

Your response

| Question | Your response |
|---|--|
| <p>Question 1: Do you agree that Ofcom's duty to secure 'localness' on local commercial radio stations could be satisfied if stations were able to reduce the amount of locally-made programming they provide? If not, please explain the reasons and/or evidence which support your view.</p> | <p>No I don't. These local radio stations would not be local, by definition. They would be quasi-national or indeed national.</p> <p>After sampling local DAB offerings here in Glasgow, I am drawn to the conclusion that these would not be a suitable replacement or substitute for local or regional commercial radio.</p> <p>Whilst these services are locally made, their quality is miles apart from the likes of Clyde or Smooth. The local presenters are mostly not up to the standard I currently listen to.</p> <p>We switch off the radio when the London programmes come on Smooth.</p> |
| <p>Question 2: Do you agree with our proposed amendments to the localness guidelines relating to locally-made programming? If not, please specify any amendments you think should be made instead (if any), and explain the reasons and/or evidence which support your view.</p> | <p>Whilst I understand news updates will be locally made under new proposals, those often include lots of celebrity fluff and information of no use to me. They are also very short and by no means make up for a presenter who understands here.</p> <p>Perhaps when someone in Milton Keynes is asked "does it matter if the presenter is in London?" people may say no. Ask the people of Scotland and you will get a very different answer.</p> <p>If I hear Scone Palace or another local landmark pronounced wrong by a presenter that has no idea what he or she is saying again, i'll scream.</p> <p>Listeners are not fooled by recorded snippets.</p> <p>I read in the consultation supporting material that programmes were a large or the highest cost of the station. That is like arguing that a football team's players were too expensive, so the team won't have any. Presenters and on air costs are part of running a local radio station. If current owners feel they can not work within this remit, i'm sure they would find willing buyers who would.</p> |

Question 3: Do you agree with our proposed new approved areas? If not, please specify any alternative proposals you think should be considered (if any), and explain the reasons and/or evidence which support your view.

Where I live, I don't think Edinburgh and Glasgow should be in the same area. Theoretically, Scotland's capital city could have no local radio programmes produced there. That is ludicrous. It has a parliament, banking headquarters, a new stock exchange opening in 2019, the biggest Arts festival in the world, but potentially no local radio shows. that isn't right.

I suggest anywhere over a couple of million population should have to provide more than 7 locally made hours, not less.

Question 4: Do you agree with our proposed amendments to the localness guidelines relating to local material? If not, please specify any amendments you think should be made instead, and explain the reasons and/or evidence which support your view.

No. Local information, stories and voices are important and will vanish under new proposals.

These commercial radio stations provide local material and national material delivered in a local way. They are from here, not miles away.

The Daily Record newspaper is mostly a rehash of the Daily Mirror, STV is mostly just ITV from London, STV2 has closed down and I never know what will be on Radio Scotland. It goes from interviews about fishing to music from round the world.

These locally made programmes matter.