railway, this is a base to cruise from, customer would not spend any time on the mooring	If the information detailed in the report is incorrect, Scottish Canals will look at applying an additional discount, as per Gerald Eve's methodology.
Restrictions	Comment	Leisure	1	Canal should be open all year round to accommodate Leisure customers	Experience shows that few boats move during winter but Scottish Canals will accommodate where necessary.
Security	Comment	Leisure	1	None at Bellanoch except a car park barrier that was missing for 9 months, no bridgehead security, public have free access to pontoons	Scottish Canals has raised this issue with Gerald Eve/GVA and they have revised their assessment of the area. See Scottish Canals' consultation response for details here.
Security	Comment	Common	1	security did not form part of the matrix but is a vital consideration, there is the need for security provision therefore the matrix rate should reflect this	Security was reviewed just not reflected in matrix
Security	Comment	Residential	1	keys for the facilities are available on the internet	Noted
Security	Comment	Residential	1	no security in the marina at the weekend and this leads to a lack of privacy	Noted
Surcharges	Comment	Common	G	why are you concerned with feedback on payment options?	We wanted to consult with our customers and gauge their opinion on preferred payment options. Feedback now shows that people want the option of paying by direct debit and up front with no surcharge. Scottish Canals has listened and will ensure customers have the option to do both.
Surcharges	Comment	Common	1 + G	value of surcharge should be the cost for SC to administer payments	Based on feedback from our customers we will allow customers to pay in monthly installments by direct debit or pay in full at the start of their contract term. Either way our customers will pay the same amount with no surcharge or discount applied which is fair to all customers and allows them the choice
Surcharges	Comment	Common	8	is there the option to get a discount for paying annually?	There will be no discount offered for paying the full fee in one installment but equally there will be no surcharge for paying in monthly installments by direct debit.
Surcharges	Comment	Common	7	Not for paying monthly by direct debit (yes for credit card)	We will not impose a surcharge for monthly payments by direct debit
Surcharges	Comment	Common	3	already pay monthly so why should SC impose a penalty if this continues	See above
Surcharges	Comment	Common	3	there should be multiple payment options but no surcharge	Based on feedback from our customers we will allow customers to pay in monthly installments by direct debit or pay in full at the start of their contract term. Either way our customers will pay the same amount with no surcharge or discount applied which is fair to all customers and allows them the choice
Surcharges	Comment	Common	2	surcharge not necessary	We will not impose a surcharge for monthly payments by direct debit
Surcharges	Comment	Common	1	why charge beforehand - using customers money as pre paid credit	See above
Surcharges	Comment	Common	1	council tax and other utilities do not levy a surcharge for monthly payments, lump sum discounts favour the better off	See above
Surcharges	Comment	Common	1	reductions could be made by investments made having boaters money in your account	Not material to the pricing strategy
Surcharges	Comment	Common	1	a prompt payment discount would be acceptable	There will be no discount offered for paying in one installment but equally there will be no surcharge for paying in monthly installments by direct debit.

Survey Monkey	Comment	Common	G + 2	questions are leading, designed to illicit response you want rather than gauge overall opinion	The formal consultation questions were designed to answer specific questions on the recommendations set out in Gerald Eve/GVA's Pricing Review and not on the methodology itself as this was designed by independent reviewers and boating customers were among many groups who had the opportunity to contribute. Comment boxes were also provided so respondents could make additional points.
Survey Monkey	Comment	Common	G	Will comments received via pricing consultation be reviewed and taken into consideration to ensure fair decision making process.	Absolutely. This can be seen by the recommendations made to the Board of Scottish Canals, the issues that have been raised with Gerald Eve/GVA and the responses to each issue raised by customers within this Issues Matrix as well as the wider consultation response document.
Survey Monkey	Comment	Common	G	questions on consultation survey are not the same as those asked in consultation documentation	The formal consultation focused on all the key recommendations made by Gerald Eve/GVA in their Pricing Review.
Survey Monkey	Comment	Common	5G + 10	On line forms do not provide sufficient space to respond in full	Scottish Canals believed that 1000 words was adequate for expressing additional points, in addition to the comment boxes under each of the questions. However, we also evaluated all the issues raised in additional emails that were submitted.
Survey Monkey	Comment	Common	1	questions appear slanted in favour of SC and not helpful to residents	The formal consultation questions were designed to answer specific questions on the recommendations set out in Gerald Eve/GVA's Pricing Review and not on the methodology itself because its was designed by independent reviewers and boating customers were among many groups who had the opportunity to contribute. Comment boxes were also provided so respondents could make additional points.
Survey Monkey	Comment	Common	1	questioning is not suitable this was not a survey but an in-depth consultation	As boaters were given the opportunity to input at various stages during the design of Gerald Eve/GVA's methodology, both face to face and in writing, Scottish Canals believes that the formal online consultation was adequate for gauging feedback to specific recommendations, particularly given that customers had the opportunity to input prior to and during the process. both in writing and in person.
Survey Monkey	Comment	Common	1	no freedom outside online survey to structure an appeal as limited by word count and multiple choice questions, only occupied with specific results. Some questions are based on % and index rates, it does not allow the customer to question what these are and the implications of a rise	The detail of the recommendations were set out by Gerald Eve/GVA in their Pricing Review. Furthermore, Scottish Canals wrote to all customers inviting them to get in contact prior to completing the formal consultation if they needed any help in understanding how Gerald Eve/GVA's recommendations would affect them. This offer was also publicised on Scottish Canals' website.
Survey Monkey	Comment	Common	1	Survey Monkey would not allow customer to log that he used both Union and Forth & Clyde Canal	Additional space was available for further comments.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Common	28 (some represent larger groups)	Not comparable with English Canals or Marinas chosen as benchmark (Gold Standard)	As stated in Section 8.2, GVA believed it was more relevant to focus on Scottish comparables in terms of a review of benchmark marina pricing, focused on locations based close to SC locations (no comparison was ever made with any English Gold Standard moorings within our report. It was included within the BSC report, although this did not influence our assessment). We accept that it is not directly comparable with several of these marinas which have direct sea access and are run by commercial entities with full facilities. Therefore the leisure figures we have arrived at are based on what we believe to be a 'standard' charge, representing what a full service marina, with high berthing occupancy in each of the locations could achieve. We have subsequently discounted rates for each mooring based on the criteria (location/facilities) which it falls under, as shown in Section 8.4 of the report. This ranges from a top graded mooring for example, direct access to the sea, located in a marina with full facilities and boatyard, to those located in the lowest criteria such as a disadvantaged location in terms of locality, those yet to be regenerated and issues such as traffic or industrial impact or that is bankside with no services.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	22	Use of 2 bed flat as comparable - Not comparable to boats	The 2 bed flat market was used as a benchmark. It shows what a person is prepared to pay to live in a certain location for a particular type of property. By looking at how rental rates south of the border relate to mooring rates we are of the opinion that this provides a good benchmark for mooring prices at the Scottish Canals mooring locations.

Gerald Eve / GVA		Common	21	Has sufficient deduction been taken off to account for improved facilities within benchmark marinas chosen (security, boat repair.....) Gold standard, relevance of comparables	Gerald Eve recognised that the residential locations they reviewed do not all have equal facilities or services to each other and to the comparator locations used. From their research they identified factors that were important and scored these out of 10 following their inspections. These scores were then converted into deductions from the initial rates, which effectively discounted them. They also made a deduction or addition to reflect a location's popularity or otherwise. As a result, the rates proposed for the non-marina locations actually equate to between 23%-39% of the 2 bed rental rates or an average of 34% whilst the average for the marina locations is 41% ranging from 31%-48% of the relevant 2-bed rental rate. This has been applied as consistently as possible but will always be subjective to some extent. Importantly, a similar methodology has been applied 'in house' for over a decade and this is supported by the fact that the mooring rates achieved by Scottish Canals over the past 12 months or so generally support the figures which Gerald Eve proposed. Leisure moorings were reviewed as price comparables rather than a facility or qualitative review. Nevertheless, GVA identified that those marinas with enhanced facilities were able to charge higher prices.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Common	14	24 hour access to sea	We have discounted the rate used to reflect restricted access to the sea where appropriate. Note - Most boat insurance prevents boaters sailing on open sea from November to March.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	13	Use of 2 bed flat as comparable - Prices need to be re-examined if /where figures are incorrect, where did GE get prices from?	We reviewed Rightmove and Zoopla and if we could not find sufficient properties then we spoke to a local estate agent. The mooring prices were obtained from the websites of the particular marina or mooring.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Common	13	No out of season restrictions, unlike seasonal restrictions within Scottish Canals	This is reflected in our pricing matrix with relevant discounts applied to reflect the restrictions
Gerald Eve / GVA		Common	13	No account of canal length restrictions (2000 miles in England v 135 in Scotland)	Gerald Eve discounted/reduced the residential rates achieved south of the border to reflect restrictions. This is reflected in our pricing matrix. GVA reflected applied relevant discounts to reflect the canal restriction within their matrix. For example, the most advantageously located moorings are graded A as they have direct access to the sea, less than 45 minutes sailing etc. Relevant discounts were then applied through the matrix for 'lower graded' marinas which would include those which have cruising restrictions. For example, an A1 graded mooring on the Caledonian Canal which has direct access to the sea and a full service marina with boatyard) may be able to charge £300 per metre. At the other end of the scale, a mooring graded E8 (a disadvantaged location, bankside with no services) would only be able to charge £60 per metre. For a full description of the location and criteria categories used, see Section 5.3 of the BSC report. Proximity to the sea and cruising distance were key elements of the facilities matrix we developed ahead of our site inspections which in turn influenced how we assessed how each mooring 'sat' on the matrix.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Common	12	No additional charges levied on English marinas i.e. boat safety certificate	The rates achieved on the new moorings exclude the boat safety certificate; examining as to whether fees such as boat safety certificates should be included within mooring fees on the SC network was outwith the scope of our report. Boat Safety Certificates are required on all UK inland waterways for all boats, with the exception of some unpowered vessels. The costs of these vary regionally and are an additional cost to the boater on top of mooring fees.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Leisure	10	Use of Marinas distorts the figures to achieve the prices SC want	The comparable marinas were chosen as they were the most geographically appropriate. Again, I note that the pricing figures derived were based on what we believe to be an appropriate 'standard' charge and were discounted based on the location and criteria of each mooring location. Further to this, we note that the report was an independent review using a pricing methodology devised by GVA and Gerald Eve and was not influenced by Scottish Canals. The only contribution from Scottish Canals through the process was progress meetings where we updated them on our work to date and where we were provided with any requested information (such as current pricing levels). While we acknowledge that there is an element of subjectivity to preparing pricing using such a matrix, we would promote it as the most equitable available method of setting a pricing approach.

Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	7	Use of 2 bed flat as comparable - Rents should have been based on social not private rented sector figures	Scottish Canals has never set out to be social housing provider and as such we instructed Gerald Eve to look at the market rate.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	7	Use of 2 bed flats as a comparable - Muirtown – wrong rates used and classed as deprived area	The rental rates used were for properties close to Muirtown and indicative of the location. Merkinch is a deprived area but Muirtown basin sits on the boundary of 2 wards and the boating community was not in place when deprivation was classified
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	6	Use of 2 bed flat as comparable - Does not account for fact that boater own boats and pay to maintain	The methodology reflects this position as the benchmarked evidence is based on boats being owned and maintained at the comparator locations as well.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	6	Use of 2 bed flats as a comparable - Boats are comparable to bedsits with no connected services	The important part of the methodology is the relationship between the flat rents and mooring rates in each location. We have used 2 bed rents as this category provided the largest source of information and provides a good comparison to properties across the country from which to calculate a sensible percentage. If bedsit rents were used as a benchmark south of the border then the relationship between bedsit rents and mooring rates would increase and the higher percentage would be used against lower rents. We are of the opinion that this approach would result in largely the same outcome.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	6	Use of 2 bed flats as a comparable - Larger % deduction required than 47-40% to reflect differences between the comparable marinas chosen	As mentioned above, we have recognised that the locations that we are reviewing do not all have equal facilities or services to each other and to the comparator locations used. From our research we identified the factors that were important and scored these out of 10 following our inspections. These scores were then converted in to deductions from the rates used and effectively discounted the initial figures used. We also made a deduction or addition to reflect a location's popularity or otherwise. As a result the rates proposed for the non-marina locations actually equate to between 23%-39% of the 2 bed rental rates or an average of 34% whilst the average for the marina locations is 41% ranging from 31%-48% of the relevant 2-bed rental rate. The mooring rates that Scottish Canals has been achieving over the past 12 months or so generally support the figures that we have proposed.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Leisure	5	BSC report should be discounted due to conflict	The BSC report was considered a reliable source of data and benchmarking, however GVA findings and recommendations were based on independent reviews, consultation and price benchmarking – as stated in Section 8.4, after thorough consultation, we believe this to be an appropriate benchmarking method, which we have adopted and modified based on our independent findings. Only the concept of the matrix from BSC was directly adopted by GVA; pricing and banding was based on our own assessments, particularly visits to all major moorings as part of our study.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Common	5	Demand adjustment will be impossible to administer and you can discount rates to encourage new users	Our research suggests that pricing is market driven, hence the suggestion of the Pricing Matrix approach. Ultimately, if pick-up is low price reviews and discounting may be used to encourage additional users (as stated in Section 8.5, final paragraph or the point three rows below). Historically pricing decisions have always reflected demand levels.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	3	Use of LOW figures sets high benchmark	These prices were set between a willing landlord and a willing tenant and there are a significant number of them so cannot be ignored.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Leisure	3	Crinan is a transit canal and should not be compared to others	We have considered Crinan separately in terms of pricing, as per our matrix in Tables 8.4.3 and 8.4.4, however we firmly believe that the same criteria used in all matrixes (facilities/locations) to be just as relevant to Crinan.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Common	3	Occupancy (demand) matrix can be flawed due to use of mooring i.e. leisure occupying residential berth	We have not considered demand in our matrix and pricing approach – whilst we have given consideration to expanding the matrix to include a separate calculation measuring boaters' satisfaction and demand, we do not believe this is a factor which can be accurately or adequately reflected, and would prove difficult to implement on an equitable basis. Demand should be measured by occupancy i.e. if a marina is near maximum occupancy, then the proposed mooring rates we suggest should be used. However, if occupancy rates are lower and Scottish Canals wish to 'fill' the marina, then there would be merit in reviewing the rates for the forthcoming year and offering an appropriate discount.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Common	3	Why not compare with Highland Harbours and marinas	Those considered relevant to the canal network were included in Section 8.2. This includes Nairn which is operated by the Highland Council Harbours Authority. All others were not felt to be geographically appropriate.

Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	2	BWML rate includes council tax, pump out, WIFI and storage	Gerald Eve/GVA recognised that the locations they reviewed do not all have equal facilities or services to each other and to the comparator locations used. From their research they identified the factors that were important and scored these out of 10 following their inspections. These scores were then converted in to deductions from the rates used and effectively discounted the initial figures used. They also made a deduction or addition to reflect a location's popularity or otherwise. As a result the rates proposed for the non-marina locations actually equate to between 23%-39% of the 2 bed rental rates or an average of 34% whilst the average for the marina locations is 41% ranging from 31%-48% of the relevant 2-bed rental rate. The mooring rates that Scottish Canals has been achieving over the past 12 months or so generally support the figures that they proposed.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	2	10% demand adjustment at Seaport yet 26 berths vacant – held for transit customers, poorly run marina, should have larger % deducted	There is one vacant leisure berth currently available in Muirtown marina
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	2	No justification to charge 50% at Scottish Marinas	This is a moot point. Gerald Eve/GVA felt that the marinas in Scotland were of a sufficient standard to match the higher percentage achieved at marinas south of the border.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	2	Why was approach to use of cost of creating maintaining etc. ruled out, could have used GGCUA breakdown then you could have considered locational advantages	The cost of maintaining specific areas are not specifically reported in Scottish Canals accounts and as such a detailed breakdown could not be given to Gerald Eve/ GVA
Gerald Eve / GVA		Leisure	2	Pricing structure discriminates against people with small boats	Leisure boats are priced per metre which is the clearest and most equitable approach used in both inland and coastal marinas throughout the UK.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Leisure	2	Leisure prices used were based on new moorings let during review process	The rates used were illustrative only and are indicative of the highest of all fees payable at each location. Regardless, this has not influenced the pricing matrix as this was based on a discounted maximum charge representing what a full service marina, with high berthing occupancy in each of the locations could achieve, and were not influenced by current SC pricing levels.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Leisure	2	Transit users – comparable is alternative cost of transportation	Gerald Eve/GVA believe it would be too difficult to compare against alternative modes of transport. To our knowledge no other waterway agencies use this approach. There are also implications of going round the north of Scotland or round the Mull – fuel/time/safety etc.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	1	Use of 2 bed flats as a comparable - Using this as a benchmark achieves the correct figure for SC	There are a large number of market transactions which supports the figures being proposed.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	1	Use of 2 bed flats as a comparable - Desirability for locations are different for flats and boats	Gerald Eve/GVA believe that there is a relationship between boats and flats at each location and that this reflects each area's uniqueness. From the wider research carried out by Gerald Eve/GVA they found that residential moorings rates were 46% of the cost of renting a two bedroom property, regardless of where that property was in the country. This provided a benchmark against which factors such as whether the location was on the city outskirts, good communications/transport links, schools etc.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	1	Use of 2 bed flat as a comparable - SC do not supply the boat so should consider ground rents instead?	By benchmarking mooring prices south of the border where boats are also not owned by the mooring provider, this has already been factored in.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	1	Use of 2 bed flat as a comparable- Statistical information considered should be wide ranging	Gerald Eve source rental prices from Zoopla and Rightmove and where no data was available in locations near to residential mooring sites, they spoke to local letting agents.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	1	GE reject auction as method of setting fair prices then can't ignore the body of letting evidence	Gerald Eve/GVA didn't reject the auction route and have commented that it can be an effective method of setting prices but are aware that it was not widely liked when used before. They did not ignore the letting evidence; they were of the opinion that the letting evidence is very important.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	1	Not using any on line comparisons for Linlithgow and Ratho linear	Gerald Eve/GVA adopted an averaging approach to calculating the benchmark for the methodology.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	1	BW set rates in 2006, why not use these with inflationary rises	Gerald Eve/GVA were instructed to look at current market rates for the moorings.

Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	1	Review by customer highlights rate adopted should have been 25%	Comparable rental prices were generated by independent sources, including Zoopla, Rightmove and local letting agents. However, these comparables were a snap shot in time, given that properties move on and off the market at varying times. However, as all rental prices were selected at approximately the same point in the year, it compared like with like, as much as possible.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	1	No difference between LOW and non LOW berths so no justification for price increase	Gerald Eve/GVA have not suggested any increase beyond the LOW prices. Berths may be the same but the use of facilities by residential customers is much heavier than for leisure users.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	1	Have no downsize option on a boat	This is reflected in the benchmarking approach.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Residential	1	Better comparable may have been caravan parks	Caravan parks tend to be in holiday locations and as there were none in city centre or near city centre locations that could be assessed, Gerald Eve/GVA did not deem it to provide an adequate and robust benchmark that could be applied in all geographic areas. In addition static caravans don't move but many residential and most leisure customers do/can move their boats.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Leisure	1	Matrix - proximity to shops and restaurants is overstated	The impact on shops and restaurants on the pricing matrix is minimal and Gerald Eve/GVA understand that for many boaters, peace and tranquillity is more important therefore the locational grading in each matrix provides a more holistic approach based on a range of general geographical factors. Section 5.3 of the BSC report gives clear definitions for each category.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Leisure	1	Better comparable would have been the cost of golf membership	Gerald Eve/GVA believe it is too difficult to take comparisons from alternative leisure uses. As stated in their Pricing Review report, they considered an adapted version of the BSC matrix as the most robust method to adopt.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Leisure	1	Analysis of transit fees is weak, no consideration of effect price increases have had on customers	Other than comments related to Crinan increases (which was due to the implementation of mandatory assisted passage after the majority of boaters surveyed agreed for this to be introduced), no other comments were received, either in the boaters meetings or customer survey, in regard to the impact price increases have had on customers (increases at other canals in our opinion have been at a relatively consistent rate). Transit fees analysis was involved examining the approach used by the three main agencies in England and we defend our findings that the diverse and contrasting charging methodologies make it challenging to draw meaningful conclusions from the analysis.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Common	1	Report done by independent party but controlled by Scottish Canals	Gerald Eve/GVA have confirmed that while they were given a brief by Scottish Canals at the beginning of the study, they were under no influence over the report's findings and that this has been an independent assessment.
Gerald Eve / GVA		Common	1	Report is too narrow in its evaluation process	Gerald eve/GVA's evaluation process ran for over six months and was extended from their original brief to make it more robust, including visits to most mooring sites throughout the canal network at the request of boaters. They do not believe further evaluations would have yielded greater results and would have entailed further fees from the consultants.