PRIDE IN PLACE
LED BY YOU – BACKED BY UK GOVERNMENT

Whitehouse Neighbourhood Board
Minutes, Decisions Taken & Action Points

Date:	Monday 17 August
Time:	15:30 – 17:00
Venue:	Paul's Social Club
Members:	Abi Abidoye Cllr Chu Man (representing the Ward Councillors) Emily Swinerd Jack Abbott MP John North Jon Reynolds Kerry Hawes Lee Walker (Chair) Teresa Davidson
Apologies:	Aaron Morley Peter Mower
Other Attendees:	Kate Price, Assistant Director – Communities Laura Meadows, Pride in Place Programme Manager

MINUTES	
1.	**Welcome and Introductions** Lee Walker (LW) introduced himself as Chair. Having grown up in the area, he gave a short overview of Pride in Place and thanked everyone for taking the time to get involved. The group then went around the room, introducing themselves and providing a brief overview of their background and interest in Pride in Place. • Cllr Chu Man – Stoke Park Ward Councillor and background in media. • Jon Reynolds – Lives just outside the area. Has an NHS background and now works for Hope Church, which runs events in Chantry. • Teresa Davidson – Community Champion at Asda and Community Connector at Volunteering Matters. • Kerry Hawes – Has lived in Stoke Park for over 35 years. Has a public sector education background and now works for Too Good To Go.

	• John North – Retired civil servant, actively involved with St Peter's Church and manages the top-up shop. • Emily Swinerd – Rector at St Peter's Church. Brings experience from working in other areas. • Abi Abidoye – Volunteers with iWill and runs a consultancy business. Equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) is an area of particular interest and importance. • Jack Abbott MP – MP for Ipswich and has previously served as a Bridge Ward Councillor. Provided further information about the programme and its criteria. He wants people to see the changes that are happening and to get started as soon as possible.
2.	**Group guidelines and agreements** The Board discussed and approved: • The Board Member Code of Conduct • Whitehouse Neighbourhood Board Terms of Reference • Conflict of Interest Policy **Decisions taken: the approval of the Board Member Code of Conduct, Stoke Park and Chantry Neighbourhood Board Terms of Reference and Conflict of Interest Policy.**
3.	**Financial Overview** Laura Meadows (LM) provided an update on the current Pride in Place finances: • Revenue Funding: No expenditure has been incurred to date. A total of £135,000 is currently available. • Capital Funding: No expenditure has been incurred to date. A total of £117,600 is currently available. LM reported that approximately £2 million will be allocated annually over the 10-year programme. This funding will be split as follows: • Capital Funding: £1.26 million per year (63%) • Revenue Funding: £0.74 million per year (37%) Jack Abbott MP (JA) gave examples of how other areas have used the funding as seed money to support community-led projects, attract further investment and deliver visible local improvements. LW discussed the need to use the initial funding to undertake further community consultation. **AP1: All members to start considering who else could be involved in the programme. LW to contact organisations and groups that**

	could support the initiative and encourage them to begin thinking about how they might contribute. The group agreed that these insights would be essential in developing a strong four-year vision for the area. **AP2: LM to share the findings from the Community Action Suffolk (CAS) VCFSE engagement when available.** Members discussed how best to engage with people who may not usually participate in consultations or community activities. LM outlined the proposed four-year funding plan and 10-year vision due in February 2027. While priorities may evolve over time, the aim is to identify key priorities for the first four years, alongside a range of potential projects that could be delivered. Upon the completion of this and submission to Government, further funding will be released. JA suggested speaking with other Pride in Place areas to learn from their experiences and gather advice from communities that have already progressed through the programme. LW stated that the ambition for Stoke Park is to become an example of best practice for future Pride in Place areas.
4.	**Boundary Extension** LW provided context that, while the funding has been awarded for Stoke Park, it could have a greater impact if the area was expanded to include Chantry, given the range of community assets located just beyond the current boundary. Extending the boundary would increase the population covered by the programme and bring more young people into the area. However, it would be important to ensure that Stoke Park and Chantry retain their distinct identities and do not become viewed as a single area simply because they are linked through Pride in Place. He explained that the focus should be on understanding the needs of both communities and ensuring residents have access to suitable facilities, rather than replicating the same provision in each area. Recent community engagement activity has also highlighted the need to include Chantry within the programme area. JA explained that, although Stoke Park Ward received the funding, one of the most deprived areas is concentrated in the south-western part of the ward, bordering Sprites Ward. Residents in this area rely heavily on services located around Hawthorn Drive, including local schools. He outlined the proposed expansion area, noting that it is proportionate and has been designed with consideration for neighbouring communities. Under MHCLG guidance, programme areas can include up to 20,000 residents. The rationale for including Chantry is that Stoke Park residents already access many of the services located

there. He also noted that the Hawthorn Drive shopping parade has recently been upgraded.

John North (JN) asked what additional population would be included through the boundary extension. Kate Price (KP) advised that it would bring approximately 4,000 additional residents.

Jon Reynolds (JR) queried why the Birds and Flowers estates were not included in the proposed expansion area. LW responded that it was important to keep the area at a manageable size while ensuring there were clear opportunities for investment and impact.

JN highlighted employment opportunities within the area, noting that St Joseph's College and Asda are likely to be two of the largest local employers.

Teresa Davidson (TD) and Emily Swinerd (ES) commented that relatively few Stoke Park residents use Chantry Library because it is too far to walk. ES expressed concern that £20 million could easily be absorbed by major services, such as the Hawthorn Drive GP surgery. JA responded that smaller amounts of funding could be used strategically to leverage investment from other partners.

KP noted that investment can be made outside the programme boundary where there is a clear benefit for Stoke Park and Chantry residents.

LW reiterated the opportunity to serve residents across both communities more effectively, rather than limiting the programme to the existing Stoke Park boundary. He stressed that the funding should not replace investment that other organisations are responsible for providing. Instead, the focus should be on creating a lasting legacy and delivering long-term transformational change.

Cllr Chu Man (CM) highlighted local frustrations when facilities are developed and then left without ongoing support or maintenance, emphasising that long-term sustainability must be a key consideration. LW noted that the programme's revenue funding could help address this issue.

ES expressed a strong commitment to Stoke Park but acknowledged that Chantry contains a number of valuable community assets. She suggested that future funding applications should be assessed on their individual merits. JN agreed and reflected on the different characteristics and needs of the two communities.

JR asked whether it would be beneficial to include local schools within the programme boundary. LW responded that assets located just outside the boundary can still receive support where there is a clear benefit to residents. ES questioned the need to expand into Chantry if funding could already be directed there. LW explained that extending the boundary increases the range of projects and assets that can be funded, while JA added that it also helps to future-proof the programme.

	TD highlighted the importance of improving links between Stoke Park and Chantry to make it easier for residents to travel between the two communities. LW then referred to the Terms of Reference and noted the importance of reaching a consensus. Following discussion, the group agreed to expand the programme boundary to include Chantry. Members recognised that the Neighbourhood Board, in consultation with the local community, would ultimately be responsible for setting priorities and deciding which projects receive funding, and were confident that this would ensure investment is allocated appropriately. **Decisions taken: the approval of the boundary extension to include part of Sprites Ward (Chantry) within the Pride in Place area.**
5.	**Training** LW and LM introduced the opportunity for Board Members to access training and development sessions. These would support members' induction onto the Neighbourhood Board and provide opportunities to build knowledge and skills in areas identified by the Board as priorities. **AP3: LM to circulate a skills audit to identify existing knowledge and experience within the Neighbourhood Board, as well as the Board's strengths and any gaps in skills, expertise or representation.** The group agreed that it would be beneficial to work alongside Whitehouse in delivering an initial induction session, enabling both Boards to share learning and build a common understanding of the programme.
6.	**Communications** LW introduced the topic of communications and highlighted the need to consider how the Board would communicate both internally, between Board members, and externally, with the wider community. Key areas for consideration included: • Launching and announcing the Neighbourhood Board and its members. • Communicating with one another between meetings. • Identifying effective ways to engage with the local community, such as social media, a website and other communication channels. LW proposed creating a WhatsApp group to enable members to stay in touch and share updates between meetings. **AP4: LW to set up a WhatsApp group for Neighbourhood Board members.** It was agreed that meetings would take place monthly initially. As the programme develops, the frequency may reduce to bi-monthly or quarterly.

	The Board identified two key pieces of communication that would need to be issued in the near future: firstly, introducing the Neighbourhood Board and its members; and secondly, communicating the proposed boundary extension. LW suggested an initial announcement introducing the Board and explaining its purpose. He proposed highlighting the Board's collective connection to the area, for example by calculating the total number of years members have lived, worked or volunteered in Stoke Park. However, he noted that once the Board is publicly announced, local expectations for delivery will increase. While this could encourage residents to engage and provide feedback, it may also create pressure for immediate results. LW expressed a desire to be in a position by Christmas to communicate some early successes or "quick wins". LW also updated members on arrangements for engagement with local councillors, explaining that separate meetings would take place to ensure they remain informed of progress. CM will act as the representative for local councillors at Board meetings. LW emphasised the importance of releasing an initial communication to demonstrate that the Board is established, listening to residents and keen to hear local views. JA suggested including a short quote or statement from each Board member as part of the launch. He also recommended considering a dedicated budget for communications and marketing activity. CM highlighted the importance of having a website containing detailed information about the programme. He suggested that this could eventually include a dashboard showing projects and progress updates. Alongside this, he felt a social media presence would be valuable for sharing updates, including before-and-after photographs of projects. He stressed the importance of storytelling and maintaining transparency throughout the programme, including communicating the reasons why proposals may not be taken forward. LM updated the group on the potential of the new Go Vocal platform and already established Volunteering Matters social media accounts, noting that it will be for the Board to determine how these channels are used going forward. The group agreed on the importance of using a wide range of communications channels to reach different audiences. Members noted that each platform should be used to amplify the same core messages and tell a consistent story. CM also suggested considering additional promotional methods, such as signage, branded clothing and other visible community engagement materials.
7.	**Future meetings** To be decided
8.	**Any Other Business (AOB)**

	CM updated the group that he has been collating a list of topics and ideas that have been arising during recent resident engagements. **AP5: Cllr Man to circulate this to LM to share with the minutes.**

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

TBC

DECISIONS TAKEN

1. The approval of the Board Member Code of Conduct, Stoke Park and Chantry Neighbourhood Board Terms of Reference and Conflict of Interest Policy.
2. The approval of the boundary extension to include part of Sprites Ward (Chantry) within the Pride in Place area.

ACTION POINTS

- AP1: All members to start considering who else could be involved in the programme and consulting with the local community. LW to contact organisations and groups that could support the initiative and encourage them to begin thinking about how they might contribute.
- AP2: LM to share the findings from the Community Action Survey (CAS) when available.
- AP3: LM to circulate a skills audit to identify existing knowledge and experience within the Neighbourhood Board, as well as the Board's strengths and any gaps in skills, expertise or representation.
- AP4: LW to set up a WhatsApp group for Neighbourhood Board members
- AP5: CM to circulate list of feedback from local residents with LM to share with the minutes.