PRIDE IN PLACE
LED BY YOU – BACKED BY UK GOVERNMENT

Minutes of the Landport Neighbourhood Board
held on Tuesday 28th July 2026

Time:	3:00pm – 5:00pm
Location:	St Faith's, Crasswell Street
Chair:	Rev Bob White (BW)
Minute taker:	Jo Horner (JH)
Board Members Present:	Cal Corkery – Councillor, Charles Dickens (CC) Courtney Warrican (CW) Daniel O'Brien (DO) Sophie King (SK) Stephen Morgan – MP, Portsmouth South (SM (online))
Apologies:	John Ryder (JR)
In attendance:	Kelly Nash – PCC (KN)
Quorum:	It was agreed that the meeting met quorum

1.07.26 Welcome

BW welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2.07.26 Apologies

Apologies were received from JR. It was noted that JR had helpfully sent his comments on the papers for inclusion in the discussions.

3.07.26 Conflict of Interests declaration

BW explained that at times people will have conflicts of interest and that these will be recorded and managed at each meeting. On this occasion BW (Fratton Together), CW (Downtown Pompey) and SK (Motiv8) declared an interest in relation to the funding bids to be discussed under item 10 on the agenda.

4.07.26 Quorum

It was agreed that the meeting met quorum.

5.07.26 Introductions

BW invited everyone to introduce themselves.

BW noted that the NB (Neighbourhood Board) is initially small to allow capacity for others to join as the project develops, it is likely potential members will come forward. However, at present, all members of the board either live or work in Landport. There are a further two people who have applied to join the board who are ex-residents and who BW plans to call in the next few days.

BW explained that underpinning the NB are two groups: Living in Landport which is the residents; and Located in Landport which is the groups and agencies located or delivering services in the area. It was noted that the Located in Landport group had met for the first time and that more than 20 organisations had been identified.

There was a discussion about the make-up of the NB. It was highlighted that it is crucial the board listens and responds to local residents so that it is community-led. In the longer term it is hoped that resident can be supported to have the skills and confidence to take a more active role in the board. It was noted that there will be a Community Connector who will lead on community engagement and empower residents to have a voice.

It was highlighted that two of the current board members are Landport residents.

CC said that there are groups in the area who have been through a similar process previously and lessons to be learned from their experience that can inform community engagement and empowerment.

6.07.26 Report on project from Kelly Nash

KN gave an overview of the background and timeline of Pride in Place which has three central aims:

- Building stronger communities
- Creating thriving places
- Helping communities to take back control of their own lives and areas

Two areas have been selected in Portsmouth: Fratton West (Landport); and Paulsgrove East (Paulsgrove).

It was noted that Landport has requested a boundary change to that initially proposed by MHCLG and a decision is expected by the autumn.

There followed a discussion about the proposed boundary and it was emphasised that the boundary is not rigid and there is some flexibility so that whilst interventions should focus on the identified area, this is not exclusive and can include neighbouring streets.

There are also two areas in Havant and one in Gosport that have been identified for the Pride of Place project which means that there are local communities that we can work alongside with whom we can share knowledge and experience.

The funding is designed to enable big ambitions and includes long-term funding that is a good grounding for making long-term plans. Funding includes capital and revenue funding and the list of pre-approved interventions is broad to allow flexibility for the different needs of different communities. If a community wants to use the funding for something completely outside the pre-approved categories, then approval will need to be sought.

In the first phase, the local authority have received the funding and are the accountable body. The role of the Accountable Body is to enable the Neighbourhood Boards.

It was agreed to invite a member of the finance team from PCC to attend a meeting in the near future to more fully explain the role of the Accountable Body and the funding framework.

It was noted that the funding is ringfenced for Landport and that this remains the case although the Accountable Body is likely to change with LGR.

KN gave an overview of the timetable for the next year and noted that the high level plan needs to be submitted in winter 2026. There is likely to be a template to complete this plan which is a broad overview and must be community-led.

Given that community engagement is ongoing, the plan is likely to be iterative and should consider what else is happening in the area for example around the City of Culture bid and neighbourhood health.

KN gave an overview of the data that had been collated about Landport for the Pride in Place data pack and highlighted that there is quite a young population in the area and that compared with surrounding areas, it is relatively ethnically diverse. There are a high proportion of people who experience poor health, and with no formal qualifications which might contribute to the above average rates of UC claimants and economic inactivity.

CC added that the area is also characterized by high levels of social housing.

Community engagement thus far has included a survey asking:

- What do you like about living in the Landport area?
- What changes would you like to see in the area?
- Where do you think Pride in Place work and funding could make a difference?

The analysis found that residents are generally positive about the area and that there is a strong sense of community among respondents. Early priorities have focused on more community activities and/or provision; and improving the physical environment.

Initial expenditure has focused on set up costs and recruitment to the board and of staff to support the board which has been largely prescribed by MHCLG, and community engagement. Both the Paulsgrove and Landport boards will have a Community Connector and these roles are key to identify what is working and where the gaps are in each community. The initial spend is over two years and any under spend can be carried across into subsequent years.

The next steps for NB are to familiarize themselves with what is operating in the area and with the role of the Accountable Body. It was noted that Portsmouth has secured Early Adopter status for community engagement and that there is money available to support engagement activities and develop the broad plan. Engagement activities were discussed further under items 10 and 11 on the agenda.

It was highlighted that all areas are different so what works in one area might not in the other.

SM noted that it is important to think about how the money can be used to attract other funding to promote sustainability as the money is broadly endowment funding with a focus on how to generate longer term funding.

KN noted that there is an Impact Fund which has been announced to go alongside capital funding and needs to be committed by March 2027.

Once the long-term plan is in place, the NB will need to think about what organizational structure will most effectively support the plan which might be for the board to become community interest company or similar.

SM highlighted that there is the potential for businesses to leverage their social responsibility and come alongside which could increase potential funding.

It was noted that there are other projects underway including the Place Partnership work being undertaken by Energise Me, and the neighbouhood health work, and that we all need to collaborate to maximise impact.

It was highlighted that having a number of areas who have received Pride in Place funding locally is a strength and that it would be advantageous to work together. BW noted that he and the Chair of Paulsgrove NB (HD) are meeting regularly and that there is an active Chair support network on email and WhatsApp.

Actions:

1. JH to arrange for a member of PCC to attend a meeting in the near future to explain the role of the Accountable Body and funding structure
2. NB needs to have a high level plan to submit in the coming winter

7.07.26 Policies

1. <u>ToR</u>

It was agreed that if the need arises, the Chair can delegate to a deputy as necessary.

It was noted that in section 2 the community priorities must come from the community.

KN added that the representative from the Accountable Body is likely to change depending on the agenda for each meeting.

In terms of Neighbourhood Board membership, CC is one of the ward councilors. KN noted the ward councilors will most likely change with LGR but that there will be a transition period in which there will be an opportunity to build relationships before a new councilor is selected to join the board.

The ToR were approved.

2. Code of Conduct

JR noted that the date needed amending to July 2026.

The Code of Conduct was approved.

3. Conflict of Interests

The Conflict of Interests policy and form were approved.

4. Privacy Statement

The Privacy Statement was approved.

Actions:

1. JH to update the date on the Code of Conduct
2. JH to email the Conflict of Interest form for all members to complete

8.07.26 Finance report

It was noted that KN had updated NB on the current financial position as part of her presentation (item 6 on the agenda).

9.07.26 Financial reporting template

KN shared the financial reporting template and noted that it includes a RAG rating so we can see where budgets are on track and where it may be necessary to give more consideration. While the NB is meeting monthly and additional spending is limited, it maybe that the financial report is brough to meetings on a quarterly basis, however when spending increases it may be necessary to report more often. HIVE will contribute to the reporting data.

DO asked whether NB will make all financial decisions. BW replied that for now NB would make the decisions, and that moving forward there may be a need for a small group who meet to make financial decisions.

KN clarified that the funds listed for digital and equipment are for laptops and licenses for staff.

There was a discussion about comms including social media and a website for Pride in Place Landport. It was agreed that CW will put together a comms plan and draft budget for this.

BW asked for people's thoughts on the name for the project. It was agreed the name needs to be something that the community relates to and needs to come from the community.

Actions:

1. CW to put a comms plan and proposed budget together

10.07.26 Funding bids for activity over the summer

BW explained that a priority between now and mid-October is to raise awareness of Pride in Place, generate excitement and ideas from the community, and to meet people where they are.

Because of the tight deadline, when the Located in Landport group, made up of a wide and diverse gathering of local agencies based and/or delivering in Landport, met last week they were asked to identify some community engagement projects they could lead on our behalf over the summer where the survey questions could be incorporated in some format to gather feedback. Proposals were submitted by email with five collated on doc 8 and an additional proposal tabled from Downtown Pompey.

It was acknowledged that in future there will be a more robust process but that on this occasion, because of the tight turnaround the email proposals would be considered at the meeting. It was agreed that on this occasion funding would be capped at £6k.

It was agreed that the information collected needs to be in a comparable format and that we will ask for a breakdown of participants from the area of benefit and feedback to our 3 key questions.

BW noted that JR had added his comments for consideration in advance of the meeting.

A key question in deliberations was whether the proposal was for Landport remembering that Fratton West is part of Landport.

The proposals were discussed and decisions were as follows:

- Motiv8 – 3 workshops with a fun, celebratory vibe to be held across the summer and early autumn. Engaging young people and their families.
  SK abstained from the vote.
  £5055 agreed.

- Downtown Pompey – "Love Lives Here: Charles Dickens Love Stories". A two-stranded proposal using a strength-based approach combining pop-ups in Commercial Road and a community event at an accessible venue in Landport such as Playland.
  CW abstained from the vote.
  £2000 agreed

- EnableAbility – It was felt there was not enough detail about the events or the target audience and whether the proposal represented value for money. There was support for the use and development of Landport Community Centre in the longer term.
  It was agreed to invite EnableAbility to the next meeting to discuss their proposal further.

- Fratton Together – their proposal included events and workshops across the summer leading up to the Lantern Parade later in the autumn which it was agreed to consider later in the year. The main focus would be families with children of primary school age. There were also concerns about duplication around the video photography work and the work being done at Playland.
  BW abstained from the vote.
  £3000 agreed towards the four workshops in August and a contribution to publicity and management costs.

- HomeStart Portsmouth – to carry out surveys in August and September with families attending Buckland and Somerstown Hubs.
  It was noted that JR raised the point that these locations are outside the boundary, however it was noted that this would be an opportunity to engage with young families and also begin to find out whether families are happy with a Family Hub in Buckland or is there a need to develop one in Landport?
  £910 agreed

- Crying Out Loud – the board felt this was an interesting proposal but wanted to know more about the benefit to Landport and how it specifically relates to the area.
  It was agreed to invite Crying Out Loud to the next meeting to discuss their proposal further.

KN highlighted that it is important to avoid duplication and to consider the data that already exists. It was agreed to look at the data from different sources and look at where the strengths and gaps are at the August meeting.

When commissioning activities, one consideration is who the target group are and which groups are already covered. It was noted that EnableAbility might be looking to target older people but that this wasn't explicit and needs further discussion. Urbond had not submitted a proposal and might be able to engage with other groups not covered thus far.

It was noted that the Community Connector will be in place early autumn and will be responsible for pulling together plans and could potentially work with Landport Community Centre to deliver engagement activities.

CC highlighted that a more robust process needs to be in place for future funding applications and assessment of bids and suggested that the model used for SEAL funding might provide a starting point.

It was agreed to develop a more robust funding process.

Actions:

1. JH to liaise with KN to organise funding as agreed
2. JH to invite EnableAbility and Crying Out Loud to the next NB meeting
3. CC to share SILL funding process with JH
4. JH to look at developing a funding application and assessment process for potential funding bids

11.07.26 Plan of engagement activities

It was agreed that we will ask all the groups awarded funding for engagement activities to give us dates and venues for their events so that we can collate the information onto a flyer for promotion.

Actions:

1. JH to ask groups awarded funding for details of their events including dates and venues

12.07.26 Meeting plans

A date was discussed for an August meeting with 10:30am-12pm on Friday 14th August proposed. This meeting would focus on reviewing the outstanding funding bids for engagement activities and any others received in the meantime. It was agreed to circulate the provisional date and other possibilities to come to a consensus in the next few days.

Thereafter it was agreed to meet monthly until the end of the year with meetings scheduled in the early evening. It was agreed to collate potential dates and then set up a doodle poll to inform the meeting plan.

It was agreed that the September meeting will focus on community mapping and BW suggested that Hayley Cook be asked if she would facilitate this. KN has a template that was used to collate information about resources in Paulsgrove and offered to do the same for Landport. It was agreed that everyone will send KN information about local groups and services to add to the presentation.

A representative from PCC will be invited to the October meeting to explain the role of the Accountable Body.

Action:
1. JH to email members the possible August dates. Put a meeting plan together 2. JH to liaise with BW on meeting dates for the autumn and then set up a doodle poll 3. JH to invite HC to the September meeting to facilitate community mapping 4. Members to share information and data about community activities, assets and resources with KN who will collate 5. JH to invite a PCC representative to the October meeting to explain the role of the Accountable Body

13.07.26 AOB

<u>13.1 Communications</u>

It was agreed to set up a WhatsApp group for board members.

Actions:
1. JH to set up a group WhatsApp for board members

Date of next meeting: TBC