

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

Ref	Name/Meeting	Date of letter/meeting	Subject	Comment
1	Member of Public - Chalvey	12/06/2018	Chalvey	
2	Letter on behalf of Grundon Waste Management and Lakeside Energy from Waste	17/07/2018	Colnbrook with Poyle	
3	Member of the Public - Langley	23/07/2018	Langley	
4	Member of the Public	26/07/2018	Colnbrook with Poyle	
5	Member of the Public	30/07/2018	Colnbrook with Poyle	
6	Councillor Dar	26/07/2018	Wexham Court	
7	Member of the Public	26/07/2018	Wexham Court	

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

8	Parish Councillor	01/08/2018	Wexham Court	
9	Member of the Public	02/08/2018	Colnbrook with Poyle	
10	Member of the Public - Colnbrook	03/08/2018	Colnbrook with Poyle	
11	Meeting with Britwell Parish Council	25/07/18	Britwell	
12	Meeting with Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council	23/07/18	Colnbrook with Poyle	
13	Meeting with Wexham Court Parish Council	25/07/18	Wexham Court	
14	Britwell Drop in session	10/07/18	Britwell	
15	Wexham Court Drop in session	17/07/18	Wexham Court	
16	Colnbrook with Poyle Drop in session	19/07/18	Colnbrook with Poyle	
17	Meeting with Thames Valley Police	23/07/18	All	
18	Wexham Court Survey	July 2018	Wexham Court	Carried out by Slough Labour Party

Ref: 1.

**Which of the following electoral areas does your submission relate to?:** Chalvey

**Your submission:** I do not see the point of creating Chalvey a "parish". One of the great advantages of Slough being a unitary authority is it being a "one stop shop". All discussions, arguments and bucks begin and end with SBC, with no overlap of duties between different levels. More importantly, the lack of duplication between different levels of council administration means lower council tax. It would appear that our existing parish councils' remits cover the lowest end of what SBC already does, and in terms of planning they are only "consulted", have no real authority, and can be overridden by the main council if that is what the main council decides. Chalvey has many effective community groups - (Chalvey Community Forum, YMCA, PWA, etc), which already represents Chalvey peoples' views on planning, highway etc issues. I cannot see that on the occasions where it does not suit the main council to do so it will take any more notice of a Chalvey parish council than it does of Chalvey's existing community groups. Most elected parish councillors stand under a political party banner, of whom some may be hoping for political advancement - even to becoming an MP. Toeing the party political line therefore could have a bearing on their dealings with the main council. However members of community groups are politically neutral, and concentrate solely on the issues. At such a basic grass-roots level surely this is better representation? A Chalvey parish council will just mean extra council tax to pay for duplication, more paper pushing and an extra talking shop. Chalvey doesn't need it.

Ref 2.

**Colnbrook and Poyle Parish Council**

Please find attached a letter offering strong support for the continued existence of Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council. This letter represents the views of both Grundon Waste Management and Lakeside Energy from Waste at a very senior level. Please do not hesitate to come back to me if you require any further information. We look forward to hearing from you of the continuity of the Parish Council.

To whom it may concern:

We understand that Slough Borough Council is currently reviewing community governance arrangements with the borough.

At both Grundon and Lakeside we have worked closely with the Parish Council – to inform them of our ongoing company activities and also identifying projects for support through the Landfill Communities Fund.

We have found the councillors very helpful. Representatives always attend our Liaison Group meetings and make valuable contributions. The Parish Council perspective is particularly important and relevant. In such a densely populated area, it is often difficult to work out just who we need to talk to – and our local parish councillors have proved invaluable in this role. They always attend meetings and provide us with a local perspective – and if individuals can't attend – we are advised well in advance that a named substitute will take their place.

Also guided by our local Parish Councillors, we have been able to direct our Landfill Community Funds to projects of direct interest to the local community – which of course is what the scheme was designed to do.

We do hope that Slough BC will agree that the need for Colnbrook and Poyle Parish Council is particularly important during these uncertain times – which seem destined to get even more uncertain before they stabilise.

Ref 3.

**Which of the following electoral areas does your submission relate to?:** Langley

**Your submission:** Whereas previously I had not seen the need for a Parish Council for Langley recent events have suggested that Langley is at a disadvantage for not having one. A number of major issues have arisen over the past couple of years, such as the proposed Heathrow Express depot (now defunct), the building of the Western Rail Access to Heathrow and closure of Chequers Bridge, the establishment of quarries by Cemex at North Park and Riding Court and access to them and the impact of Heathrow Expansion. Many of these affect both Langley and a neighbouring community - in most cases Iver, but also Datchet. Both of these have a Parish Council to act on behalf of their local residents, but Langley does not have the equivalent. This means that when issues such as those mentioned above arise our neighbouring communities have a statutory body in its Parish Council which has to be formally consulted about plans affecting the parish. Langley does not have a similar statutory right. So whereas Iver and Datchet Parish Councils can express views which statutorily have to be taken into account on cross-border issues, Langley does not have the opportunity. This means that if, for instance, an issue affects Langley and Iver or Langley and Datchet, not only must the views of the Parish Councils be taken into account, they could make recommendations which work to the detriment of Langley to avoid the impact on their own area. In practice recently, non-statutory bodies in Langley, eg the Langley Neighbourhood Forum and the local Neighbourhood Action Groups have had to represent Langley alongside Iver Parish Council to oppose some of the detrimental proposals affecting both Langley and Iver.

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

Ref 4.

**Which of the following electoral areas does your submission relate to?:** Colnbrook with Poyle

**Your submission:** The parish has lost a great number of councillors who actually did something for the community and who cared about Colnbrook . At the moment it is all about people who just like publicity. Apart from the very few who actually do any work. There is nothing they do which benefits Colnbrook.

Ref 5.

**Which of the following electoral areas does your submission relate to?:** Colnbrook with Poyle

**Your submission:** The PC as currently represented is not viable BUT I do feel that a PC or similar non-political, grass root level of representation of the community is beneficial. The PC if it is to continue must become a more cohesive, functional and engaged entity with the best interests of the ward residents/environment/ etc at the forefront of their agenda. Training of councillors would be essential as many seem to have an idea of their role. The PC must be non-political and concern is that our current PC has a minority of independent, village based representation while several are either Conservative or Labour and/or do not live in the ward. Also its essential that the PC engage with younger percentage of the community as they lack of social media awareness. Similarly elderly residents may require a more traditional, door step approach. Overview message of current PC is that it needs to reform its ways, re-asses core values and why they were elected, what their roles/ambitions should be clearly defined off the back of meetings/minutes of meetings

Ref 6.

**Which of the following electoral areas does your submission relate to?: Wexham Court**

As you know I am a borough councillor for the wexham lea ward of which the Wexham parish is part of.

Over of the last 5/6 years I have observed the standard of the parish increasingly diminish. Ranging from the quality of councillors to services provided by the parish to the residents.

I have been a campaign organiser for the Labour Party over the past 5 years and residents often ask what the purpose of the parish is and how its serves the residents. As I have stated previous it has failed to cater for the needs of it residents and provide value.

1] Unity - their is no unity amongst the 11 councillors who are elected to serve their residents. This then spills into not working together for the interests of the parish which has greatly affected the delivery of services. The staff is also affected by the disunity as they often being directed by various fractions of the councillors. Which has led to little or no authority/ management of the staff leading to disagreements.

2]Communication - lack of communication between

- members - clerk
- clerk - rest of employees
- parish council - to Parish residents

All the above illustrates the lack of clarity of roles & responsibilities, aim & purpose of the parish

Residents used to receive a magazine twice a year which ceased 2 years ago

Prior to 2015 majority of the councillors were from the parish and this may explain why since then communication has been so poor.

Residents raise this as an ongoing concern as how can councillors who do not live in the ward and pay the precept then represent them and achieve value for money.

Consultation - the parish has failed to appropriately consult residents on major projects and more recently the sale of the parish's land.



## COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

They received a capital receipt which they have ear marked for future projects which residents have had no sight of. If the parish was working effectively it would ensure its decisions were driven by insight from residents via proper consultation.

3] Finances - purpose of the hall is for residents use, the parish has signed long leases which restrict ordinary residents from using the space.

Bowls Club - rented out for £450 per annum this is blatant misuse of parish assets and the parish has continually failed to take appropriate action. As the previous parish members were the ones who authorised the low rates and now manage this. No legal advice has been sought to pursue the matter in order that the parish residents receive their dues.

Hall hire - the halls are used commercially at the cost of parish residents usage. This is commercially driven decision which does not take in to account the needs of the population. Parish councillors have taken bookings and grant discount for commercial use for non- parish residents.

Insurance - as the parish has several commercial businesses of which many include children and vulnerable adults. The parish has no process or procedure to ensure these operators are insured or indeed DBS checked to work with such groups. This is an on-going concern as this may fall short of safeguarding protocols.

4] Staff training - Clerk was previously recruited who did not have the appropriate skills to undertake the role. This has led to poor support, minute taking and running of the meetings. At times disruption by the said clerk in interfering in meeting procedures resulting in arguments and abandoned meetings. The clerk has no experience and hence is ill advising the chair and councillors on procedures.

He has the same attitude against the staff he is obliged to manage. This has led to them being disgruntled and uncooperative in parish business.

Ref 7.

**Which of the following electoral areas does your submission relate to?:** Wexham Court

Whilst not residing in the ward I stood for election in 2013 and was elected with a very large majority and served until 2015 when I did not stand again. The person I stood against was a former Parish Councillor who had caused a disturbance at a meeting I first attended before being elected as a member of the public, the former councillor was also a member of the public who refused to let the meeting end and stopped people leaving. The Head of Legal of SBC was present taking notes and after she warned him that it was false imprisonment I called the police.

This sort of behaviour characterised what I found when I took my place as a councillor.

My wife and I married in 1971 and hired the Parish Hall for our wedding reception, returning in 2013 it had changed little, smelled musty and was largely locked during the week. It did not provide any activities for local residents. The halls were used largely for Asian receptions at weekends.

I thought (wrongly) that I was joining a group of people who were community-minded, with the exception of a couple of other members, most members appeared to want the status of being a councillor and I recall one member (elected after me) who had business cards printed to hand out and delighted in being asked to sign passport applications. Little was done between meetings and the desire was to hold the precept and hoard money in the bank.

I managed to get support for the installation of a disabled lift so that all could use the main hall upstairs and to modernise and decorate the building which involved the electrical installation being updated. During the course of the lift installation brown asbestos was found and a full asbestos report was required, which found asbestos elsewhere and specifically in the ceiling of the upstairs hall and above the stage. No previous examination of the building had ever taken place. The garage in the ground was in a state of disrepair with asbestos guttering and downpipes lying on the ground. The disabled access did not meet regulations and was improved, the bricks above the upstairs door into the hall was unsupported by a lintel, with the bricks resting on the door frame. The facade of the building (made of concrete) was falling apart and had to be replaced with PVC. There were issues with the fire exit which had to be resolved. There were numerous other less serious problems found. The point is that generations of parish councillors had not ensured the building was safe for use by the public.

## COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

Once the building was modernised (with the exception of central heating which did not meet modern safety standards in some places) Age Concern were approached and started an old folks luncheon club, which is still running.

The recreation area in The Cherries is inspected annually and weekly by SBC but the new play area (built on the basis of a grant) was not inspected at all by qualified persons. After I raised the matter (after my departure) with the current Parish Council, he arranged an annual inspection. I understand that is still the only proper safety inspection which takes place and is carried out by competent persons. The sliding doors on the conference room created downstairs still remains unpainted with fire retardant paint despite the Clerk being told of this need.

The allotments which were being considered for the provision of toilets, remain as they have been since the days of Eton Rural District Council

Compare this to the provision at all of SBC's allotment sites, which all have toilets.

The care of the building and assets is slipping back into the ways of the past.

The composition of the council largely comprises the acolytes of two long established Borough Councillors, one of whom is also a Parish Councillor and the other sits with the Parish Council. When reminded that his role was to attend and make a report and then retire to the public seating he took (and I am told) still takes offence. The council seems to be the province of these two councillors.

The previous Clerk was dismissed for gross misconduct after a proper disciplinary hearing. The current clerk was appointed after the only advertising being a notice on the door of the Parish Hall. Previously we used to advertise for caretakers in the local press and on cards in shops locally

The present incumbent was well known to two Parish Councillors. He did not live in Slough but elsewhere, and did not use the hall. This was not the way to advertise for such a position.

I did not stand for election in 2015, following a decision of full council made in April 2014 to seek a loan from the Public Works Lending Board (approved by Berkshire Association of Local Councils who act for the PWLB) being "deferred" due to the upcoming election, so as not to lose votes. The loan was never sought and the ancient heating system which was beyond economic repair

## COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

has been bodged and continues in use. Documents detailing this were confirmed to be on file still by the former Monitoring Officer Linda Walker.

Having been approached to stand for election I naively thought that I would be a member of a group working to improve and maintain facilities for the local community. What I found was extremely disappointing. The idea of Parish Councils, whilst appealing to me as a means of localisation, in practice did not exist at Wexham Court. If it is to continue, the Unitary Authority needs to ensure that things are run properly with some form of supervision and support being available. I found that there was little support available when it was needed.

Ref 8.

**Which of the following electoral areas does your submission relate to?:** Wexham Court

Good Evening, I think that we should have a vote of no confidence in the current chair and clerk. We cannot carry on like this

Good evening.

I would like to add a few things to the review. Perhaps making the area of the parish smaller, therefore reducing the number of councillors. May make it more efficient and effective. The three councillors, chair, vice chair and chair of finance use it as a secret club. They decide with the clerk and do not include others. When questioned about something, Sarfraz Khan just says, oh you were not here at that meeting. They have done absolutely nothing in the last three years. Despite enough money there do improve things. The current chairs are bullies. The AGM and two subsequent meetings have had councillors walking out ,after rows and arguments. Shaida and Sarfraz have not allowed me to be on any committees. The clerk arranges meetings with outside bodies without councillors being told. He decides what he wants. We have no idea what the caretaker does. He puts in for overtime , but does not want to open and close after the hirers. So much is kept hidden. The clerk gets a couple of men from the Temple to come in and do odd jobs. Change light bulbs and toilet rolls.

These should be duties of the caretaker. We have a nice hall. Big space. Money to do stuff. The precept payers are entitled to more.

Ref 9.

**SBC COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW – PHASE 1 – COLNBROOK WITH POYLE PC**

Dear Sirs,

I respond to this consultation as a former Parish Councillor and resident of Colnbrook for some 16+ years. I am the Secretary of the Colnbrook Community Association (CCA) although this submission is made in a personal capacity. I volunteer to run the CCA web site, Facebook page and Twitter account. I also run / assist in running other media sites for local interest groups. I consider that I am very much in touch with the views of many residents due to my involvement in these media sites.

**OVERVIEW**

The Parish Council (PC) should be a valuable asset to the community that it serves. Unfortunately, Colnbrook with Poyle PC (CwPPC) has of late become politicised, firstly with Slough Labour introducing candidates from outside the area with little or no connection to our communities; then more recently Slough Conservatives joined in, but at least with resident candidates. We are now left with the vast majority of councillors having a political affiliation and as a result the truly independent local people are outnumbered by the Party appointees who at anytime could be called upon to propose and support matters along party lines.

This is unacceptable in an age where professionalisation of national and local governance is increasingly taking power away from independent apolitical residents with life experiences who care about their communities, into the hands of an unelected autocracy; the party administrations.

**COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC MATTERS**

**1. COMMUNICATIONS**

The PC has an extremely poor record when it comes to communicating with residents.

At the last review the then Chair was explicitly instructed by SBC to improve communications with residents. That bought about a half yearly, very expensive, full colour A4 glossy brochure promoting the achievements of the PC and the other groups /

organisations with which the senior councillors were associated. Other groups (Schools, Scouts, CCA etc) were invited to contribute.

This was a lost opportunity to pose questions on individual projects and whether they were in line with residents wishes. Instead it became historical in the sense of 'We have done this; you will like it' rather than 'we would like your views on this'?

A website was established. If you wanted one that was so unfriendly to users you would need to go to an ancient '.Gov' site or the likes thereof. Between April and June 2018 there were no news updates! Posts to this site are not channelled to Facebook. The site I run for Colnbrook just ripples through to Facebook and Twitter; it's not rocket science.

The Facebook page operated for a while but is now dead. (Last post 16<sup>th</sup> March 2018) That could have been a revelation as it is with neighbouring PC's, but it was not to be. Why do the PC not engage with students to become involved and help with the administration of the site?. The PC Fb page has 219 'likes': in contrast the CCA associated pages have 4,011. I have traditionally shared all PC posts.

***Conclusion: The PC attitude to communicating with our residents is unacceptable in this day and age. There are options available, including using volunteers and other community groups to 'spread the word' to residents. The very expensive Newsletter should be replaced by a bi-monthly magazine supported by the PC, local volunteers and groups, businesses and part financed by advertising. This would be distributed electronically via media such as Facebook and a small print run available from local shops.***

## **2. AGENDAS AND MINUTES OF MEETINGS**

During my tenure as a councillor we collectively introduced the emailing of PC Agendas and Minutes to any resident that requested them in order to encourage community engagement. Although this was never widely communicated by the PC, it was appreciated by the active residents and generally I thought it was a step in the right direction. Since the appointment of a new Clerk this facility has been withdrawn and will only be sent under duress to the Chairs of local groups.

This is not acceptable; they must be available to all residents upon request.

The minutes produced in the past year or so are not fit for purpose as they do not impart any discussion points, and quite often do not reflect the proceedings at meetings.

***Conclusion; The PC must be encouraged to accept that Agendas and Minutes are an essential part of communicating with residents. The practice of circulating the at each occasion must be re established at the earliest opportunity. The minutes must be expanded to record discussion points under each agenda heading.***

### **3. GLORY PROJECTS**

In the past the PC has engaged in 'Glory Project' designed to satisfy the egos of certain past councillors. This era appears to have passed although the matters of the 'Museum' and a third 'War Memorial' appear to linger on.

Monies have apparently been set aside for these projects between the PC and groups associated directly or indirectly, with former senior councillors. These monies must now be accounted for to the residents who contributed then via various events including the last Apple Fayre.

***Conclusion: The confusion between certain community groups and current / former councillors must be highlighted and all funds raised publicly accounted for.***

### **4. PCSO ENGAGEMENT**

The PC has never engaged two PCSO'S. For a short time 12 – 24 months is reimbursed TVP for the costs of one PCSO. A situation arose when there was an opportunity to renew that contract with TVP for one PCSO. This meeting was attended by two councillors, three CCA committee members and one other. It was made very clear that a written request would be required for the renewal and that it would not be a simple exercise of duplication the existing agreement. The then Chair of the PC did not attend this meeting but chose to go it alone and have his own meeting with TVP. We were all informed of this at our meeting. It would appear that this was never passed on to the full council.

***Conclusion: The CwPPC area has very serious policing issues. Much of this is not communicated to TVP due to the perceived threat of intimidation. The CCA channels complaints, reports, incidents etc anonymously to TVP on a regular basis and will continue to do so. The PC let residents down very badly by nor requesting a renewal of the old contract;***



***that action led to the serious ASB issues we have had over the past few years, but thankfully the new Sargent at Langley is very proactive and producing results.***

## **5. MEETINGS**

Meetings of the PC are poorly promoted, and there is confusion as to which are public meetings. Even some councillors think that the 'main' meeting on the first Tuesday monthly is the only one open to the public, whereas ALL PC meetings are public. The situation was confused by the format; the 'main' meeting was held in the main hall at CVH, whilst the Committee meetings were held in an anti-room with hardly space for all councillors let alone residents.

This situation has been further confused by a recent decision to only allow 6 councillors on each of the committees. Other Councillors will be allowed to attend but not vote; highly undemocratic as previously all councillors were on all committees and could represent resident's views as appropriate.

The 'open doors' meeting on the last Saturday of each month is beyond it's sale by date. It is never promoted, and 'A' boards put up 15 minutes before the start are pointless. That is not engagement! For the cost of a quality gazebo and a few chairs and tables, the PC (two or three councillors each time), could hold regular meetings in local neighbourhoods, going to the people rather than ignoring them.

***Conclusion: Clarity around meetings is essential, and the PC should be more adventurous in exploring the way in which the successful local Parishes away from Slough deal with resident engagement.***

## **6. PC REPRESENTATION ON 'OUTSIDE' BODIES**

The PC has a number of outside bodies to which it is entitled to send representation; either by a serving councillor or an agreeable third-party resident with knowledge of the outside bodies purpose. I note that in some cases the representatives are former councillors who do not appear to report back to the PC; and who do not support the PC's position on the subject matter.

These representations should be reviewed as a matter of urgency in order that the representative is obliged to produce a written report to the PC following each bodies meeting. The current unmonitored situation allows for the possibility of vested interests to be seen to represent our communities' interests, whereas in fact they could simply be serving their own interests.

***Conclusion: Representation on 'outside bodies' has long been looked upon as a chore to be suffered. Some of these bodies are very important to the future of our communities and a greater amount of importance should be given to the appointees to ensure they are sufficiently aware of the PC's position and the subject matter.***

## **7. HEATHROW EXPANSION**

This is the single biggest issue to potentially affect the CwPPC communities since the Grondon Incinerator and the Jayflex quarry on Horton Road, Colnbrook. The PC's official position has, to my knowledge, always been to oppose the expansion. In view of the support of SBC for the project, our PC should be supporting the opposition led locally by the CCA and Slough and District Against Runway Expansion. This is a very serious omission and possibly sums up the current PC's lack of commitment to supporting the views and opinions of residents. SBC does not inform its residents of the current state of play, but then it is paid vast sums by Heathrow not to make waves.

***Conclusion: Heathrow's proposed expansion is very unlikely to pass judgement through the courts and, according to recent reports could be tied up in legal actions and political inaction for 15 years or more'. The PC should be supporting the local groups who inform residents of current research and the myths spread by the Heathrow owned fake group "Back Heathrow".***

## **8. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The PC generally responds to major developments, but smaller domestic issues are generally marked 'down to residents' which is actually no response at all. The filling in of driveways and gardens are creating an increased chance of flooding, and also increases the incidence of 'multiple occupancy' homes thereby depriving the younger generation of residents from owning their own homes.

***Conclusion: I do appreciate that the PC has an advisory roll on planning matters, but they should be firmer in their objections to all planning applications that have a potential to affect the flood planes and the incidence of HMO'S.***

## CONSULTATIONS

The Parish Council has the right to be consulted on many local and national government issues and provides a local perspective in responses to consultation requests. Unfortunately, it has been very lacking on any published responses for some years.

***Conclusion: The PC has a 'right' to be consulted, but on the major issue affecting Colnbrook residents in recent years they appear to have failed; Heathrow Expansion is a case in point. In this context I do not refer to the box ticking exercises from Heathrow and the DfT. I can find no responses to other matters such as the Western Rail Link to Heathrow, the Windsor link, the now started Smart Motorway scheme for the M4, or any other major development affecting the parish, including those emanating from South Bucks DC. These matters have been left to individuals and the CCA.***

## 9. PARISH NOTICE BOARDS

We are in a new world; these notice boards must either be kept up to date or the PC must admit it cannot keep them up to date on a weekly basis and remove them.

***Conclusion: The Notice Boards are poorly maintained in terms of content such as PC Agenda's, Meetings etc. Not fit for purpose!***

## REVIEW

As part of this exercise I have rated each of the above headers on a score out of ten. The result was a dismal 24 out of a possible 100.

The logical question at this point becomes “Does the Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council have a future?”

I support the concept of Parish Councils as a political construct, but my recent experience of reviewing a number of PC's is that they are generally very inefficient; the access door to councillors closes upon election; secrecy prevails; senior councillors become aloof; spending money becomes a priority even on unwanted projects; 'gangs' arise due to political infighting; self interest takes over from representation; and after a while residents lose interest and become apathetic for quite understandable reasons.

## COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

A recent report contrasted the rolls of PC's against resident led community groups and found that PC's were inefficient and discouraged resident participation whereas the community groups were very cost effective with high levels of community engagement. I suspect the reason for this is that PC's are perceived to be 'owned' by the councillors; whereas the community groups are 'owned' by the residents themselves.

### **CONCLUSION**

Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council should have a future however the present councillors must have dedicated training on their roles and the rules and obligations of being a councillor, and they must reinstate / develop user friendly communication channels as a matter of great urgency.

We have been here before so any recommendations resulting from this consultation should come with a final 'do it or lose it' warning! I will not be holding my breath.

Ref 10.

Governance Review:- Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council – 2018.

**1.0. General appraisal:**

1.1 The Parish Council is important to the residents of the parish, it is the first tier of local government, and a facility that is much more approachable for the residents, as most of the Councillors live within the parish and are known to residents.

1.2 The parish council, as a body, operates reasonably well but like any statutory body will only be as good as the sum of the members. Conflicts have recently been observed due to the changes that occurred during the May 2015 Election, when Slough Labour put up candidates to stand against resident candidates. Parish councillors had traditionally stood as either independent or with no classification.

1.3 The Parish Council has now reached the position where the majority of Councillors declare along party political lines, with five, from the 12, declaring either independent or a non-status. The political dynamics of the councillors, I believe, has caused a certain friction within the council, and a certain mistrust of the democratic process with those outside of the “council circle”, namely those whom the councillors are purporting to represent.

1.4 This situation demands a strong leadership to guide and harmonise the “team” into a fluent group of “team players” working for the community and not personal “point scoring” which occasionally comes to the fore. I believe that the current Chair and Vice Chair do have the experience and qualities to achieve this unenviable task.

1.5 I would also advocate the need for Councillor Training in order to reaffirm Code of Conduct and recognition and interpretation of Standing Orders. It is unfortunate that the many by-elections that have occurred since the May 2015 Parish Elections, has seen the decrease in councillors with long-term parish knowledge and experience to just one.

**2.0 The Parish Council.**

2.1 The Parish Council was formed back in 1995 and it evolved out of the Colnbrook Residents Association which was constituted back in 1947. The Colnbrook Residents Association was not disbanded at this juncture, but rather “receded into the background”

## COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

for reason of most of the committee had now become Parish Councillors. The work of the Parish Council is important to the residents as it is the driving force to effect change and improvements. The Parish Council is supportive of local groups and remains a key player in many of the groups with members of the council representing the council on the respective committees or boards of such groups.

2.2 The Parish Council, made a major contribution to the Neighbourhood Policing Team in as much as sponsoring a dedicated PCSO for Colnbrook, which continued for a period of years. Thames Valley Police, facing serious funding cut-backs, had taken the decision to “cluster” Colnbrook with Poyle along with Foxborough. Both the Parish Council and our very active Neighbourhood Action Group (NAG) had many discussions with the then Inspector (Sarah Cook), over the falling levels of TVP engagement contrary to the original Agreement and a Memorandum of Understanding of 2011. Inspector Cook could not fully commit to the Service Level Agreement with the staffing level that she was provisioned with. Sadly Colnbrook and Poyle suffered with greater levels of “low level” crime especially ASB increasing. It is my understanding that the Parish Council are committed to continue with this funding agreement when our local Neighbourhood Police Team can bring numbers of PCSOs to a level that will allow for a dedicated member for Colnbrook & Poyle.

2.3 The Parish Council are pro-active on issues that directly affect the residents’ daily life raising problems with the respective departments of SBC and Thames Valley Police as appropriate. Issues around fly-tipping, fly-parking, antisocial behaviour and the ever increasing freight traffic that impinges upon our local roads are all subjects that are high on residents concerns.

2.4 The Parish Council are wholly engaged with activities and groups which engender community cohesion, both from initiatives which they instigate, whilst working with existing groups on their own initiatives providing sponsorship and hands-on assistance to produce events throughout the year.

2.5 As stated in 2.4 above, Colnbrook has many active groups, all engaged with the community and all working in their own ways to bring benefit to our community. These groups bring an addition to the work of the Parish Council – some provide a strong critique of the Parish Council – which is not to be considered a negative aspect, but is sometimes a necessity in order to gain important feedback. My perception of these other groups, and I cannot speak for all, but I believe that none would wish to see the loss of the Parish Council. The Parish Council is, primarily the only Statutory Local Government body closest to the community it represents.

2.6 It can be argued that those wards of Slough that are located at the extreme edge of the Borough have specific problems that central areas do not experience. Colnbrook on both its northern and southern boundary can be classed as a typical rural/urban fringe. Colnbrook and Poyle being located totally within the Colne Valley Regional Park and until Heathrow expansion came onto the scene, Colnbrook provided the Strategic Gap between Greater London and Berkshire. The Parish Council is vital in reflecting

the views of the community that live within this rural/urban fringe environment which are not high priorities for the central wards of the Borough.

### **3.0 How could our Parish Council be improved?**

3.1 At no point in time can any organisation claim to be at the “top of its game” with no improvements or changes require. I would listt following considerations, not in any implied order of importance.

#### **Communications.**

There is already a website, which is currently evolving and upgrading. Dedicated pages are being added for the various community groups to have a page for information about their own work to be published.

There was a social media site (Fb) which has suffered a problem. It is important that Social media is fully upgraded in order to keep the youth of Colnbrook and Poyle both engaged and participating in community life.

Many of the “senior” populace may not be part of the computer connected community, therefore quarterly newsletters are a means of engaging, albeit a costly method, but something that was well received in the past.

Better use of the many noticeboards.

Finally leafleting for updates on important issues that will affect our community; e.g. NSIPs that directly affect, our roads, air quality or public meetings called by the other groups.

#### **The Councillors**

There is a strong display of the need for councillor training. As a member of the public who often attended council meetings, I am very aware of a state of conflict between certain councillors and the need to reinforce that a councillor is there to represent his or her community, and not for their own gratification or as a means to enhance their CV.

Some of the councillors do not live within the parish and that is not conducive to the understanding of the area. Their point of reference can only be based upon the area that they live within, a more central urban area and not this urban/rural fringe.

I would hope that looking to the future we should look to councillors standing for election irrespective of their political membership, and not to stand with their political label. At Parish level there is no room for party politics, it only creates a corrosive environment the electorate disengage with the process. The recent elections have seen turnout percentage for parish elections plummet, accepted that there have been several by-elections.

**Conclusion**

It is important that we continue with our Parish Council and that improved engagement with the electorate is achieved, and this has to be two way engagement process between the council and the electorate. It is easy for some within the community to state that there is no engagement with the electorate, but there are monthly surgeries in the village hall on the last Saturday of each month, there is a public session at the beginning of each council meeting on the first Tuesday of each month. The Parish Council is directly engaged with the Colnbrook Community Partnership, the Colnbrook Residents Association, Colnbrook NAG, Colnbrook FAG. If it were to be disbanded, a great deal of local hardship would ensue.



Ref 11.

## **COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018**

### **NOTE OF COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW WORKING GROUP AND REPRESENTATIVES OF BRITWELL PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY 25 JULY 2018**

Present: Councillors Hussain (Chair), Strutton, Wright, Swindlehurst and Cheema  
Catherine Meek (Head of Democratic Services)  
Fiona Ahern (Community Governance Review Project Officer)  
Britwell Parish Council: Councillors Isernia (Chair) and Sean Wright  
Jonathan Holder : Clerk Britwell Parish Council  
Apologies: Councillor Mann

- 1 Councillor Hussain introduced those present and invited Councillor Isernia to make a brief presentation. The Parish had provided the Working Group with information and a profile of the Parish as requested and this information had been circulated in advance of the Meeting.
- 2 Following the Community Governance Review in 2013 the Council had been reduced in size both geographically and in the consequent reduction in number of Councillors. During the first year of the new Parish Council being elected it had been the victim of a serious fraud which consumed much of its attention. The Council was now able to focus on areas it would have wished to have done earlier had it not been distracted by the crime. Councillor Isernia advised that that the Parish Council had had a difficult period but was now focussed on delivering value for money to those within the parish council area.
- 3 The Parish Council had set up a Strategy Working Party and following consultation with Slough Borough Council had made its facilities available to fit into an activity programme for Britwell and Slough residents and had worked with the local NAG to organise a Fun Weekend for residents in June which was well received.

## COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

- 4 Councillor Wright explained that following the fraud the Council had decided that it would not operate the bar itself in future and arranged for it to be run by a licensee. Details of the lease were provided along with profit information. The Council had also strengthened its auditing processes since that time to incorporate best practice.
- 5 Councillor Wright advised of the Parish's future plans which focused on the ways to increase useage of the Community Centre and grounds to benefit local people. Residents of the Parish could hire of the hall at a reduced rate. The Parish had plans to refurbish the toilets and changing rooms. The PC was working closely with the Police to reduce crime in the area. The Parish Council was encouraging use of the Centre by a job club, adult education programmes etc.
- 6 Involvement in delivering the Britwell Carnival was seen as a priority along with an emphasis on provision and participation in sports.
- 7 In terms of communications with residents the Parish Council had made use of information fliers in the past but mainly relied on word of mouth, question time at Council meetings and the website which would be updated in the next six/twelve months.
- 8 Councillor Swindlehurst advised that Tan Dhesi MP had raised an issue which had been brought to his attention over the conduct of the Chair of the PC in connection with an incident at the Chicken ranch. Councillor Isernia advised that the Parish Council had considered it a serious allegation and had investigated the matter by way of an investigating committee comprising the whole Council convened by the Clerk. On reviewing the evidence it had been agreed that no further action be taken.
- 9 Members of the Working Group asked for additional information on:
  - The number of hires for the previous twelve months
  - what training had been completed by Parish Councillors and what the requirements were for future training
  - evidence/information of any drop in sessions for residents in the area that the Parish Council/Councillors had held.

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

10 Councillor Hussain thanked Councillor Isernia and his colleagues for attending the meeting.

Ref 12.

**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018**

**NOTE OF COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW WORKING GROUP AND REPRESENTATIVES OF COLNBROOK WITH POYLE PARISH COUNCIL HELD AT SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL, ST MARTINS PLACE ON 23 JULY 2018 AT 5PM**

Present: Councillors Hussain (Chair), Strutton, Wright, Swindlehurst and Cheema  
Catherine Meek (Head of Democratic Services)  
Fiona Ahern (Community Governance Review Project Officer)  
Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council: Councillor Puja Bedi (Chair)  
Dexter Smith (Chair - Policy & Finance Committee)  
Apologies: Councillor Mann

- 11 Councillor Hussain introduced those present and invited Councillor Bedi to make a brief presentation. The Parish had provided the Working Group with information and a profile of the Parish as requested and this information had been circulated in advance of the Meeting.
- 2 Councillor Smith and Bedi outlined the history of the Parish which was coterminous with the Colnbrook with Poyle borough ward. The PC comprised twelve democratically elected councillors and elections to the Parish were always contested indicating strong local support for the Parish. The Council employs a part time clerk and RFO, a finance assistant and an IT administrator.
- 3 Communication with the local community is via a dedicated parish council website, notice boards, bulletins, newsletters, facebook and Parish Forums plus attendance at consultation meetings. There has been an issue with the facebook page which is currently being resolved. Information cards were also currently being updated with Councillor contact details and a calendar for 2019 on the reverse to be delivered to every household in the Parish. Parish drop in sessions are held and hosted by the Parish Council on the last Saturday of each month and at the beginning of each full council meeting the Chairman invites questions from members of the community – the public session.

## COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

- 4 The Parish Aim is to represent and serve the local community and deal with local rather than wider or political issues. The Parish looks to supplement the service provided by the Borough Council and make Colnbrook with Poyle a better place to live.
- 5 The PC is supporting our Local Identity and History and also supports local businesses and voluntary groups. In 2011 The Parish Council joined the Love Where You Live campaign established by Keep Britain Tidy.
- 6 Parish councillors attend appropriate training sessions provided by Slough Borough Council or BALC. Training already attended – Code of Conduct (Slough MO), Being a good councillor, standing orders, the constitution – joint with Datchet Parish council.
- 7 The PC liaised with Borough councillors and officers on matters where it considered that they could be helpful or that discussions and working together would be beneficial for the local community. Parish councillors attended Parish forums arranged by SBC, commented on planning applications, and made representations on behalf of the local community.
- 8 Councillor Bedi and Smith outlined the local threats and concerns the Parish had. It was concerned with the development of the new runway at Heathrow and how that will affect residents. Whilst Heathrow and its associated businesses provide employment opportunities for Colnbrook, Slough and the UK, the Parish suffers the negative consequences more than any other part of Slough. Western Rail Link to Heathrow was also a concern to residents and the PC was doing all it could to resolve those concerns.
- 9 The Parish had a Parish Plan and the WG was advised of the projects that had been identified and pursued in the past two years. The PC had in the past provided funding that was matched by Thames Valley Police for the provision of extra PCSOs in the parish. It was hoped that the Police would provide the matched funding that would enable this to continue.
- 10 Councillor Smith outlined the amount of monies collected through the precept and drew attention to the fact that the PC delivers considerable additional value in the form of unpaid work by councillors.
- 11 The PC looked forward to continuing to work in partnership with SBC.

## COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

- 12 Members of the Working Group asked for additional information on the attendance figures for the Parish Council drop ins and the issues raised.
  
- 13 In answer to questions the PC advised that an IT consultant had been appointed to address issues with the PC website. With regard to PC reserves which were healthy (£30k) the PC had plans to facilitate the return of a GP surgery and a dedicated bus service to and from Langley Health Centre.
  
- 14 Councillor Hussain thanked Councillor Bedi and Smith for attending the meeting.

Ref 13.

## **COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018**

### **NOTE OF COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW WORKING GROUP AND REPRESENTATIVES OF WEXHAM COURT PARISH COUNCIL HELD AT SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL, ST MARTINS PLACE ON 25 JULY 2018**

Present: Councillors Hussain (Chair), Strutton, Wright, Swindlehurst and Cheema

Catherine Meek (Head of Democratic Services)

Fiona Ahern (Community Governance Review Project Officer)

Wexham Court Parish Council:

Councillor Raja Muhammad Fayyaz (Chair)

Councillor Shaida Akbar (Vice Chair)

Councillor Sarfraz Khan (Head of Finance)

Councillor Paul Sohal

—  
Apologies: Councillor Mann

1. Councillor Hussain introduced those present and outlined the background to the review, and explained that the review group had invited the parish council to meet them during the opening phase of the review. She stressed that the Council were gathering evidence at this early stage. Members had reached no conclusions but would formulate draft recommendations after the completion of the current public consultation. The scope of the recommendations of a community governance review could include creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes, altering their electoral arrangements, council size and boundaries etc.
2. The purpose of the meeting was to gain a greater understanding of the issues and to give the Chair of the Parish Council (PC) an opportunity to present his thoughts on any of the issues falling within the terms of reference of the review such as the parish boundaries, the services that the PC provides to local residents, issues related to value for money and governance etc.

## COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

3. Councillor Sohal referred to the background information and presentation which had been circulated in advance of the meeting. He outlined the wide range of activities that took place in the two Halls and Board Room which the Parish Council rented out. Councillor Sohal confirmed that the hall was let to parish residents at preferential rates. He drew attention to the Parish Poll that had been held as part of the 2013 review which had found in favour of retention of the Parish Council.
4. Councillor Sohal outlined the main methods of communication the Parish used to reach its residents which included Councillor walkabouts, newsletter and website, annual newsletter, public question time at meetings and open days. Representatives of the Parish Council also attended the local Police Forum.
5. In answer to questions Councillor Sohal, on behalf of the Parish Council, advised that the Parish Council was aware that attendance by some members was poor and that it was doing what it could to address, the grounds maintenance contract had been tendered, the Parish Council obtained professional HR advice on staffing matters and the Borough Council's Monitoring Officer was involved if there were complaints about Councillors. The Parish Council was looking to devise its own complaints procedures to ensure fairness and transparency.
6. Councillor Sohal outlined future Parish Council projects included:
  - Improving the facilities at the Norway Drive site and at The Cherries
  - Consider Indoor Gym
  - Consider A Childrens Nursery
  - Consider a Health Center
  - Consider a Cricket Practice Pitch
7. Members of the Working Group asked for additional information on:
  - the frequency of the drop in sessions/walkabout visits and how many people attended
  - financial records for the previous twelve months



## COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

- Update Newsletters with more information and on a more regular basis.
  - what training had been completed by Parish Councillors and what the requirements were for future training
  - the membership arrangements of the Bowls club attached to the Parish Council Hall and how the Council and Bowls club work together.
8. Cllr Hussain thanked Councillor Fayyaz and his colleagues for attending the meeting.

Ref 14.

**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018**

**NOTE OF DROP-IN SESSION HELD AT BRITWELL CENTRE, WENTWORTH AVENUE, SL2 2DS ON 10 APRIL 2013 AT 4.00 PM**

Present: Councillors Hussain (Chair) (Part), Swindlehurst (Part), Strutton, Wright (Part)

Apologies: Councillor Mann, Councillor Cheema

Local Resident

The review group were seeking the views of local people on the Parish Council and the services it provides.

Views were expressed on a number of matters to do with the Parish including:

- The Parish Council should be more transparent/accountable particularly in connection with managing resources. Reference was made to the lack of an annual financial report despite it being requested. There was a view that meetings were not productive and they were not transparent as it should be;
- There was a clear understanding of how the chicken Ranch was ran and never able to provide receipts of business.
- The Parish explain that they have no powers with regards to local issues, what powers do the parish have and can they deal with local issues.
- There is not enough support and engagement with residents. How are the parish advertising events/meetings about issues to residents.

Ref 15.

**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018**

**NOTE OF DROP-IN SESSION HELD AT WEXHAM COURT PARISH HALL. NORWAY DRIVE, WEXHAM ON 17 JULY 2018 AT 4.00 PM**

Present: Councillors Hussain (Chair), Swindlehurst (Part), Strutton (Part) Wright (Part) and Cheema – Slough Borough Council

Apologies: Councillor Mann

Also attending (part): Councillor Sabah, Nazir and Dar.

Local Residents (5)

The review group were seeking the views of local people on the Parish Council and the services it provides.

Views were expressed on a number of matters to do with the Parish including:

- the Parish Council could do more to support residents in relation to the poor bus service for the area and the difficulties it created for local people;
- Parish Councillors needed to be more visible and engaged in the local community. Reference was made to the walkabouts that used to be under taken by parish councillors;
- Parish Councillors should be from, and living within, the area of the Parish;
- The Parish Council should communicate more with the residents of the Parish – regular newsletters were mentioned and that there shouldn't be reliance on electronic communications as not all residents had the internet and e mail. The Council's website was also felt to be difficult to use and contained anomalies;

## COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

- The Parish Council should be more transparent/accountable particularly in connection with managing resources. Reference was made to the lack of an annual financial report despite it being requested. There was a view that meetings were secretive and business not conducted as transparently as it should be;
- SD felt that there was no longer pride in the estate and that people in the area were generally unhappy. SD felt that the Parish Council should be abolished;
- Facilities management generally was not prioritized by the Parish council – reference was made to the poor state of play areas and the Hall;
- Complaints that had been submitted to the Slough Borough Council Monitoring Officer had not been investigated appropriately;
- Ongoing concerns over governance arrangements and the extent of delegations to officers.

### Local Resident (1)

Involved in hiring the Parish Hall for tuition sessions. Advised that Hall and booking system was well managed. The hall itself was convenient and excellent value for money. Resident believed that the Parish Council did deliver a leaflet to households every quarter? Setting out what the Parish Council was doing.

Ref 16.

### **COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018**

#### **NOTE OF DROP-IN SESSION HELD AT COLNBROOK WITH POYLE, ST THOMAS CHURCH, VICVARAGE WAY, SL3 0JY ON 19 JULY 2018 AT 6.30 PM**

Present: Councillors Strutton, Wright, Swindlehurst (Part), Cheema (Part)

Apologies: Councillor Mann, Hussain

The review group were seeking the views of local people on the Parish Council and the services it provides.

Views were expressed on a number of matters to do with the Parish & local issues:

Local Residents : (6)

- The Parish Council should communicate more with the residents of the Parish – whether this is through social media or newsletters/notice boards. Resident's mentioned that noticeboards weren't updated and social media was not updated. It was confirmed that the parish website was updated regularly but again not all residents have the internet.
- The Parish Council meetings were more of a political battle between parties rather than discussing important matters and getting them resolved. Minutes of the meeting were not informative and not complete. There was no continuity and staff changed regularly within the parish council.
- Parish councillors should be provided with better training. Need to ensure that parish councillors understand their role in the parish and what their duties are.
- PCSO funding was provided through the parish council, however there has not been enough communication through the Police on what is currently being provided for the parish.
- What are the duties of the parish council.

## COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

Other issues which were raised with the working group:

- Fly tipping on the estate.
- Car parking on pavements (verges on corner of street)
- HGV vehicles coming through Colnbrook High Street which isn't allowed due to the restrictions in that area (trying to access the Poyle Trading Estate)
- Pavements uneven/need fixing
- Grass growing out of drains – causing overflow at certain times of the year
- Littering on streets
- L&Q Housing Association – not dealing with issues raised by residents concerned with particular issues in that area
- GP surgery – will there be one in this area

Ref 17.

**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018**

**NOTE OF MEETING HELD WITH THAMES VALLEY POLICE WITH COMMUNITY REVIEW WORKING GROUP AT SLOUGH  
BOROUGH COUNCIL, ST MARTINS PLACE ON 23 JULY 2018 AT 3PM**

Present: Councillors Hussain (Chair) , Strutton (Part), Wright, Swindlehurst , Cheema

Catherine Meek (Head of Democratic Services)  
Fiona Ahern (Community Governance Review Project Officer)  
Inspector Neil Misselbrook

Apologies: Councillor Mann

- 1 Councillor Hussain introduced those present and explained the background to the Community Governance Review. The Review Group had asked for a representative of Thames Valley police to meet with them to outline their experience of working with the Parishes and any input to the Review from the Police relevant to policing in the area.
- 2 Inspector Misselbrook advised that he was the inspector for the South East Area of Slough and had sought input from the Inspector that covered the North Area which included Britwell.
- 3 Inspector Misselbrook advised:
  - That the Police usually sent representative to meetings for each of the three parishes. This would be a sergeant or a neighbourhood PC/PCSO.
  - There was some confusion amongst police officers on what the parishes actually did and were responsible for.
  - Colnbrook was a very active parish council. Wexham Court /Britwell less so. There were many issues raised in the Colnbrook Parish Council which were not police matters low level issues and needed to be signposted to the right

## COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

people/agency to deal with. Colnbrook Parish meetings were well structured with an opportunity for the police representative to outline crime statistics, trends and prevention measures.

- The meetings of Wexham Court and Britwell Parishes lacked structure and were not so effective. It was unclear what value was added by the attendance of a representative from the Police at these meetings
- Police had a good working relationship with the Neighbourhood Action group (NAG). It was often more productive to deal with the NAG which had a clear purpose and often a crossover of some members as the Parish Council..
- Colnbrook with Poyle used to part fund a PCSO – Inspector Missselbrook advised that there was insufficient funding available to match fund the post and the police could not justify the financing of the post at the present time although the Police were looking to recruit to the vacant PCSO posts in the Borough..
- The Britwell youth club/boys club was a great benefit to the community and was a very positive and productive for children in the area. It was noted that Britwell also recently held fair which was run well. There was a police presence in the Community Hub building.
- The Police had been advised of the issues which have been raised in the Colnbrook parish with regard to anti-social behavior and were being dealt with.

4 Councillor Hussain thanked Inspector Misselbrook for attending.



COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

Ref 18.

**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW**

**QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY CARRIED OUT BY SLOUGH LABOUR PARTY**

	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>1</b>	As a Parish resident area do you use the building/services provided by the Parish council  If you answered YES to the above what Parish services do you use/value most	<b>YES 16</b> <b>NO 55</b>  Hall tuition Club Weddings Sports Tennis courts
<b>2</b>	Is there a Parish service/are there parish services that you do not value/support? If so please give details	-
<b>3</b>	Do you attend parish council meetings	<b>YES 7</b> <b>NO 64</b>
<b>4</b>	Do you vote in Parish Council elections	<b>YES 29</b> <b>NO 44</b>
<b>5</b>	Does the Parish council consult with local residents on its activities. Plans and its management of local assets and buildings	<b>YES 2</b> <b>NO 70</b>
<b>6</b>	Do you think the parish council provides local residents value for money for the services that it provides	<b>YES 2</b> <b>NO 66</b>
<b>7</b>	Do you think the Parish Council meets the needs of local residents in the parish area	<b>YES 4</b> <b>NO 66</b>
<b>8</b>	Does the parish council effectively represent local residents' views and concerns	<b>YES 1</b> <b>NO 64</b>
	The Borough council reviewed the Parish Councils in Slough in	

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018 – Schedule of Evidence received – Stage 1 of the Review

	2012/13 and made several recommendations about the parish council's performance .	
9	Did the PC share information with you after that review, and/or consult you about any subsequent plans	<b>YES 0 NO 67</b>
10	Since that review, do you think the arrangements and plans of the PC have	<b>Improved 3 Stayed same 9 Declined 16</b>
	<b>Further comments made:</b>	
1	Why is a parish needed (2)	
2	Parish Councillors should be from Wexham (2)	
3	We have got two benches in the Childrens play area on cherries park, there's no other benches outside the play area (2)	
4	There was a bin for dog poo on the west end of wexham allotment that has been taken down and it is needed. I think there should be another dog poo bin by Khalsa School and football club	
5	It's a waste of time and money	
6	I have never heard about Parish council in my area (3)	
7	The Parish council should be demolished (2)	
8	Why do we have Councillors from outside the Parish (3)	
9	Too many councillors do not live in the Parish but they rule the Parish	
10	Parish Council is not needed. Their funds should be used for improving safety of wexham estate	
11	Only Parish members should be councillors	
12	Never told of a review	
13	Used to attend meeting	