

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

Q1. What are your views on the overall costs and savings identified in the Business and Regulatory Impact Assessments?

No comments

Q2. Do you agree with the registration process as described?

No

Q3. If not, what changes would you propose to the process?

Given that the process is not one of approval it would seem sensible to allow retrospective registration of activities within a reasonable timeframe, as some activities would seem subject to change due to weather on the day for example, or subject to the need for reasonably immediate action such as removal of a marine mammal or human remains from the shore.

Q4. Do you agree that the listed activities should be registerable, rather than licensable?

Yes No

Q5. Do you have further comments regarding the activities listed above?

Divers use air-filled floatation bags in their routine diving for example to recover equipment, to mark their position to surface cover and to recover markers on the seabed and to enable safe diving. Therefore we would recommend that the phrase 'The use of air filled floatation bags capable of lifting less than 100 kg from the sea bed' – should be qualified using a statement such as 'to lift objects from the seabed that have been deposited for longer than 12 months'.

We would expect all other activities by divers using air-filled floatation bags outside this statement to be exempt. Perhaps this guidance could be inserted into the Diver Guidance document.

In a wider sense all these activities are very low-impact activities; some of the listed activities are so low-impact we would question the need for registration. For example we are not sure that the deployment of yacht racing marker buoys needs to be registerable and suggest that this becomes an exempt activity.

Q6. Are there any other classes of activity that should be registerable?

No, however we would wish to be consulted should currently exempt

classes of activity that have a likely relevance to recreational diving be considered for addition to the registerable list.

Q7. Do you agree that statutory consultees should not be specified in legislation for the pre-application consultation process?

Yes No

Q8. If not, which persons or bodies do you believe should be specified as statutory consultees for the pre-application consultation process?

We would wish the opportunity to comment on pre-application consultations at either Scottish or British Sub-Aqua Club level, should recreational diving activity possibly be affected by the development. The pre-application consultation process seemed to focus on local consultations that often miss recreational or sporting users of a resource.

Q9. Do you agree with the classes of activity that will be subject to pre-application consultation?

Yes No

Q10. If not, what activities would you add or remove from the list?

No comment

Q11. Do you believe that the above proposals discriminate disproportionately between persons defined by age, disability, sexual orientation, gender, race and religion and belief?

Yes No

Q12. If you answered yes to Question 11, in what way do you believe the proposals to be discriminatory?

No comment