PRIDE IN PLACE
LED BY YOU – BACKED BY UK GOVERNMENT

Gorton South Pride in Place
Neighbourhood Board minutes

Date and Time: Monday 9 November 2026 530 – 730pm
Location: Gorton Hub, Peter Pan room
Chair: Jo Sharples
Vice Chair: Chris Kennedy
Secretariat: Jo Sharples (Board Chair)
Board Members:
[Resident names redacted from published document]
Apologies

---

1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies

- Jo welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted apologies.
- An overview of the peer-to-peer session was provided.

2. November Event Update and Discussion

- The Secretariat provided an update on venue availability at Sacred Heart, including associated costs, and outlined the potential cost of using Gorton Hub.
- Beth provided an update on the proposed themes, table discussions and approach to participation.

The Board discussed the best format for the engagement event. Two broad options were considered:

- VCSE-focused session: An invite-only event involving local voluntary and community organisations, with paid attendance to support participation and sense-check the emerging priorities.
- Open community event: A wider open-invite session, potentially with a more informal or festival-style approach and without paid attendance.

There was concern that attendance at an open event could be challenging given the short notice, particularly with the proposed event taking place on a Saturday.

Chris felt the timescale lent itself more strongly to the first option. Mehwish also suggested taking a cautious approach, particularly given the potential for food and other activities to significantly increase attendance and the organisation required.

The Secretariat suggested delaying the event, particularly given the breadth of the themes being considered.

Beth suggested commissioning a more organised engagement event for the new year. Suzanne supported a targeted approach involving residents and local groups and

cautioned against significant expenditure on a single engagement event, given that further engagement would be required throughout the programme.

The Chair suggested using the engagement to present the emerging priorities and encourage residents and organisations to become involved in supporting the priorities and associated subgroups.

Troy emphasised the importance of meeting and engaging directly with local people and supported proceeding with an event.

Options including a festive event in December and delivery through a commissioned organisation were discussed, with Beth suggesting potential groups that could support delivery.

Suzanne noted that she had been contacted by several groups that are not based within the Pride in Place area.

Fesl highlighted the amount of preparation required, particularly around safeguarding.
Decision: The Board agreed that, given the short notice and the absence of an essential November deadline, the event should be moved to 30 January to allow sufficient time for planning and delivery.

Actions:

- Julie to contact Claire Evans regarding the event.
- Suzanne to explore venue options and contact Cedar Mount School, with Cath Hollywood suggested as a contact.
- Further work to be undertaken on the format and potential commissioning of the event.

3. Participation Ideas by Theme

- The Chair provided an overview of the emerging priorities and invited Board feedback.
- 24 November was confirmed as the deadline for final comments and sign-off.
- The Board discussed the themes and considered which Board members may wish to lead or support each area.

Beth highlighted the need to develop a specific approach to young people's participation and shared a brief she had prepared for the programme.

The proposed approach included:

- Working with youth clubs and schools.
- Delivering engagement sessions in spaces that young people already use.
- Concluding the process with a participatory budgeting event.
- Providing a mentoring programme for participating young people.
- Building monitoring and evaluation into the process.

Action: Beth to circulate the young people's participation brief to the Board for feedback.

The Chair also highlighted the need to explore where elements of the work could be commissioned. This approach was supported by other Board members.

4. **Regeneration Plan Draft Sharing**

- The draft Regeneration Plan was circulated to Board members by email.
- Paper copies were also made available.
- Board members were asked to review the draft as part of the ongoing development and sign-off process.
- Board members to provide feedback, additions or adjustments must be provided before the next meeting at which point the plan will be signed off.

5. Monitoring & Evaluation Proposals

The raising of 'evaluation and monitoring' this early on in the 10 year project by the council was welcomed and understood to be a really important element to get right. The rushing of this commission seemed unnecessary, even given match funding deadlines from the university. (Fesl)

It is currently unclear how the selection process by the MCC meets procurement requirements for open, competitive and fair tendering procedures for this package of work, particularly given the high cost of the work. (Chair)

We have no comparative quotation to see if this represents value for money. (Pelumi)

Commissioning a large institution such as University of Manchester (UoM) as one of our first large commissions does not feel in line with our ambitions of the Pride in Place programme to ensure the money benefits as many local people as much as possible and is not lost to bureaucracy. (Julie)

Although UoM's previous working with the council is understood to be positive, there was insufficient information presented at our PIP chairs meeting to understand the experience and appropriateness of those involved. (Chair)

We would like to actively encourage people from diverse backgrounds to apply to undertake this work that are representative of our community through the commissioning process. Multiple languages spoken would be useful to help to break down communication barriers. (Chair, reflected from Moss Side Chair)

Although the ambition to incorporate co-design of the process with local VCSE organisations was positive. It is currently unclear whether the community organisation would be paid out of this existing budget, or whether additional funding would be required and who would be responsible for what. (Beth)

A suggestion to draw upon the work of the Manchester based Centre for Local and Economic Strategy CLES which created the 'Preston Model' for breaking down tender packages to allow smaller organisations to bid for work would be helpful. (Suzanne)

Based on the information provided, the Monitoring and Evaluation proposal from the University of Manchester put forwards by the council was rejected by the Board.

The Board is keen to work with the council to develop a strong brief and procurement processes that develop one of our core priorities for Gorton South around 'Community Wealth Building'. This feels like positive opportunity to make a difference, that could potentially be undertaken by more local organisations. It might be helpful to put a 'call out' or Expression of Interest' to understand whether these skills exist locally.

6. Any Other Business

- No additional items were recorded.

7. Date and Location of Next Meeting

Date: Monday 23 November 2026
Location: Northmoor Community Centre

Action Summary

Action	Lead
Contact Claire Evans regarding the January engagement event	Julie
Explore venue options and contact Cedar Mount School	Suzanne
Circulate the young people's participation brief to the Board	Beth
Board members to provide final feedback/sign-off on priorities by 24 November	Board members
Further develop the format and potential commissioning approach for the January event	Board / Secretariat