

## **Corporate Improvement Scrutiny Committee – Meeting held on Tuesday, 04 March, 2025.**

**Present:** Councillors Stedmond (Chair), Hulme (Vice-Chair), Ajaib, Matloob, Rana, W. Sabah and Tomar.

**Also present under Rule 30: Councillor Shah**

### **Apologies For Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Dauti and Satti. Apologies were also received from Helen Kenny, Thames Valley Police.

### **1. Declarations of Interest**

The were declarations of Interest received

### **2. Minutes of previous meetings**

The Committee were informed that the minutes of the meetings on 6 February and 19 February would be brought to the next meeting.

### **3. Attendance Report**

**Resolved: that the Committee noted the attendance record for 2024/25.**

### **4. Strategies and Partnership Plans for Creating Healthier Communities in Slough**

The Director of Communities and Partnerships, ICB NHS Frimley, presented the report to the Committee. The report provided an update on key strategies and plans relating to the health and wellbeing of the local population in Slough. It focussed on Frimley's Integrated Care Partnership overarching Creating Healthier Communities Strategy 2023-25 and the forward plan and intention to update Slough's Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy and Slough's Health and Care Plan during 2025.

The ambition of the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Health and Care Partnership was to develop a new joint 10-year Health and Wellbeing Strategy and Local Place Delivery Plan during 2025-26. Committee Members and Members of the public were encouraged to take part in the consultation that was currently active.

Members raised the following questions that were responded to by Officers:

- The were a few stakeholders mentioned in the report, were these all of them or were there others? It was confirmed that there were many stakeholders, the ones in the report were just a sample.

- What is being done about Slough's lower healthy life expectancy, which was lower than other boroughs? This had increased nationally but there were two factors of life expectancy that were being looked at, how long someone lives and how the quality is of that time. The factors that were robbing of the quality years. The quality was being affected by pain, mental health, anxiety and depression and high levels of heart disease, cancer, respiratory diseases and high levels of deprivation areas. Work was being done together as a system to tackle these areas.
- Had it been taken into consideration that Slough had a younger population compared to the neighbouring boroughs? The Strategic Ambitions started with Starting Well and addressing health inequalities through a focussed approach to meeting the needs of vulnerable children who experienced deprivation and poverty, initiatives to improve the lives of babies and Children in the first 1001 days through to primary school and supporting and strengthening partnerships around health visiting and school nursing, working in partnership between the NHS, Local Authorities and Public Health to make improvements in these vital roles. It was suggested that Places of Worship were a good point to get messages across to full communities.
- What was being done for hard-to-reach populations? Frimley was ahead of others in this area. Many different methods were being used to reach populations that were disengaged from support services.
- Were there populations that were not accessing some of the important areas? The belief was that prevention was very important. The uptakes were low for the screening programme for cancers and child immunisation. A lot of work was being done with NHS England to carry out targeted work and this had seen some improvements in some areas such as the uptake of MMR but much more work was required. Another trial was that one doctor visited a family and attended to all family members whilst there.
- Were all the methods that are being used working? There had been a very slight improvement. It was important to learn from other countries where you could get more healthier food and could move around easily to make a better healthier lifestyle. This was not the situation in this country.
- Was new legislation required to achieve the targets? There was a new food strategy under consideration at present. There was still a lot to be done nationally and locally.
- Were Slough receiving fair funding to carry out all the tasks? This was not an easy task to deliver as there was a huge funding deficit. There was a person that sat on the Board at Frimley providing information on funding. Slough did receive more than other parts of Berkshire of the public health grant and there had been a further uplift this year. It needed to be recognised that it took more effort and funding to address people with greater needs. Slough was part of the national picture, but government was pushing funding where it was needed more, nationally. Was the funding and its uses being scrutinised? This would be taken away to investigate and reported back to the Committee.

**ACTION**

- Was there any evidence that scrutiny could see of all this work being done? There was good evidence about GPs going into schools especially on the data of immunisations. This had been popular and had assisted improvement in school attendance and the uptake of immunisations. This could be shared with the Committee. [ACTION](#)
- One of the reasons that Slough was under interventions was SEND. Information was requested on what actions were being taken forward for improving SEND. This would be investigated, and the response shared with the Committee. [ACTION](#)
- Could any further study be done of why Slough had a lower life expectancy to neighbouring boroughs. Information could be collated from GPs. There was already national data and local information about Slough. Slough had a large south Indian community that had a higher risk for CVD, communities in deprived areas had higher rates of disease. Early diagnosis and treatment were very important.
- The walking to school initiative was good for the child, the family and the environment. The Park and Stride campaign were being discussed where parents could park a little further and walk a little more. Were there any links with Living Streets? There were good links with Living Streets. Could the Park and Stride be enforced? This would be investigated. [ACTION](#)
- It would be interesting to understand why the levels of breastfeeding were low in Slough but nationally were very good. Were their good connections with NCT? A lot was being done on breastfeeding as this was good for the child and mother. There was good engagement with voluntary sectors.
- Was any work being done about vaping? A survey was being carried out about vaping which was very prevalent in children. A service had been launched in November 2024 for young children to stop vaping. The new tobacco bill was also at the next stage. Legislation was required on the sales of vapes.
- Was there any information on access for children to dentists. This could be investigated and brought back to a future meeting. [ACTION](#)
- The Local Plan was discussed and whether there was anything that could stop the number of takeaways in a row on one road, for example on Farnham Road, there were at least 30 takeaways in the vicinity of 5 schools, so children would buy unhealthy food after school. Currently there was no legislation to stop this from happening, but the Local Plan would address this issue and tackle it going forwards. A lot of work was being done to inform the Local Plan and this would assist to limit takeaways next to each other. It was suggested that off licences also be included as they were selling fast food, alcohol and vapes. Members requested that the draft Local Plan be presented to the Scrutiny Committee to discuss. [ACTION](#)

**Resolved: that the Committee noted the Frimley ICBs Creating Healthier Communities Strategy 2023-25 and the plans to update the Slough Health and Wellbeing Strategy and Local Place Plan.**

**The Committee also raised a number of actions set out above.**

## 5. Relocation of Jubilee Ward, Upton Park Hospital

The Committee received an update on the current situation regarding the Jubilee Ward in Upton Hospital in Slough and the proposals to relocate to St Marks Hospital in Maidenhead, as it was no longer fit for purpose. The relocation would aim to provide a clinically safe and sustainable inpatient rehabilitation service for local residents. An independent options appraisal had been carried out and had found that this was the preferred solution. This would provide improved facilities, enhance patient experience and offer a modern clinical environment.

Many options had been considered and this move was best for Value for Money with the quickest timescales. There would be 21 beds, more side rooms with en-suites and several bays with more space. There would be a big gym space, dining area and garden space with improved staff facilities. It would take 18 months to create the new space.

The engagement process had included surveys, newsletters, social media use, Healthwatch and many more. All responses were now being analysed and the final report would go through the governance process. All organisations that took part were formally thanked. Feedback was also taken from staff.

Some of the feedback received included:

- It was important to have access to staff.
- Most patients and their carers are old.
- The patient transfer was a concern.
- The cost of parking was a concern but there was free parking available at St Marks.
- It was important to improve safety of patients.
- The travel implications were a concern.
- Generally, the feedback was in support.

The Committee were interested to see all the options considered and this would be shared by Officers. **ACTION**

Members asked the following questions:

- If the staff currently working at the ward were local staff, would the relocation create any redundancies? There had been transparency with staff. There would be a further consultation. There would be no redundancies, but redeployment would be offered.
- Had the transport options been considered, how easy and costly were these? These had been considered and would be shared with Members. **ACTION**  
Was there any funding available for transport? This was being looked into. There was no other option as the expenditure was significantly more.

**Resolved: that the Committee reviewed and noted the proposals and engagement that had taken place and made comments and suggestions to be considered to inform the plans for relocation of the Jubilee Ward.**

## 6. Report from the Safer Slough Partnership

The report presented provided an overview of the Safer Slough Partnerships work and achievements against the key priorities from April 2024 to December 2024. This was an update from last years report since this was now fully functional and way ahead of where things were last year.

Members made the following comments:

- It was interesting to see the KPI's, but more detail was required and a direction of travel. The KPI's were based on the priorities but were outcome focussed and further evidence and figures were required to see and understand the progress.
- Knife Crime was a major issue in Slough. Had there been any success in this area? A Serious Violence Board had been set up that met quarterly to oversee the progress of the action plan. Knife Crime and violence partnership briefings continued monthly, work with schools continued, the Hospital Navigator Scheme pilot continued, and many other projects were being undertaken.
- How many Street Guardians were there? Currently, there were two Street Guardians, and more were being recruited. The funding for the coordinator had been lost but funding for the role was being considered. Further information was requested about the Street Guardians, who employed them and what qualifications they had. This would be provided to the Committee.  
**ACTION**
- What progress had been made on the Safe Accommodation Strategy? This had been written and was awaiting implementation into housing. There was safe accommodation now that was fully grant funded. Further details were being looked at.
- Domestic Abuse was a major concern in Slough. What steps were being taken to reduce this? There were many communication campaigns taking place to raise awareness. This was being circulated to the Community Groups and would look into Faith Groups too. It was important to educate people. This would continue. It was important to note that different partnerships were talking to each other and all working together on the same issue at the same time. It was suggested that more male orientated areas such as football matches could be used.
- It was trying to look for new solutions to old problems. There was a constant search of new ways and new partners to get on board.
- Had the environmental issue of anti-social behaviour been considered, such as fly tipping, there were a few hotspots in Slough. Work was being carried out with colleagues and businesses. A grant of £120K had been secured to look further into anti-social behaviour, looking into known drug issues by working with Thames Valley Police. The Committee commented that some improvements had been seen.
- Members inquired how the public protection order was progressing and was informed very well, alcohol had been ceased and there were many ongoing

court cases. The Chair asked for evidence for the Committee to see how well it was going. This would be provided at a future meeting. **ACTION**

- The Committee was informed that there was one single problem-solving database now, that was working very well. The intel was now all in one place and this was encouraging robust partnership working.
- The Committee was informed that a grant of £60K from the Police and Crime Commissioner had been received, this would be reduced for next year. The proceeds of the crimes fund that Thames Valley Police received were reused by them. Members suggested asking PCC why Slough had the lowest funding with the highest crime levels and anti-social behaviour. **ACTION**

**Resolved: that the Committee noted the progress made by the Safer Slough Partnership in the past year but asked for more evidence related to outcomes measures.**

**The Committee raised question and comments on the progress made and made suggestions for the Partnership to take forward. The Committee noted the progress against KPIs but asked for evidence, more detail and the direction of travel**

## **7. Report of the Children's Services Engagement Task and Finish Group**

The Committee received an update on the Children's Services Engagement Task and Finish Group. The task and finish group considered the engagement of community, faith and voluntary groups, supporting children, young people and their families to inform the development of services by Slough Children First and Slough Borough Council Children's Services. It undertook the role of a catalyst to put in place the foundations for such work to begin. The Committee were informed that from the findings of the survey, the event 'Knowing me .....Knowing you' took place on 25 February 2025, which was a true success with 80 people participating.

The CEX Slough Children First and Executive Director for SBC Children's Services, commended the work as a vibrant piece of work taking a different approach. The day had been very successful, standing in great stead for networking amongst many faiths.

The Chair and Committee thanked Councillors Rana, Matloob and Mohindra and Officers for their commitment and support to the work of the task and finish group.

**Resolved: that the Committee endorsed the report and its recommendations in section 5 of Appendix A and approved the report and its three recommendations set out in the Executive Summary of the report.**

## **8. Date of Next Meeting**

The Committee noted that the next meeting would be on 25 March 2025.

The meeting ended at 20.48.