

Consultation questions

Instructions

- Please provide your answers following the template instructions and format, in the cells highlighted in grey
- Please do not modify or change the template format
- Numeric values should be provided in a number format (e.g. "1,000" - not "one thousand")
- Please complete the Response Form (including any supporting evidence or attachments) and email it to us by **17th August 2016** at: LA.consultation@prsformusic.com. Alternatively, you can also complete the web survey form at www.prsformusic.com/localauthoritiesconsultation to submit your responses

1	Questionnaire	
2	Respondent name	Deborah Clarke
3	Organisation name As part of its response to and summary of the consultation submissions, PRS intends to publish a list of respondent organisations. If you do not wish us to do this, please insert an X in the box. []	Action with Communities in Rural England (ACRE)
4	Would you like <i>PRS for Music</i> to treat your answers on a confidential basis? If so, please indicate if this applies to the information provided in all or only part of your responses.	We are happy for all of our response to be shared
5	We would be interested to hear your views as to whether a new tariff is required for local authorities?	<p>According to ACRE research carried out in 2009 5% of village halls and similar rural community buildings are owned and managed by Parish and Town Councils which would indicate they come under the PRS Local Authorities Tariff. We have not heard any complaints or issues about the LA Tariff but are interested in the proposals following ACRE's discussions with PRS around the Community Buildings Tariff which applies to Parish and Town Councils that are custodian trustees i.e. only hold the legal title).</p> <p>Simplification and reducing burdens is welcome, but not if it ultimately leads to increased charges on community groups and others.</p>

6	What are your views with regard to the basis on which the new tariff has been proposed?	<p>We are interested to note that the new tariff will be based on the area of the premises where music is audible and that the tariff will reflect the 'value' of music rather than the music actually played/provided in the space?</p> <p>The two aspects of the tariff i.e. core music fee and bolt on fees appear a good place to start.</p> <p>Whilst we realise that a metric for calculation is necessary we fail to understand how the size of the space can be linked to the amount of core music usage in the building.</p> <p>A large hall could have no core music usage and a small hall could have high levels of core music usage.</p>
7	Specifically, are you content for background music in any premises to be charged dependant on the size of the audible area?	No, given our response to 6 above.
8	What are your views on our intention to remove fees for individual audio and/or audio visual devices from the proposed tariff?	This is acceptable as it reduces the burden of trying to calculate the number of devices.
9	Do you have any further comments?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The examples don't provide enough detail. They don't split the audible area and the featured events or provide the person capacity of the featured events, for example. It may also be necessary to add on a charge for activities within the tariff exclusions. 2. It would be interesting to model village halls currently under the Tariff CB? 3. Local Authorities also have to take into account the fees payable to PPL.