

Budget Proposals 2019/20: Cancer Rehabilitation Programme

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 pageⁱ, which outlined the overall background to the exercise, and provided links to each of the individual proposals on our Consultation Portalⁱⁱ.

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: Cancer Rehabilitation Programme

Consultation Summary Report

Proposal Background

A Macmillan evidence reviewⁱⁱⁱ showed that physical activity is important for cancer patients at all stages of the cancer care pathway. Physical activity:

- Improves, or prevents the decline of physical function without increasing fatigue during treatment.
- Helps recover physical function after treatment.
- Can reduce the risk of recurrence and death for some cancers, and of developing other long term conditions during and after treatment.
- Can help maintain independence and wellbeing for those with advanced cancer.

We currently subsidise a programme of exercise classes for individuals living with and beyond cancer, at a cost of £8,290 per year. This covers the cost of the instructor and room hire provided by Legacy Leisure. Individuals can attend a 12 week programme through referral from a GP or Cancer Nurse Specialist, at a cost of £2.80 per week. Classes take place weekly at Northcroft Leisure Centre^{iv}, and provide individuals with a range of tools and opportunities to enhance recovery from cancer.

Legislation Requirements

There is no legislative requirement to provide this service.

Proposal Details

To cease the annual funding of the cancer rehabilitation programme (a saving of £8,290 or 100%) from 1 April 2019.

Consultation Response

Number of Responses

In total, 15 responses were received, although one respondent did not complete the questionnaire.

Five of the respondents identified themselves as service users, nine as residents, two as employees of West Berkshire Council, one as a Parish/Town Councillor, two as partner organisations and two as other.

Summary of Main Points

11 respondents either strongly disagreed or disagreed with the proposal.

Budget Proposals 2019/20: Cancer Rehabilitation Programme

Consultation Summary Report

Response from service users stated that taking part in the exercise classes provided the significant benefits to both physical and mental wellbeing.

Concerns were expressed about affordability if the class was charged for, which may contribute to inequalities in health.

One respondent highlighted the strong evidence of regular exercise on the reduced risk of different types of secondary cancer and that the proposal to cease funding the exercise class should be reconsidered.

It was also suggested that the intervention would likely save money in the long-term and therefore the removal of funding was a false economy. The council should work together with the local hospitals to support cancer sufferers and not shift responsibility onto the NHS.

There was a consensus that the classes were a major part of the recovery process as well as providing peer support from individuals living with cancer.

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	5	23.8%	33.3%
A resident of West Berkshire	9	42.9%	60.0%
Employed by West Berkshire Council	2	9.5%	13.3%
A Parish/Town Councillor	1	4.8%	6.7%
A District Councillor	0	0.0%	0.0%
A service provider	0	0.0%	0.0%
A partner organisation	2	9.5%	13.3%
Other	2	9.5%	13.3%

2. How far do you agree with the proposal to cease the annual funding to the cancer rehabilitation programme from 1 April 2019?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Strongly agree	1	6.7	7.1
Agree	1	6.7	7.1
Neither agree nor disagree	1	6.7	7.1
Disagree	2	13.3	14.3
Strongly disagree	9	60.0	64.3
Total	14	93.3	100.0
Not answered	1	6.7	

Budget Proposals 2019/20: Cancer Rehabilitation Programme

Consultation Summary Report

Total	15	100.0	
-------	----	-------	--

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?

Many respondents indicated that classes might stop, as a result of the price increase and/or discriminate against those individuals who would be unable to afford the new prices e.g. younger people with families who may have to pay for child care.

Comments expressed the view that individuals with cancer already experienced financial hardship, as a result of not being able to work.

One respondent commented that the removal of funding would have a negative impact on the over 65's who do not do any form of regular exercise because of health issues which are compounded by having cancer.

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.

One respondent suggested that the price rises be minimised to reduce the likely impact of the cuts to those individuals who might not be able to afford the class.

Other suggestions included exploring grant funding for the class.

One respondent noted that they had assumed the class was paid for by Macmillan and hadn't realised that the local authority funded it.

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.

Suggestions included:

- Charitable appeals
- Council tax increases
- Reduce Foreign Aid

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 respondents gave their contact details.

7. Any further comments?

Budget Proposals 2019/20: Cancer Rehabilitation Programme

Consultation Summary Report

None that had not been raised in earlier comments.

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

Zoe Campbell
Programme Support Officer
Public Health & Wellbeing
09/01/2019

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

https://www.macmillan.org.uk/documents/aboutus/health_professionals/physicalactivityevidencebasedguidance.pdf

^{iv} <https://www.leisurecentre.com/northcroft-leisure-centre>

Overview of Responses and Recommendations

Budget Proposals 2019/20: Cancer Rehabilitation Programme			Head of Service: Matt Pearce		5 March 2019
			Author:		Version 1 (Full Council)
Proposal:	To cease the annual funding of the cancer rehabilitation programme from 1 April 2019.				
Total budget 2018/19:	£8,290	Initial proposed saving 2019/20	£8,290 (100%)	Recommended saving 2019/20	£0 (0%)
No. of responses:	<p>In total, 15 responses were received. Of those that responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five identified themselves as users of the service • Nine as residents of West Berkshire • Two as council employees • One as a Parish/Town Council • 0 as District Councillors • 0 as service providers • Two as partner organisations • Two as other 				
Key issues raised:	<p>11 of the respondents either strongly disagreed or disagreed with the proposal.</p> <p>The main responses were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users stated the significant positive impact to both physical and mental wellbeing. • Concerns were expressed about affordability if the class was charged for, which may contribute to inequalities in health. • Intervention would likely save money in the long-term and therefore the removal of funding was a false economy. • The classes were a major part of the recovery process as well as providing peer support from individuals living with cancer. 				
Equality issues:	The consultation supported the stage one Equality Impact Assessment suggesting that the proposed changes might have some impact on individuals with disability and older people who may be on lower incomes.				

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
	Minimise the price rises	The council have been liaising with our Leisure Service provider and it is expected that the price of the class will rise from £0 to either £2.90 with a West Berks Card £3.90 without. This is lower than similar rehabilitation classes such as New Hearts -cardiac rehabilitation which charge between £4.35 and £5.35
Suggestions for saving money or increasing income:	Suggestion	Council response
	Charitable appeals	Opportunities for grant funding could be explored.
	Council tax increases	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.
	Reduce Foreign Aid	The council doesn't have any legislative power to influence foreign aid.
	Use grant funding to cover the cost of the class	The council will continue to work with our partners to explore opportunities for grant funding from other sources, although this can often mean the funding is short-term. We will also continue to lobby national government to reverse the cuts to the public health grant.
Conclusion and recommendation:	There has been some confusion regarding the current charging for the cancer classes. It has become clear that participants are not charged for the initial 12 weeks of classes. However, following on from this they are directed to a more general exercise referral class, which they do pay for. The consultation has not accurately described this process and based on this information it is recommended that this proposal is not progressed at this time.	

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 Two Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA 2)

What is the proposed decision?	To cease the annual funding of the cancer rehabilitation programme (a saving of £8,290 or 100%) from 1 April 2019.
Summary of relevant legislation	The commissioning of healthy lifestyle services is a discretionary component of the Public Health Ring Fence Grant.
Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the council's key strategic priorities?	No
Name of budget holder	Matthew Pearce
Name of assessor	April Peberdy
Name of Service and Directorate	Public Health & Wellbeing, Communities
Date of assessment	14/01/2019
Version and release date (if applicable)	Version 1.0
Date EqIA 1 completed	12/11/2018

Step One – Scoping the Equality Impact Assessment

1. What data, research and other evidence or information is available which will be relevant to this EqIA 2?			
Service targets		Performance targets	
User satisfaction		Service take-up	
Workforce monitoring		Press coverage	
Complaints & comments		Census data	
Information from Trade Union		Community Intelligence	
Previous EqIA	x	Staff survey	
Public consultation	x	Other (please specify)	

2. What are the findings from the available evidence for the areas you have ticked above?

As a result of the consultation with the public we have compiled the following documentation to summarise the feedback which has been received

- Consultation Summary Report
- Stage One Equality Impact Assessment
- Overview of Responses and Recommendations

We have conscientiously taken the views of respondents into account

Please see the public consultation showing responses. The consultation supported the previous Stage One Equality Impact Assessment suggesting that the proposed changes would have some impact on those with disabilities, along with some older people who may be on lower incomes.

3. What additional research or data is required, if any, to fill the gaps identified in question two? Have you considered commissioning new data or research e.g. a needs assessment?

N/A

Step Two – Involvement and Consultation

4. How do the findings from the evidence summarised in Step One affect people with the nine protected characteristics?

Target Groups	Summary of responses and type of evidence
Age – relates to all ages	<p>Reduction in funding may reduce opportunities for individuals who are living with and recovering from cancer to participate in community physical activity sessions. There is a range of ages in the classes, however 74% of attendees are aged over 50 years.</p> <p>The consultation responses suggest that the proposal may be unaffordable for someone on a pension.</p>

<p>Disability - applies to a range of people that have a condition (physical or mental) which has a significant and long-term adverse effect on their ability to carry out 'normal' day-to-day activities. This protection also applies to people that have been diagnosed with a progressive illness such as HIV or cancer.</p>	<p>Cancer is a disability and the proposal is therefore likely to impact this group.</p>
<p>Gender reassignment - definition has been expanded to include people who chose to live in the opposite gender to the gender assigned to them at birth by removing the previously legal requirement for them to undergo medical supervision.</p>	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other</p>
<p>Marriage and civil partnership – protects employees who are married or in a civil partnership against discrimination. Single people are not protected.</p>	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other</p>
<p>Pregnancy and maternity - protects against discrimination. With regard to employment, the woman is protected during the period of her pregnancy and any statutory maternity leave to which she is entitled. It is also unlawful to discriminate against women breastfeeding in a public place</p>	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other</p>
<p>Race - includes colour, caste, ethnic or national origin or nationality.</p>	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other</p>
<p>Religion or belief - covers any religion, religious or non-religious beliefs. Also includes philosophical belief or non-belief. To be protected, a belief must satisfy various criteria, including that it is a weighty and substantial aspect of human life and behaviour.</p>	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other</p>
<p>Sex - applies to male or female.</p>	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other</p>

Sexual orientation - protects lesbian, gay, bi-sexual and heterosexual people.

There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other

5. Who are the main stakeholders (e.g. service users, staff) and what are their requirements?

The service users would be any individuals who have cancer and are eligible to take part based on the inclusion criteria of the exercise class.

We currently subsidise a programme of exercise classes for individuals living with and beyond cancer, at a cost of £8,290 per year. This covers the cost of the instructor and room hire provided by Legacy Leisure. Individuals can attend a 12 week programme through referral from a GP or Cancer Nurse Specialist. This is currently provided free to all users. There is a weekly class which takes place at Northcroft Leisure Centre¹, and provides individuals with a range of tools and opportunities to enhance recovery from cancer.

6. How will this item affect the stakeholders identified above?

The 12 week course is currently free however following the changes those attending the course will be required to pay £2.90 (West Berkshire card holders) £3.90 (Without a West Berkshire card) per week to attend.

Step Three – Assessing Impact and Strengthening the Policy

7. What are the impacts and how will you mitigate them?

The potential impacts for those who are over 65 or individuals with a disability are that they would need to pay to attend the classes rather than access the service free of charge. There are other activities that they may be able to attend such as free running and walking groups which are currently provided through Public Health and Wellbeing but those activities are not specifically designed for individuals with cancer or may not always be suitable for every individual with a disability.



Step Four – Procurement and Partnerships

8. Is this item due to be carried out wholly or partly by contractors?

Yes

The classes will be provided at a reduced hourly rate to individuals with cancer to help support those who may be on a low income or unable to work due to their illness.

We will ensure that legacy Leisure the provider has an equality policy in place and this will be reviewed under their main contract as part of the regular monitoring process.

Step Five – Making a Decision

9. What are your recommendations as a result of the EqIA 2?

In making your recommendations please summarise your findings.

We have carefully and conscientiously taken the views of the respondents into account and considered the impact of the proposals in relation to equality. We have considered whether the proposal could lead to actual or potential discrimination and have considered whether the mitigation we have proposed is sufficient.

We believe that the mitigation measures that we have proposed demonstrate that we have met the authorities responsibilities in relation to equality

Step Six – Monitoring, Evaluating and Reviewing

10. How will you monitor the impact on the nine protected characteristics once the change has taken place?

Ensure that Legacy Leisure have an Equality policy in place and an Equalities Impact Assessment to be completed each year as part of the annual review of the service

Step Seven – Action Plan

Categories	Actions	Target date	Responsible person
Involvement and consultation	Consult with service provider to ensure that the relevant equality policy is in place and plans are made to ensure that those with protected characteristics have equal access to services	Summer 2019	April Peberdy Programme Manager



Data collection	Monitoring data will be requested from the provider and reported on a quarterly basis	Quarterly	April Peberdy Programme Manager
Assessing impact	Monitor the service take up of those with protected characteristics	October 2019	April Peberdy Programme Manager
Procurement and partnership	Ensure that equality is considered at point of any future procurement of service		April Peberdy in conjunction with Leisure Services Manager – Jim sweeting
Monitoring, evaluation and reviewing	Annual review of Equalities Impact Assessment	April 2020	April Peberdy in conjunction with Leisure Services Manager – Jim sweeting

Step Eight – Sign Off

The policy, strategy or function has been fully assessed in relation to its potential effects on equality and all relevant concerns have been addressed.

Contributors to the EqIA 2

Name: April Peberdy

Job Title: Programme Manager

Date: 14/01/2019

Head of Service

Name: Matthew Pearce

Date: 14/01/2019

ⁱ <https://www.leisurecentre.com/northcroft-leisure-centre>



West Berkshire
C O U N C I L

Number of responses: 15 (including 1 incomplete)

ID	How far do you agree with the proposal to cease the annual funding of the cancer rehabilitation programme from 1 April 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	Strongly disagree	<p>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: The National Strategy "Achieving World Class cancer outcomes" states that the number of people diagnosed and living with cancer each year will continue to grow rapidly, even with major improvements in prevention. The primary reasons for this are our ageing population and our success in increasing survival. This will place significant additional demand on health and social care services. By 2021 the number of new cancer cases is predicted to rise to 383,000 per year at an increased cost of care of £15.3 billion. There is strong evidence for physical activity and it has been shown through studies that regular exercise reduces the risk of a number of different types of secondary cancer by 10-50% and also to reduce the risk of cancer-specific death. Therefore the provision of physical activity would help to improve reduce the risk of secondary cancers and also support the proposed national Quality of Life measure. We strongly recommend the proposal to cease funding the exercise class should be reconsidered as it is not in line with the national strategy and will potentially increase the burden of cost for health and social care.</p>				
2	Strongly disagree	<p>The proposed savings are minimal to the council, but it is important that such rehabilitation continues and it is obvious that some who suffer from cancer will not be able to afford the extra cost that they would be asked to pay.</p>	<p>Clearly it would affect people suffering from cancer who don't have enough money.</p>	<p>Councillors could dip into their own pockets to pay for the activities.</p>	<p>Obviously the money from Business Rates dwarfs the amount that is paid out for this rehab programme.</p>	

ID	How far do you agree with the proposal to cease the annual funding of the cancer rehabilitation programme from 1 April 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	<p>This service was free, only last week were we told it would cost £2.80, your proposal would double that. Cancer takes so much from people, it is financially destructive because of the inability to work but even if you can the huge cost of having treatment, travelling, needing to buy extras like special food or even a wig because you have lost your hair, all mount up. It also destroys your self-esteem and confidence. These classes are an absolute lifeline back to fitness and normality. I would never have gone to a group or gym otherwise. To be surrounded by fellow users who know what you have been through and do not judge you but support you is invaluable. To have a trainer who understands your physical restrictions and that some of the class are still undergoing treatment and may not live long is so unique. We watch each other grow in confidence and ability, we laugh with each other and support each other. It is easy to say £5 is not much but that is £20 to find a month, some members of the group simply do not have it and they may be the most depressed, therefore the most in need. £8,000 seems quite a lot of money but to keep just one cancer patient healthy, motivated and safe from the darker thoughts that inevitably enter their minds would be worth it. This money saves the NHS and public health from dealing with the ongoing consequences of Cancer, you do not just get treated and all is well. It is never over, the physical side effects of treatment can last forever and the mental reaction is often not seen until later. Please look at the bigger picture and realise that this is one pot of money that is doing proportionately much more than can be calculated.</p>	<p>It will affect those who have been hit particularly hard by the cost of their treatment and who are already struggling day to day financially</p>	<p>It has already been a shock to the group that it is no longer free. Whilst those who can are happy to pay the £2.80 fee, to double it within months would be particularly harsh, delaying this decision further would soften that blow</p>		
4	Strongly agree					
5	Strongly disagree	<p>This class has a hugely positive impact on mental health as well as physical. I have been going since I finished my chemotherapy and it helps me to see the 'bigger picture', when work is busy and there are other stresses, this class puts everything back in to perspective and makes me feel better. It is the single thing that has made the most difference to my rehabilitation. The exercise makes you fitter, stronger and more active but it is more than that as it is the mental effect of positively doing something that is the most important aspect of it. Not having to access further NHS services clearly saves money, not missing work saves money so it is preventative. Not everybody would be able to afford to pay and they would then not be able to access this valuable support.</p>	<p>Cancer is covered under the Equality Act (2010) and the provision should be maintained.</p>	<p>If there has to be a charge then it needs to be minimal as some people will not be able to come. Interestingly West Berkshire are funding this but the WB logo does not appear on any of the literature in the class. It is all branded with 'Macmillan' and most people thought they were funding it.</p>	<p>To not fund this class would be a false economy.</p>	

ID	How far do you agree with the proposal to cease the annual funding of the cancer rehabilitation programme from 1 April 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.				
6	Strongly disagree	This is a valuable and beneficial service offered free to all individuals affected by cancer and to cease the funding for this service would be very upsetting for all the people concerned who very much enjoy attending these classes and might not otherwise be able to if they had to pay for this service. I already attend the gym once a week at a cost of £4.35 and would certainly find it a struggle to pay for two classes per week as I am a pensioner who has had a operation for lung cancer. I have found these classes to be most effective in my well being and recovery and to have to stop attending once a week because of lack of funding would be devastating.	In my opinion I think all cancer patients would be affected by this proposal and the Council should be aware that if funding ceases these individuals could suffer greatly, not being able to improve their health and recovery through attending these classes which are very much beneficial to all concerned.	No I do not have any alternative suggestions. We need the funding to continue.	Yes. The Government should seriously consider cutting the Foreign Aid budget to other Countries and concentrate on the needs of the British people. 'Charity begins at home'	
7	Neither agree nor disagree					
8	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.				
9	Strongly disagree	It will cause the service to slowly lose support and eventually cease entirely		Make a charitable appeal to those that can afford to pay more should pay more council tax	Make a charitable appeal to those that can afford to pay more should pay more council tax	
10	Disagree	I have seen the proposals regarding the Council's Cancer Rehabilitation Programme and, as a user of this excellent programme at the Northcroft Centre, I think it would be very regrettable for this support to be discontinued next year. It is an excellent course and ticks all the boxes as far as the best form of exercise and psychological wellbeing is concerned for cancer patients. Withdrawing the support would make attendance a financial worry for some people, particularly younger patients with families, who already have travelling expenses and have to pay for childcare when attending clinics and hospitals for appointments in what is essentially a rural area. It is generally understood that savings do need to be made in the present climate but this seems a very small commitment for what is a much appreciated and undoubtedly valuable benefit by those of us who attend these sessions. Furthermore, exercise is something which is considered to be an important element in the nation's health at this time, I do hope a way can be found for this programme to continue.				
11	Strongly disagree					

ID	How far do you agree with the proposal to cease the annual funding of the cancer rehabilitation programme from 1 April 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.				
12	Agree	Having survived cancer and the rigorous rounds of treatment which put a huge financial strain on you as you cant work because you are ill and the parking charges for many visits to Reading this programme run by McMillian is a life line and a chance for you to take back control of your life and regain some strength lost. This exercise class is a major part of the recovery process as well as providing vital support from fellow cancer sufferers some who are still undergoing treatment but still want to do some form of exercise. Cancer is a frightening life changing illness and this class helps you physically and mentally get through it. The majority of those that attend are retired or not working and do not have the financial means to take on this expenditure and if it were taken away they would lose their only source of regular exercise. The programme is widely supported at Northcroft with the classes regularly full with waiting lists so much so a second class has recently started.	Yes I think it will have a huge impact on the over 65's that attend who do not do any form of regular exercise because of many health issues compounded by having cancer. They have little or no regular adult contact outside the home and are consumed by hospital and doctor appts to deal with the illness. This class once a week gives them the opportunity to do exercise tailored to their individual circumstances and also provides a support network of like minded people to talk through their worries. Surviving on a pension this may be an expenditure they cannot afford to take on.	No they will be devastated and probably feel they have no where to go to replace it as normal exercise for a cancer person is just not workable in the recovery phase.	Stop putting up useless statues in the town centre and focus more on services to help people.	At a time when West Berkshire has raised millions to open a new cancer centre in Thatcham you should be working together with the hospital to support cancer sufferers not shifting the onus onto the NHS. Rehabilitation is an important step in many cases returns with devastating effects. Keeping people active and supported at least gives them a fighting chance of keeping well and fighting for their lives. Shame on you West Berkshire Council!
13	Disagree	The individuals most likely to use this programme are those most likely to need the financial support provided by WBC.	It will affect the poorer members of our community. And it may well result in a further reduction in the service.	You could subsidise them individually - but then you wouldn't be saving any money.	How about lobbying the Government and reminding them that, apparently, Austerity is Over, and that as a council you've already cut services far beyond what is acceptable?	
15	Strongly disagree	People who have had cancer need support. Cut your bonuses instead.	It could have a detrimental affect those without a support network		Stop spending money on stupid things like statues	