

SCARBOROUGH NEIGHBOURHOOD BOARD

FRIDAY 27th MARCH 2026
SCARBOROUGH TOWN HALL | 10:00 AM

DRAFT MINUTES

Chair Heath Samples HS	Kathryn Daly KD NYC
Adrian Perry AP Scarborough and District Civic Society	Isobel Shire IS YNYCA
Alison Hume AH MP – Scarborough & Whitby	James Shield JS Senior Communication Officer – Parliament
Cllr Liz Colling LC NYC	Helen Jackson HJ NYC
Cllr Norman Murphy NM Scarborough Town Council	Kerry Levitt KLV NYC
Karen Porter KP ConnectEd CIC	Lauren Hopson-Haw LHH NYC
Matthew Butterworth MBT CU University	Laurie Wilsher LW Minutes NYC
Richard Cooper RC Beyond Housing	

1. WELCOME & APOLOGIES

- Richard Boyes, Scarborough Business Partnership
- Richard Flinton, North Yorkshire Council (represented by Kathryn Daly)
- Cllr Mark Crane, North Yorkshire Council
- Martin Barkley, York & Scarborough NHS Foundation Trust
- Simon Bull, Scarborough Business Ambassadors
- CI Lucy McNeill, North Yorkshire Police
- Sarah Douglas, English Heritage

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2.1.KP declared an interest in Agenda Item 5.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS (ATTACHED) AND MATTERS ARISING

3.1.The Board reviewed and agreed the minutes of the meeting held on Friday 14th November 2025 and February 27th Extraordinary General Meeting as a true record.

3.2.No matters arising.

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE REVIEW AND APPROVAL

- 4.1. HS reiterated the rationale for the proposed changes to the Terms of Reference, as previously discussed at the Extraordinary General Meeting. The revisions restrict Board Members and their associated organisations from holding active funding bids, thereby strengthening transparency and ensuring independent governance of the programme.
- 4.2. HS confirmed that, in light of the amended ToR, representatives from North Yorkshire Sport, the Stephen Joseph Theatre and Coast and Vale Community Action have decided to withdraw their membership. These organisations will continue ongoing involvement within the relevant thematic groups, acting in an advisory capacity rather than holding decision-making authority.
- 4.3. The Board formally ratified and approved the amended Terms of Reference.
- 4.4. HS outlined the proposed mechanisms for the tiered governance arrangements incorporating initial scrutiny at thematic group level followed by formal Board review. Once established, these arrangements will enable the reopening of project proposals submissions for consideration within future investment periods.
- 4.5. Board Members queried the potential skills gaps arising from these changes and the approach to membership recruitment. A Board refresh process is proposed for the coming months and will commence following the appointment of an Independent PR Consultant. This process will comply with MHCLG requirements and prioritise identified gaps.

ACTION: A mapping exercise to review the thematic groups and Board to be undertaken and included as an agenda item for the June meeting.

5. PROJECT DECISIONS

- 5.1. KLV reiterated the key considerations underpinning the project prioritisation process and outlined the Board's requirements for determining the allocation of funding during the initial investment period.
- 5.2. Clarification was provided on the funding profile within the initial investment period. It was noted that borrowing will be required to address funding shortfalls in year one and subsidise project costs to enable delivery to commence in 2026.

5.3. Project recommendations were presented based on three core assessment criteria:

- Public vote net favourability from project engagement undertaken in early 2026
- Alignment with the programme's thematic objectives as developed by the relevant thematic groups
- The Council's technical assessment of projects, undertaken in accordance with HM Treasury Green Book principles

A comprehensive scoring matrix was devised to consolidate the quantitative scores across each assessment criterion, ensuring a consistent, objective and fair framework for prioritisation.

5.4. The Board endorsed a weighting methodology for the scoring matrix that assigned 50% of the overall score to the public vote reflecting the community-led nature of the programme. A weighting of 30% was applied to the technical assessment to ensure project proposals are viable and capable of effective delivery, with the remaining 20% allocated to thematic objective alignment. This resulted in an overarching ranked list of projects for prioritisation.

5.5. LC queried whether sponsors had received appropriate support in relation to the submission requirements. Officers advised that supporting documentation had been provided and each sponsor was assigned an officer to assist throughout.

5.6. AH sought clarification on whether the Board had been informed of the Councils' technical assessment. Officers confirmed that this information was included within the Investment Plan circulated to members.

5.7. The Board agreed that the scoring matrix would inform, but not solely determine, funding decisions. Members undertook further detailed review of each shortlisted project, considering the final project briefs and business cases to validate the recommendations, inform final positions, and refine any associated funding conditions and caveats.

5.8. Sprucing-up Scarborough:

5.8.1. The Board recognised the project's capacity to deliver early benefits and its clear focus on addressing a key community priority.

5.8.2. A bench-marking exercise has been completed to refine scope of intervention. It was noted ongoing maintenance arrangements will broadly

align with existing arrangements, with any exceptions to be agreed with contractor prior to delivery.

5.8.3.LC queried whether PiPP funding would be used to support the implementation of High Street Rental Auction Powers under the Sprucing up Scarborough project. Officers confirmed the costs associated with implementing HSRA will be allocated from a separate North Yorkshire Council budget. However, it was highlighted that building owners and landlords may also be eligible to apply for grants under Sprucing Up Scarborough project to supplement the funding gap required to bring the building back into active use.

5.8.4.The Board agreed that direct involvement in refining the project scope would be required through the High Streets Thematic Group to ensure greatest resident benefit.

5.9.Youth Safe Zones Network:

5.9.1.The Board discussed the need for further analysis of existing youth provision and noted that additional development work would be required to bring the project to a deliverable stage.

5.9.2.Questions were raised regarding the appropriateness of both the proposed revenue and capital costs in relation to delivery of specified outputs.

5.9.3.Concerns were raised over the added value of the proposed intervention and whether the investment would adequately respond to identified local challenges.

5.9.4.The Board also noted that the Community Grant Scheme could provide an alternative route to support some of the identified priorities, enabling existing youth spaces and organisations to bid for funding through this mechanism.

5.10.Scarborough Fair:

5.10.1.The Board noted that the project is well developed and in a strong position; however, a funding condition was proposed requiring enhanced monitoring and reporting to the Board. Officers confirmed this would apply to all projects within the Pride in Place programme.

5.11.Square one (SQ1) Redevelopment:

5.11.1.It was noted that project deliverability is dependent on securing wider funding commitments and the need for partners to progress collectively.

5.11.2.The Board recognised that a failure to proceed would have detrimental implications for the redevelopment of a key strategic site and the town centre as a whole.

- 5.11.3. A phased release of funding, alongside a value engineering exercise, was proposed as a means of mitigating risk to the Board.
- 5.11.4. It was highlighted that project sponsors will be required to provide clearer and more comprehensive information going forward, including the submission of an updated business case. Sponsors will also be expected to actively support a coordinated and collective approach to progressing the project.

5.12. Stephen Joseph Theatre:

- 5.12.1. The project was recognised as being in a strong position in terms of deliverability and its potential to attract significant external investment into the town. However, questions were raised regarding the extent to which the project relies on PiPP funding to progress and if the funding could be secured elsewhere. Confirmation will be sought from the project sponsors on the criticalness of the PiPP funding.
- 5.12.2. Support was expressed in principle, on the confirmation that the project would not proceed without PiPP funding.

5.13. Scarborough Community Fund:

- 5.13.1. HS outlined the rationale for the decision by the Chair, Vice-Chair, and MPs to introduce a combined capital and revenue funding stream, with a tiered grant structure. This approach was proposed to maximise impact, deliver greater overall benefits, and more effectively target identified local needs.
- 5.13.2. The proposed mechanisms were noted as critical to the successful delivery of the project. It was agreed that a Task and Finish Group be established to develop and oversee the governance arrangements and criteria.

5.14. Scarborough Watersports Hub:

- 5.14.1. Site viability was identified as a critical concern that currently limits the deliverability of the project, with ongoing uncertainty meaning that the proposal is not considered viable at this stage.
- 5.14.2. The Board discussed the allocation of funding for development costs, however priority remains on investment in projects that are able to progress to delivery and demonstrate clear, tangible benefits for residents.
- 5.14.3. The Board remains supportive of the project's underlying objectives and agreed to consider any refined proposals that may be brought forward during the course of the programme.

5.15. Scarborough Volunteering Hub:

5.15.1. Whilst the project was considered affordable and technically deliverable, the Board identified a comparatively weaker alignment with the strategic priorities.

5.15.2. Concerns were raised around duplication of local activity already being delivered.

5.15.3. It was also noted when compared with other interventions that the project was more limited in its capacity to deliver benefits that reflect locally identified needs and priorities.

5.16. Men's Wellbeing Hub:

5.16.1. It was confirmed the project has secured further match funding which significantly enhances the project's delivery position.

5.16.2. While the scale of direct beneficiaries is lower than for some other projects, the proposal addresses a particularly acute and locally significant challenge and the impact of the intervention on resident lives is crucial.

5.16.3. Robust safeguarding measures will be required to support delivery.

5.17. Old Town Regeneration:

5.17.1. The Board noted that the project requires significant further development to refine its objectives and ensure stronger alignment with identified community needs. It was also acknowledged that alternative interventions are currently in a stronger position to deliver benefits for residents in the first investment period.

5.17.2. The Board expressed its support in principle for the objectives of the intervention, recognising Castle Ward as a significant and integral part of the town.

5.17.3. Discussion took place regarding the potential use of capacity funding to support the initial establishment of a community forum, with the aim of refining the scope and direction of the wider regeneration project. This will be explored.

5.17.4. It was also queried whether the Town Council could explore available options and submit a proposal, subject to its capacity to do so. NM will provide feedback to Scarborough Town Council for further consideration

5.18. Board Members undertook a formal vote to determine the selection of projects for funding in the initial investment period.

The outcomes of this vote will remain confidential until the completion of the required subsidy control assessments and due diligence checks. Board Members please refer to appendix 1

6. SUBSIDY CONTROL ASSESSMENT

6.1.KLV provided an overview on the subsidy control assessment process, which is a requirement for all publicly funded projects. The process is designed to ensure that grants are awarded fairly and legally.

6.2.An outline of the assessment process was presented, including the criteria used to determine whether a project constitutes a subsidy and, where applicable, the route by which compliance is demonstrated. It was highlighted that the Government have developed streamlined assessment routes to support timely delivery of local regeneration projects.

6.3.Members were advised that all projects recommended for funding will be subject to the appropriate level of subsidy control assessment prior to any formal funding commitment being made, as part of the Council's role as the accountable body.

7. FORWARD ENGAGEMENT PLAN

7.1.LHH presented the forward engagement plan developed by the Engagement Working Group. The Programme is now entering the fourth phase of engagement, which aims to maintain an ongoing dialogue with the community throughout the first delivery period. The approach will provide additional opportunities for resident feedback and support community awareness ahead of the second investment period.

7.2.The Board approved the proposed engagement model during the delivery phase, which is built around five core elements:

- Always-on visibility
- Quarterly public sessions
- Themed engagement sessions
- Proportionate engagement with deeper dives where relevant
- Stakeholder communications

7.3.AH provided updates on the progress of MHCLG's programme branding and the Board still intends to adopt this once developed.

8. A.O.B

8.1. None.

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- Friday 12th June 2026

Appendix 1: Board Member Project Prioritisation Voting summary

PROJECTS	SUPPORT	NOT SUPPORT	ABSTAINED	EXEMPT
Turning Tides	Unanimous (9)	-	-	-
Sprucing Up Scarborough	8	-	1	-
Youth Safe Zones Network	0	Unanimous (9)	-	-
Scarborough Fair	7	-	1	1
Square One (Sq1)	6	3	-	-
Stephen Joseph Theatre	9*	-	-	-
Watersports Hub	-	Unanimous (9)	-	-
Volunteering Hub	-	Unanimous (9)	-	-
Men's Wellbeing Hub	8	-	-	1
Old Town Regeneration	-	Unanimous (9)	-	-

*on the assumption the project is reliant upon PiPP funding for delivery.