

# Scarborough Neighbourhood Board

Date: **Friday 19 June 2026**

Time: **10am to midday**

Location: **Sea View Conference Room, Scarborough Town Hall**

## Agenda items

1. WELCOME & APOLOGIES – CHAIR
  - Richard Flinton, NYC
  - Cllr. Mark Crane, NYC
2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - CHAIR
3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (ATTACHED) AND MATTERS ARISING – CHAIR
4. OPEN LETTER TO RESIDENTS – ALISON HUME 15 minutes
5. PROGRAMME MANAGER – ALISON HUME 10 minutes
6. SCARBOROUGH COMMUNITY FUND – CHAIR 10 minutes
7. SPRUCING UP SCARBOROUGH OVERVIEW - CHAIR 10 minutes
8. CHANGING TO A COMMUNITY LED MODEL - CHAIR 20 minutes
9. COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT 20 minutes
  - 9.1 Comms Update – Helen Baker
  - 9.2 Public Session Format – Lauren Hopson-Haw
  - 9.3 Commonplace Platform – Lauren Hopson-Haw
10. PROGRAMME UPDATE – KERRY LEVITT 5 minutes
11. FINANCE & BUDGETS – KERRY LEVITT 10 minutes
  - 11.1. Explanation of NYC Costs
  - 11.2. Forward Budget Plan
12. A.O.B
13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING - Friday 11<sup>th</sup> September 2026

# SCARBOROUGH NEIGHBOURHOOD BOARD

FRIDAY 27<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2026  
SCARBOROUGH TOWN HALL | 10:00 AM

## DRAFT MINUTES

Chair Heath Samples <b>HS</b>	Kathryn Daly <b>KD</b> NYC
Adrian Perry <b>AP</b> Scarborough and District Civic Society	Isobel Shire <b>IS</b> YNYCA
Alison Hume <b>AH</b> MP – Scarborough & Whitby	James Shield <b>JS</b> Senior Communication Officer – Parliament
Cllr Liz Colling <b>LC</b> NYC	Helen Jackson <b>HJ</b> NYC
Cllr Norman Murphy <b>NM</b> Scarborough Town Council	Kerry Levitt <b>KLV</b> NYC
Karen Porter <b>KP</b> ConnectEd CIC	Lauren Hopson-Haw <b>LHH</b> NYC
Matthew Butterworth <b>MBT</b> CU University	Laurie Wilsher <b>LW</b> Minutes NYC
Richard Cooper <b>RC</b> 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 14<sup>th</sup> November 2025 and February 27<sup>th</sup> 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 strengths and weaknesses of each final project briefs and business cases. This was used to validate the recommendations, inform final positions, and refine any associated funding conditions and caveats.

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

Please Note: A section of these minutes has been redacted from the publicly available version due to commercial confidentiality. The Board considered and agreed a funding decision that is subject to legal due diligence and an external communications embargo. An unredacted record of the discussion and decision has been retained in accordance with governance and record-keeping requirements and will be made public once the embargo has been lifted.

## **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 12<sup>th</sup> June 2026

DRAFT

## **Pride in Place (PiP) Project Assessment and Approval Process**

### **1. Project Submission**

All project proposals seeking PiP funding must be submitted to the designated North Yorkshire Council (NYC) Regeneration Team email address and clearly identified as a PiP project.

- ✓ Heath Samples – Chair, Pride in Place Board
- ✓ Richard Boyes – Vice Chair, Pride in Place Board

### **2. Initial Administrative Review**

- ✓ Proposal completed
- ✓ Supporting information provided
- ✓ Broad eligibility review
- ✓ Identification of legal, procurement or compliance issues

This review is administrative only and does not constitute project approval.

### **3. Thematic Group Assessment**

Projects are referred to the relevant Thematic Group:

- ✓ High Streets, Heritage, Regeneration & Housing
- ✓ Cohesion, Safety & Security, Health & Wellbeing
- ✓ Skills, Productivity, Education & Transport

Thematic Groups:

- ✓ Review proposals
- ✓ Assess strategic fit
- ✓ Consider community benefit
- ✓ Consider value for money
- ✓ Make recommendations to the PiP Board

### **4. PiP Board Decision**

- ✓ Approve
- ✓ Approve with conditions
- ✓ Defer
- ✓ Reject

The PiP Board determines which projects proceed and are prioritised for funding.

### **5. Assurance and Compliance Review**

## Agenda Item 6

Following Board approval, NYC undertakes:

- ✓ Procurement compliance
- ✓ Subsidy control checks
- ✓ Financial due diligence
- ✓ Legal checks
- ✓ Monitoring requirements

This is not a project selection process.

### **6. Funding Agreement and Delivery**

Once assurance requirements are satisfied, funding agreements are issued, and delivery commences. Progress is monitored and reported back to the PiP Board.

### **7. Community Grant Fund Fast-Track Process**

Community Grant applications are submitted through the normal process.

- ✓ NYC administrative review within 10 working days
- ✓ Referred to Community Grant Task & Finish Panel

Panel Membership:

- ✓ Heath Samples (Chair)
- ✓ Richard Boyes (Vice Chair)
- ✓ Alison Hume MP (Board Member)
- ✓ One additional Board member nominated annually

Funding Thresholds:

- ✓ £1,000–£10,000 – Panel approval authority
- ✓ £10,001–£25,000 – Panel recommendation and Chair's Action approval if required
- ✓ £25,001–£50,000 – Full PiP Board approval required

All decisions are reported to the next Board meeting for transparency.

### **Key Principle**

The Pride in Place Board leads project prioritisation and determines which projects proceed through the programme.

Thematic Groups undertake detailed scrutiny and provide recommendations.

North Yorkshire Council acts as facilitator and Accountable Body, providing governance assurance, statutory compliance and administrative support.

# Scarborough Neighbourhood Board

## **PURPOSE OF PAPER**

This paper outlines the options available for the Board to become a community-led body, in line with MHCLG guidance. It also sets out the key differences between a CIO and a CIC.

The paper does not make any recommendations on a preferred option, nor does it provide a full assessment of the legal and risk implications associated with each option.

## **COMMUNITY INTEREST COMPANY (CIC) VS CHARITABLE INCORPORATED ORGANISATION (CIO)**

### **Core Difference in Simple Terms**

- **CIO** = community-focused, grant-led, high accountability
- **CIC** = delivery-focused, trading-led, more flexibility

## **WHAT MATTERS FOR THE BOARD**

### **1. Handling public funding**

#### **CIO**

- Designed to manage funding for public benefit
- Strong safeguards and oversight (Charity Commission)
- Seen as lower risk for public sector partners and funders

#### **CIC**

- Can receive funding, but is still a company structure
- Fewer restrictions on use of funds (within community benefit rules)
- May be viewed as higher risk for managing large public funds

### **2. Governance and accountability**

#### **CIO**

- Trustee-led governance
- Stronger requirements around decision-making and conflicts of interest
- Clear public benefit duty

#### **CIC**

- Director-led (more like a company)

## Agenda Item 8

- More flexibility but fewer built-in safeguards

### **3. Independence from the local authority**

Both structures:

- Are legally separate bodies
- Allow the Board to move away from council oversight

However:

#### **CIO**

- More clearly positioned as an independent community organisation
- Aligns with typical “community-led” models

#### **CIC**

- More likely to be seen as an operating or delivery company

### **4. Delivery role**

#### **CIO**

- Can deliver projects, but:
  - Less suited to commercial activity
  - May need a trading arm for income generation

#### **CIC**

- Designed for:
  - Direct delivery
  - Contracts
  - Income-generating activity

### **5. Financial sustainability**

#### **CIO**

- Strong access to grants and funding
- Less flexibility for trading

#### **CIC**

- Stronger ability to:
  - Earn income
  - Reduce reliance on grant funding

## Agenda Item 8

### **OPTIONS**

#### **Option 1: CIO**

##### **Best where the Board:**

- Acts as custodian of public funding
- Oversees delivery by third parties
- Needs strong transparency and assurance
- Wants to clearly demonstrate community benefit

##### **Pros**

- Trusted structure for public funding
- Strong governance
- Better access to grants

##### **Cons**

- Less flexible for commercial activity
- More formal governance requirements

#### **Option 2: CIC**

##### **Best where the Board:**

- Intends to act as a delivery organisation
- Will generate income through trading
- Needs flexibility and speed in operations

##### **Pros**

- Flexible and delivery-focused
- Can trade and generate income

##### **Cons**

- Weaker fit for managing public funds
- Less access to grant funding
- Perception risk (more commercial)

#### **Option 3: Hybrid model**

##### **CIO (parent) + CIC (delivery arm)**

##### **How it works:**

- **CIO**
  - Holds funding
  - Provides governance

## Agenda Item 8

- Oversees priorities and outcomes
- **CIC**
  - Delivers projects
  - Trades and generates income

### Why this works

- Separates oversight from delivery
- Reduces risk to public funding
- Allows commercial flexibility where needed

This model is commonly used where:

- Public funding + community governance + delivery activity all need to sit together

### **Option 4: use an existing established community organisation to deliver the Pride in Place programme.**

Under this option, an existing, established local community organisation would be appointed to act as the accountable body and delivery organisation for the Pride in Place (PiP) programme.

The Scarborough Neighbourhood Board would continue to sit separately, in the same way it currently sits outside the Council, but the community organisation would take on financial management, assurance, and accountability for delivery of the programme instead of the Council.

### **Option 5: Independent Body with Local Authority Support (Service Level Agreement Model)**

Under this option, the Scarborough Neighbourhood Board would establish itself as an independent, community-led body with its own governance arrangements and resources, including staff where required.

The Board would operate independently in terms of decision-making and delivery, but the Council would continue to provide key support functions, such as legal and financial management, through a formal Service Level Agreement (SLA). This could include, for example, financial administration, audit requirements, legal advice, and assurance processes linked to public funding.