SCARBOROUGH NEIGHBOURHOOD BOARD

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

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 strengths and weaknesses of each final project briefs and business cases. This was used 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 12th June 2026