

# **Budget Proposals 2019/20: Get Berkshire Active (Community Based Leisure and Recreational Activities)**

## **Consultation Summary Report**

---

### **Why we consulted?**

Over the last nine years we've had to make savings of £60 million as our central government funding, the Revenue Support Grant (RSG), has reduced and the need for social care support has increased. We've done this by becoming more efficient at what we do, by reducing some of our administrative functions and increasing our income. Throughout this period we have done our best to protect your services.

Six years ago, the RSG was worth £24 million to the council and was reduced to just £100,000 last year. In 2019/20 there will be no grant and our costs will exceed our income. As a result, we'll need to find a further £7 million in savings or income generation. Much of this will come from becoming a more efficient council, however, 14 proposals, amounting to approximately £300,000, have been identified from services that will impact the public.

It was these proposals that made up the Budget Proposals 2019/20 consultation.

### **Approach**

We published all the public facing proposals on our website on 12 November 2018 with feedback requested by midnight on 23 December 2018.

Respondents were directed to a central index page<sup>i</sup>, which outlined the overall background to the exercise, and provided links to each of the individual proposals on our Consultation Portal<sup>ii</sup>.

Each individual page included further details on the specifics of what the proposal contained and what we thought the impact might be, along with any other elements we'd taken into account. Feedback was then invited through an online form and a dedicated email address. Hard copies of the proposal documents and surveys were also made available on request.

As well as publishing the consultations on our website, we also emailed members of the West Berkshire Community Panel (around 400 people), notifying them of the exercise and inviting their contributions. Heads of Service also made direct contact with those organisations directly affected prior to them being made publicly available.

Finally, we issued a press release on the 12 November 2018, and further publicised our consultations through our Facebook and Twitter accounts. We also placed posters in our main offices and other council properties e.g. libraries, leisure centres and family hubs, and made them available to WBC Councillors and Parish and Town Councils to put up in the wards/parishes.

# **Budget Proposals 2019/20: Get Berkshire Active (Community Based Leisure and Recreational Activities)**

## **Consultation Summary Report**

---

### **Proposal Background**

This is a consortium project headed by Get Berkshire Active<sup>iii</sup> which includes the following organisations Alzheimer's Society<sup>iv</sup>, Berkshire Vision<sup>v</sup>, Mencap<sup>vi</sup>, Newbury Community Resource Centre<sup>vii</sup> and Age UK<sup>viii</sup>. The work of this consortium involves supporting older people, vulnerable adults, including the visually impaired, those who are socially isolated and individuals with dementia. Activities of the consortium includes support into employment, home visits, cooking, gardening and social clubs and physical activity sessions.

Within the project, there is a physical activity service for older people called Ever Active<sup>ix</sup>. This service aims to deliver community based physical activity opportunities for older people in West Berkshire seeking to improve their health, fitness and wellbeing.

134 people used the Ever Active service during the last year.

We currently provide Get Berkshire Active with annual funding of £90,641 for the whole project.

### **Legislation Requirements**

The Care Act 2014<sup>x</sup> sets out duties relating to people with care and support needs. This includes duties relating to a range of eligible needs and their relationship with individuals' wellbeing. It also sets out duties relating to the prevention of future care and support needs.

The commissioning of healthy lifestyle services is discretionary, guided by the Public Health Outcomes Framework<sup>xi</sup>, the local Joint Strategic Needs Assessment<sup>xii</sup> and the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy<sup>xiii</sup>.

### **Proposal Details**

To reduce the annual funding to Get Berkshire Active (Community Based Leisure and Recreational Activities programme) from £90,641 to £50,641 (a saving of £40,000 or 44%) when the current contract ends on 31 March 2019.

We propose that we will commission a new re shaped service that which will continue to provide some community based leisure and recreational activities. However, physical activity specifically for older people will no longer be funded as part of this service.

# **Budget Proposals 2019/20: Get Berkshire Active (Community Based Leisure and Recreational Activities)**

## **Consultation Summary Report**

---

### **Consultation Response**

#### Number of Responses

In total, 16 responses were received, although one of the respondents didn't complete the questionnaire.

One of the respondents identified themselves as a user of the service, 10 as residents, two as Parish/Town Councillors, and two as partner organisations.

We also received one petition from the Learning Disability Partnership Board.

#### Summary of Main Points

The responses to this consultation were mixed. 10 respondents either strongly disagreed or disagreed with the proposal, whilst three strongly agreed and two were indifferent.

An issue was raised in relation to reduced funding and the impact it would have on the Mencap Leisure Plus and Gateway services, which are elements of the Get Berkshire Active Consortium programme of activities.

Responses highlighted issues in relation to provision of activities to support the socially isolated, overweight and disadvantaged and were therefore against the proposal to reduce funding.

Responses also suggested that the proposal was not aligned with the published Health and Wellbeing strategy and will have a detrimental effect of people's ability to maintain independence.

One response highlighted the very high cost per person of £676; and that there were plenty of alternative services that would cost less; it costs nothing to take a daily walk.

# Budget Proposals 2019/20: Get Berkshire Active (Community Based Leisure and Recreational Activities)

## Consultation Summary Report

### Summary of Responses by Question

#### 1. Are you...?

(N.B. respondents were able to tick more than one option)

	Responses		Percent of Cases
	N	Percent	
Or anyone you care for, a user of this service	1	5.9%	6.3%
A resident of West Berkshire	10	58.8%	62.5%
Employed by West Berkshire Council	0	0.0%	0.0%
A Parish/Town Councillor	2	11.8%	12.5%
A District Councillor	0	0.0%	0.0%
A service provider	2	11.8%	12.5%
A partner organisation	2	11.8%	12.5%
Other	0	0.0%	0.0%

#### 2. How far do you agree with the proposal to reduce the annual funding to the Get Berkshire Active programme from £90,641 to £50,641 when the current contract ends on 31 March 2019?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Strongly agree	3	18.8	20.0
Agree	0	.0	.0
Neither agree nor disagree	2	12.5	13.3
Disagree	2	12.5	13.3
Strongly disagree	8	50.0	53.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>93.8</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Not answered	1	6.3	
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

#### 3. What do you think we should be aware of in terms of how this proposal might impact people? For example, do you think it will affect particular individuals more than others?

The responses to this question were as follows:

- The elderly, those who need to review their long term health issues related to weight, heart, strokes, etc. Ignoring this and depriving those so motivated a chance to turn their lives around, thus reducing future demand on your budget.
- These schemes are specifically aimed at people with a learning disability with the aim of keeping them active and busy and reducing the potential for deterioration in wellbeing which may lead to a need for more costly

## **Budget Proposals 2019/20: Get Berkshire Active (Community Based Leisure and Recreational Activities)**

### **Consultation Summary Report**

---

support services, which would need to be provided by West Berkshire Council

- Yes, people with bad health and overweight
- Only those who have a medical condition, which means they cannot leave their home.

**4. If the decision is taken to proceed with this proposal, do you have any suggestions for how we can reduce the impact on those affected? If so, please provide details.**

The responses to the question are as follows:

- Ensure village agents are made aware of those who are dropped from the programme and ask them to connect
- As part of the whole Adult Social Care discussion a volunteer scheme where people who wished to do so could visit elderly people who are socially isolated could be considered. A trial could be undertaken in one area to see if it was viable. Volunteers would need to have the appropriate legal checks and a co-ordinator would be required.
- Promote more forcefully the remaining denuded scheme so those so motivated do not miss out.
- As this seems to be aimed at residents who can take part in activities, and are not housebound, I suggest that they look at alternative options.

**5. Do you have any suggestions on how we might save money or increase income, either in this service, or elsewhere in the council? If so, please provide details**

The responses to the questions are as follows:

- Increase council tax, holding a referendum, as required by central government, if necessary.
- Lobby central government.
- Reduce demand on services through investment in prevention.
- Work more effectively with other bodies, including health, criminal justice etc. to pool resources and invest for longer term benefit, particularly in prevention.
- Means test the applicants; participant to pay a nominal cost for inclusion in the scheme.
- See if venues would forgo charges for venue hire, or indeed sponsor/promote same, as part of their promotion of community health.
- Make a charge for this service

# Budget Proposals 2019/20: Get Berkshire Active (Community Based Leisure and Recreational Activities)

## Consultation Summary Report

---

6. If you, your community group, or organisation think you might be able to help reduce the impact of this proposal, if the decision is taken to proceed with it, please provide your name and email address below.

No respondent provided their contact details

7. Any further comments?

No other comments were made.

Officer conclusion and recommendation can be found in the associated Overview of Responses and Recommendations document.

Zoe Campbell  
Programme Support Officer  
Public Health & Wellbeing  
10/01/2019

**Please note:** In order to allow everyone who wished the opportunity to contribute, feedback was not sampled. Therefore this wasn't a quantitative, statistically valid exercise. It was neither the premise, purpose, nor within the capability of the exercise, to determine the overall community's level of support, or views on the proposals, with any degree of confidence.

The feedback captured therefore should be seen in the context of 'those who responded', rather than reflective of the wider community.

All the responses have been provided verbatim as an appendix to this report. Whilst this summary seeks to distil the key, substantive points made, it should also be read in conjunction with the more detailed verbatim comments to ensure a full, rounded perspective of the views and comments are considered.

---

i <http://www.westberks.gov.uk/budgetproposals>

ii <http://info.westberks.gov.uk/consultations>

iii <http://www.getberkshireactive.org/default.aspx>

iv <https://www.alzheimers.org.uk/>

v <http://www.berkshirevision.org.uk/>

vi <https://www.wbmencap.org/>

vii <http://cfpnewbury.org/>

viii <https://www.ageuk.org.uk/>

ix <http://getberkshireactive.org/1496/get-active/ever-active/>

x <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/care-act-statutory-guidance/care-and-support-statutory-guidance>

xi <https://fingertips.phe.org.uk/profile/public-health-outcomes-framework>

xii <https://info.westberks.gov.uk/jsna>

xiii <https://info.westberks.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=33954&p=0>

## Overview of Responses and Recommendations

Budget Proposals 2019/20: Get Berkshire Active (Community Based Leisure and Recreational Activities)			Head of Service: Matt Pearce Author: Zoe Campbell	14 February 2019 Version 1 (Executive)	
Proposal:	To reduce the annual funding to Get Berkshire Active from £90,641 to £50,641 when the current contract ends on 31 March 2019.				
Total budget 2018/19:	£90,641	Initial proposed saving 2019/20	£40,000 (44%)	Recommended saving 2019/20	£40,000 (44%)
No. of responses:	<p>In total 16 responses were received. Of those that responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• One identified themselves as a user of the service</li><li>• 10 as residents of West Berkshire</li><li>• 0 as council employees</li><li>• Two as Parish/Town Councils</li><li>• 0 as District Councillors</li><li>• Two as service providers</li><li>• Two as partner organisations</li><li>• 0 as other</li></ul> <p>We also received one petition from the Learning Disability Partnership Board.</p>				
Key issues raised:	<p>The responses to this consultation were mixed. 10 respondents either strongly disagreed or disagreed with the proposal, whilst three strongly agreed and two were indifferent.</p> <p>An issue was raised in relation to reduced funding and the impact it would have on the Mencap Leisure Plus and Gateway services, which are elements of the Get Berkshire Active Consortium programme of activities.</p> <p>Reponses highlighted issues in relation to provision of activities to support the socially isolated, overweight and disadvantaged and were therefore against the proposal to reduce funding.</p> <p>Responses also suggested that the proposal was not aligned with the published Health and Wellbeing strategy and will have a detrimental effect of people’s ability to maintain independence</p>				
Equality issues:	No issues were raised during the consultation, that were not already included in the stage one Equality Impact Assessment.				

**NB:** This Overview of Responses and Recommendations paper should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Summary Report and Verbatim Responses received in relation to this proposal. These can be found in the agenda pack or on our [Consultation Portal](#).

## Overview of Responses and Recommendations

Suggestions for reducing the impact on service users:	Suggestion	Council response
	Ensure village agents are made aware of those who are dropped from the programme and ask them to connect	The council will ensure that participants who take part in activities which end as a result of the proposed savings, will be informed about alternative provision.  We will consider informing the Village Agents on individuals affected, although this would require consent from participants to share their contact information with another agency.
	Promote more forcefully the remaining denuded scheme so those so motivated do not miss out.	This can be included in the contract key performance indicators when the new service/s are commissioned.  We will continue to promote physical activity/activity opportunities for older people that are available across West Berkshire.
	As part of the whole Adult Social Care discussion a volunteer scheme where people who wished to do so could visit elderly people who are socially isolated could be considered. A trial could be undertaken in one area to see if it was viable. Volunteers would need to have the appropriate legal checks and a co-ordinator would be required.	Village Agents are currently funded in West Berkshire who visit older people and help sign post to activities across West Berkshire, including promoting the Befriending service that is also funded. We will continue to actively promote these two services to residents.
Suggestions for saving money or increasing income:	Suggestion	Council response
	Increase Council Tax, holding a referendum, as required by central government, if necessary	The raising of Council Tax will be one of the options that Members will consider as part of setting a balanced budget for 2019/20.
	Lobby central government	The council continues to lobby central government to reverse cuts to the public health grant.

**NB:** This Overview of Responses and Recommendations paper should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Summary Report and Verbatim Responses received in relation to this proposal. These can be found in the agenda pack or on our [Consultation Portal](#).



## Overview of Responses and Recommendations

	Reduce demand in services through investment in prevention	The council continue to review how the public health grant is used to ensure that it improves the health and wellbeing of our population and reduces health inequalities. This requires balancing the allocation of funds to support individuals at immediate risk of ill health to preventing the onset of disease in the first place.
	Work more effectively with other bodies, including health, criminal justice etc. to pool resources and invest for longer term benefit, particularly in prevention	The council will continue to work with a range of partners (including the NHS, police and voluntary sector) to support the health and wellbeing of our residents. This is mainly achieved through the Health and Wellbeing Board which bring together the NHS, public health, adult social care and children's services, including elected representatives and Local Healthwatch, to plan how best to meet the needs of our local population and tackle inequalities in health
	Means test the applicants, participant to pay a nominal cost for inclusion in the scheme.	Nominal costs for some elements of the scheme are already in place, and therefore will continue e.g. Walking football.
	See if venues would forgo charges for venue hire or indeed sponsor/promote same as part of their promotion of community health.	Venue hire is often free of charge.
	Make a charge for the service	<p>Some elements of this service are delivered by charities, therefore it would not be possible to charge for all services.</p> <p>Some services do already charge for the activities provided.</p> <p>This service is reaching very low numbers, or is in a sustainable format, e.g. walking football, and therefore there would be minimal impact.</p>

**NB:** This Overview of Responses and Recommendations paper should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Summary Report and Verbatim Responses received in relation to this proposal. These can be found in the agenda pack or on our [Consultation Portal](#).

## Overview of Responses and Recommendations

<b>Conclusion and recommendation:</b>	<p>Although the majority of the respondents disagreed with this proposal, feedback has not identified any issues which would prevent the council from progressing with it.</p> <p>Some of the activities are already running in a sustainable format through support from partners including Legacy Leisure. Therefore, it is felt that this element of the programme does not require continued funding for these activities to continue.</p> <p>The physical activity specifically delivered by Get Berkshire Active for older people e.g. the kits supplied for home use were not in demand, or well used.</p> <p><b>It is therefore recommended that this proposal is progressed</b> and that residents are signposted to other existing physical activity opportunities across West Berkshire.</p> <p>It is also recommended that a new reshaped service be commissioned, which will continue to provide some community based leisure and recreational activities, support, advice and social activities.</p>
---------------------------------------	--

**NB:** This Overview of Responses and Recommendations paper should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Summary Report and Verbatim Responses received in relation to this proposal. These can be found in the agenda pack or on our [Consultation Portal](#).

## Stage One Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA 1)

<b>What is the proposed decision?</b>	<p>To reduce the annual funding to Get Berkshire Active (Community Based Leisure and Recreational Activities programme) from £90,641 to £50,641 (a saving of £40,000 or 44%) when the current contract ends on 31 March 2019.</p> <p>We propose to commission a new service, which will continue to provide community based leisure and recreational activities, but not physical activities specifically for older people.</p>
<b>Summary of relevant legislation</b>	<p>The Care Act 2014 sets out duties relating to people with care and support needs. This includes duties relating to a range of eligible needs and their relationship with individuals' wellbeing. It also sets out duties relating to the prevention of future care and support needs.</p> <p>The commissioning of healthy lifestyle services is discretionary, guided by the Public Health Outcomes Framework, the local joint strategic needs assessment and the joint health and wellbeing strategy.</p>
<b>Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the council's key strategic priorities?</b>	No
<b>Name of budget holder</b>	Matthew Pearce
<b>Name of Service and Directorate</b>	Public Health & Wellbeing, Communities
<b>Name of assessor</b>	Zoe Campbell
<b>Date of assessment</b>	29/10/2018
<b>Version and release date (if applicable)</b>	V1. 12/11/2018

Is this a...?		Is this policy, strategy, function or service...?	
Policy	No	New or proposed	No
Strategy	No	Existing and being reviewed	Yes
Function	No	Changing	Yes
Service	Yes		

1. What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?	
<b>Aims:</b>	To reduce spending in line with ring fenced grant reductions and council savings.
<b>Objectives:</b>	To reduce the current provision of funding for this service.
<b>Outcomes:</b>	Reduction in cost toward older people's physical activity services.
<b>Benefits:</b>	Saving of £40,000.

2. Which groups may be affected and how? Is it positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this?		
Group affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this
Age	50+	Reduction in funding may reduce opportunities for individuals to attend physical activity group sessions. Some of the sessions that have been developed as part of the current Ever Active project are now in a sustained format such as walking football and walking netball and will be still available without the requirement for ongoing funding. Consequently, we expect there will be a relatively small impact on those residents who are currently accessing the services.

<b>Disability</b>	We expect there will be a relatively small impact on those residents who are currently accessing the services.	Ever Active project are now in a sustained format such as walking football and walking netball and will be still available without the requirement for ongoing funding.
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other	
<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b>	There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other	
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other	
<b>Race</b>	There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other	
<b>Religion or belief</b>	There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other	
<b>Sex</b>	There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other	
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other	
<b>Further comments</b>		
There is a wide range of alternative physical activity opportunities available in West Berkshire. These include free community based walking, running and cycling groups, and a programme of activities for the over 50's 'Fit for Life' delivered at West Berkshire Leisure Centres in Newbury, Thatcham, Lambourn and Tilehurst.		



3. Result	
<b>Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?</b>	No
We expect there may be a relatively small impact on those residents who are currently accessing the services. Ever Active project are now in a sustained format such as walking football and walking netball and will be still available without the requirement for ongoing funding, participants are charged and will continue to be charged, there will be no change.	
<b>Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?</b>	No
We expect there will be a relatively small impact on those residents who are currently accessing the services.	

4. Next steps	
<b>EqlA 2 required?</b>	No
<b>Owner of EqlA 2</b>	
<b>Timescale for EqlA 2</b>	



Number of responses: 16 (including 1 incomplete)

ID	How far do you agree with the proposal to reduce the annual funding to the Get Berkshire Active programme from £90,641 to £50,641 when the current contract ends on 31 March 2019?		What do you think we should be aware of in terms of how this proposal might impact people? For example, do you think it will affect particular individuals more than others? Please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) to see what has already been identified.	If the decision is taken to proceed with this proposal, do you have any suggestions for how we can reduce the impact on those affected? If so, please provide details.	Do you have any suggestions on how we might save money or increase income, either in this service, or elsewhere in the council? If so, please provide details.	Any further comments?
	Response	Please tell us the reasons for your response.				
1	Disagree	We acknowledge that the Council is in a challenging financial situation and will therefore need to reduce its expenditure. We do however have some concerns about the areas highlighted below, particularly because prevention is one of the main priorities in the NHS Five Year Forward View and the West Berkshire Health and Well Being Strategy. We would also like to continue to explore how we can work together through the Berkshire West 10 to maximise economics of scale across our area. These are the areas of concern and questions we wanted to highlight: We note that the proposed cuts are specifically aimed at older people as this cohort has been listed as not aligning with the key priorities of the Health & Wellbeing Strategy. However, helping older people maintain a healthy, independent life for as long as possible is one of the cross cutting themes in the strategy, along with preventing falls and maximising independence for older people and those with long-term conditions. We would contend that any proposed cuts to this service are not aligned with the published strategy of the Council and will have a detrimental effect of people's ability to maintain independence. It is also noted that the organisation will be expected to continue to support vulnerable adults, including the visually impaired, those who are socially isolated and individuals with dementia while providing support into employment, home visits, cooking, gardening and social clubs and physical activity sessions. It would be useful to understand how this could be sustained at the same level with the cuts being proposed?				
2	Strongly disagree	The costs for specifically targeting older people to stay active are key to ensuring they remain in good health and do not require the emergency services due to loss of mobility or end up falling which has very poor outcomes statistically. This short term measure will end up putting more pressure on the NHS and much stretched care service's in the long run and shows a lack of foresight or care for the quality of life of the elderly.	I think the socially the socially isolated elderly will suffer in particular and those who lack confidence. It is also likely to impact on their mental health directly at odds with one of the two health and well being board targets on mental health by damaging the advantages of regular contact. It is also a concern the other members of the health and well being board were not consulted about these proposed cuts	Ensure village agents are made ware of those who are dropped from the program and ask them to connect		

ID	How far do you agree with the proposal to reduce the annual funding to the Get Berkshire Active programme from £90,641 to £50,641 when the current contract ends on 31 March 2019?		What do you think we should be aware of in terms of how this proposal might impact people? For example, do you think it will affect particular individuals more than others? Please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) to see what has already been identified.	If the decision is taken to proceed with this proposal, do you have any suggestions for how we can reduce the impact on those affected? If so, please provide details.	Do you have any suggestions on how we might save money or increase income, either in this service, or elsewhere in the council? If so, please provide details.	Any further comments?
	Response	Please tell us the reasons for your response.				
3	Strongly disagree	There does not appear to have been any analysis of the net social cost-benefit impact of these cuts, particularly through increased costs on the health service. Increasing activity of older people can not only improve their quality of life but dramatically decrease costs on health services (e.g. from falls). There is no indication in the information provided of working positively with the health services to identify better ways of dealing with this issue, rather, simply an abdication by the council of its responsibility.	This is likely to disproportionately impact on the elderly and more deprived people.		I do not have sufficient information about the workings of the rest of the council to be able to suggest any better area for cuts. More general options for increasing income would be to increase council tax, holding a referendum, as required by central government, if necessary. The council might also wish to lobby central government and inform them of the harm being done by their cuts. It could also lobby, directly and through the LGA, for a fairer, more sustainable and more decentralised system for funding local government, which increased the extent of local control. One way of reducing costs longer term would be by reducing demand on services through investment in prevention, which is the opposite of what these cuts are doing. The council should be considered social costs more broadly and working more effectively with other bodies, including health, criminal justice etc. to pool resources and invest for longer term benefit, particularly in prevention.	
4	Strongly disagree	These folk need all the help they can get. I reckon if this programme were reduced, resulting deterioration in people's health and wellbeing would cost society more in the long run			I imagine that most residents would be prepared to pay a little more council tax in order to cover this very minor item of expenditure but vital helpline	
5	Strongly agree	People who are socially isolated are not likely to be motivated to join an exercise group. Elderly people may may complex medical needs which again may prevent them from exercising. They are more likely to respond to a person centred approach, rather than a group approach.		As part of the whole Adult Social Care discussion a volunteer scheme where people who wished to do so could visit elderly people who are socially isolated could be considered. A trial could be undertaken in one area to see if it was viable. Volunteers would need to have the appropriate legal checks and a co-ordinator would be required.		
6	Strongly disagree					



ID	How far do you agree with the proposal to reduce the annual funding to the Get Berkshire Active programme from £90,641 to £50,641 when the current contract ends on 31 March 2019?		What do you think we should be aware of in terms of how this proposal might impact people? For example, do you think it will affect particular individuals more than others? Please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) to see what has already been identified.	If the decision is taken to proceed with this proposal, do you have any suggestions for how we can reduce the impact on those affected? If so, please provide details.	Do you have any suggestions on how we might save money or increase income, either in this service, or elsewhere in the council? If so, please provide details.	Any further comments?
	Response	Please tell us the reasons for your response.				
7	Disagree	Good n excellent service which motivated me to loose weight (25%) and improved my lifestyle, the long term benefit being for me a positive retirement and less future cost to the council. A latent future saving in budget	The elderly, those who need to review their long term health issues related to weight, heart, strokes, etc. Ignoring this and depriving those so motivated a chance to turn their lives around, thus reducing future demand on your budget.	Promote more forcefully the remaining denuded scheme so those so motivated do not miss out.	Means test the applicants, participant to pay a nominal cost for inclusion in the scheme. See if venues and forgo charges for venue hire or indeed sponsor/promote same as part of their promotion of community health.	Nil
8	Strongly disagree					
9	Strongly disagree	Reductions in funding for the services provided as part of this scheme will lead to a reduction in the services provided by Leisure plus and Gateway Club. These schemes are specifically aimed at people with a learning disability with the aim of keeping them active and busy and reducing the potential for deterioration in wellbeing which may lead to a need for more costly support services. Gateway Club helps people with a learning disability take part in leisure, social and creative activities in the community, and provides opportunities for personal development. This is a weekly club held on a Wednesday evening at The Mencap Centre. The aim is to break down barriers to social inclusion so people with a learning disability can lead a full and active life in the community. We deliver over 2,000 sessions per year. Leisure Plus sessions run three days per week offering, recreational and leisure activities including art, badminton, cooking skills, crafts, drama and trampoline skills. We deliver over 2,400 sessions per year	These schemes are specifically aimed at people with a learning disability with the aim of keeping them active and busy and reducing the potential for deterioration in wellbeing which may lead to a need for more costly support services which would need to be provided by West Berkshire Council			
10	Strongly disagree	At a time of increased obesity in the UK where 70% of Adults are overweight or obese...This seems a shortsighted policy to cut funding to an organisation that can help this situation. In the end we will pay more out in poor health treatment than is saved	yes people with bad health and overweight	not really.....	make a charge to use service based on means	
11	Neither agree nor disagree					
12	Strongly disagree	You have already made huge and sustained cuts to many support services over the last few years which in many cases have hit the needy the hardest. It's time to stop this, and to focus limited funds on those who need them most. I cannot support any of the above cuts and urge you to find savings elsewhere or re-allocate funds from areas that will not impact the disadvantaged.				

ID	How far do you agree with the proposal to reduce the annual funding to the Get Berkshire Active programme from £90,641 to £50,641 when the current contract ends on 31 March 2019?		What do you think we should be aware of in terms of how this proposal might impact people? For example, do you think it will affect particular individuals more than others? Please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) to see what has already been identified.	If the decision is taken to proceed with this proposal, do you have any suggestions for how we can reduce the impact on those affected? If so, please provide details.	Do you have any suggestions on how we might save money or increase income, either in this service, or elsewhere in the council? If so, please provide details.	Any further comments?
	Response	Please tell us the reasons for your response.				
13	Strongly agree	So it costs £676.43 per person for this service in the current year. There seem to be plenty of alternative services/ suggestions that would cost far less per person. And it costs nothing for people to take a daily walk/exercise.	Only those who have a medical condition which means hey cannot leave their home.	As this seems to be aimed at residents who can take part in activities, and are not housebound, I suggest that they look at alternative options.	Make a charge for this service.	
14	Strongly agree					
16	Neither agree nor disagree	I understand the need for funding cuts however I feel you should increase my council tax so that these services do not suffer.			Please increase my council tax so that these services do not suffer.	