

My Ideas – Pride in Place Review

Resident Meeting Summary Sheet



Meeting Details

Meeting Name: Pride in Place Meeting

Date of Meeting: Friday 5th June 2026, 13:00 – 15:00

Location / Format: Virtual meeting (Teams)

Facilitator (Role): Tenant Engagement Officer

Staff: Tenant Engagement and Communications colleagues

Number of Tenants: 6

Summary

Tenants met with staff to review Pride in Place applications, discuss proposed improvements to communal outdoor spaces, and consider how projects could be maintained in the long term. The group supported one application in principle, subject to further checks on maintenance, quality assurance and resident involvement. A second application required more detail before a decision could be made. Tenants also discussed how future applications could be clearer and shared suggestions for involving local businesses, colleges and community partners.

Key Discussion Points

- Staff welcomed attendees, thanked everyone for joining, and reminded the group of the meeting purpose and ground rules.
- Tenants were made aware of an upcoming communications meeting, with interest noted from attendees who wanted to take part.
- Application 1 focused on covered planters and garden improvement works. The group felt the proposal was positive and reasonable, but wanted further assurance before full approval.
- Tenants discussed long-term upkeep, including responsibility for weeding, grass cutting, maintenance if residents move on, and how to prevent the area deteriorating over time.
- Suggestions included asking residents to take responsibility for individual planters or pots, considering weed-control membrane, and checking whether the proposed budget would be enough for a durable solution.
- The group asked for quality assurance around any works completed and for staff to explore maintenance expectations with the relevant local housing colleague.
- Application 2 was considered promising, with tenants recognising that existing improvements appeared positive, but the group felt there was not enough information to approve funding.
- Tenants requested clearer details on what the funding would be used for, whether the land was owned or managed by the organisation, how far the budget would stretch, and whether local businesses or community partners could help support the project.

My Ideas – Pride in Place Review

Resident Meeting Summary Sheet



Decisions Made

- Application 1 was supported in principle, subject to further checks on maintenance arrangements, resident involvement, budget suitability and quality assurance.
- Application 2 was not approved at this stage, as the group requested more detailed information before making a decision.
- The group agreed that the application form may need to ask for more specific information to reduce follow-up questions in future.
- No further Pride in Place funding decisions were made during the meeting.

Actions

- Tenant Engagement to invite interested attendees to the upcoming communications meeting.
- Tenant Engagement and Communications colleagues to speak with the relevant local housing colleague about Application 1, including long-term upkeep, resident involvement and quality assurance.
- Staff to request further detail for Application 2, including a clearer list of proposed works, costs, land ownership or management arrangements, and whether external support could be explored.
- Staff to consider improving the application form so applicants provide more specific information about planned works and budget estimates.
- Tenant Engagement to share information on how to make a Pride in Place application if attendees are unable to locate it online.
- Tenant Engagement to check whether a communal washing line could be considered through Pride in Place funding; fence painting was noted as potentially suitable, subject to normal checks.

Future Engagement

Next Meeting Date: The next neighbourhood meeting is scheduled for October 2026. An additional Pride in Place meeting may be arranged before then if needed.

Contact for information or to get involved: Customer Scrutiny Team