

Question 1: Which of the three options do consultees favour, and why?:

I favour option 2 because it is the most far reaching in asking for 20% of all programmes to be audio described. However, I feel this still falls very short of what should be provided for visually impaired people. If you consider what percentage of programmes are subtitled for deaf and hard of hearing people then 20% for audio description lags way behind.

Question 2: Do consultees have any further suggestions for future access service provision? If so please provide the rationale for these suggestions:

1. Remove the half price television licence for blind people so that they do not have to pay anything.
2. Give the same free television licence to all partially sighted/sight impaired people too.
3. Increase the number of programmes audio described to as near to 100% as possible.

If you are only aiming for 20% of programmes to be audio described why should a blind person have to pay for half of the licence and why should a partially sighted person have to pay for an entire licence? Once the number of audio described programmes are significantly increased it might then seem fairer to charge visually impaired people for the licence.

Comments: