

FEBRUARY 2020 MEETING MINUTES

Woodend
The Crescent
Scarborough, YO11 2PW

Thursday 27th February
12pm-2:30pm

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Financial Update
3. SBC Internal Ballot Investigation
4. Comms
5. Projects
6. AOB

ATTENDEES

Clive Rowe-Evans (CRE)
Kerry Carruthers (KC)
James Hodgson (JH)
Mark Miller (MM)
Jayne Nendick (JN)
Dean Bullen (D-B)
Rudi Barman (RB)
Michael Graham (MG)
Mark Kibblewhite (MK) – On behalf of DB
Jo Dooley (JD) – On behalf of SH

PROXY

Ben Gilligan (BG)
Mo Driffield (MD)
Richard Bradley (R-B)
Pete Gibson (PG)
Tony Snow (TS)

APOLOGIES

David Bowe DB
Janet Deacon (J-D)
Ben Gilligan (BG)
Cllr. Horton (SH)
Pete Gibson (PG)
Mo Driffield (MD)
Richard Bradley (R-B)
Tony Snow (TS)

1.Welcome / Introductions / Minutes

January 8th Actions completed and minutes accepted

2.Quorum

Meeting with quorate: 61.5% in attendance

Quorum clarified for voting purposes (including proxies):

19% Voting share between public bodies: – 3 present, 1 authorised via proxy % share is 6.3% each for general votes and 4.75% for pre-determined votes allowing proxies.

81% Voting share between private sector directors: 5 present, 4 authorised via proxy,% share is 16.2% for general votes and 9% for pre-determined votes allowing proxies.

NB: Abstentions which affect voting % and calculations are shown below

CRE: Confirmed that proxies are only acceptable for votes when the board is quorate.

3.Financial Update

CRE: Figures presented up to and inclusive of 31st January 2020
Highlighted revenue received and amount of levy payers contributed
SBC Summons still not being issued until the SBC investigation is concluded
ERYC adjournment – new date 25.03.2020

4.SBC Internal Ballot Investigation

Report to be presented by the AEA to the audit committee on 19th March.
BID has requested to view the report prior to it being published.

The board requested clarification about what the report/investigation covers

CRE: Advised the terms of reference related to SBC decision, handling and conduct of the November 2018 ballot, but believe it has been extended into how the BID was developed.

Board queried whether the BID Board could take action against SBC for reputational damage being incurred due to ongoing delays and lack of information.

JH: Advised that proof would be required to evidence damage financial/reputation

The board queried the lack of SBC representation at BID Board meetings, including why Information was appearing in local media. By not updating the BID on the reports progress, it was a) not informed and b) putting undue pressure on the company to issue last minute responses.

Additional questioned raised by the board:

- Why and how are SBC able to prevent issuing summons which is a statutory requirement?
- Why are SBC not adhering to the operating agreement?

ACTION: KC to write to Nick Edwards on behalf of the Board and request an update and access to the report.

5.Internal / External Communications

PR plan and internal / external communication discussed

KC: Requested the board to provide constructive feedback and suggestions for improvements beyond email communication.

JN: Requested for the BID team to look at social impact stories and how the BID is affecting the community.

D-B: A more robust and positive response to negative stories in the media.

MM/JH In agreement

D-B: Increase more interaction and decisions to be made by companies.

Refute more false claims about the BID.

More direct emails to levy payers in a non-corporate format – more conversational.

JN: Suggested a staggered drip feed of information to not provoke a backlash.

KC: Requested clearer direction from the board to form action points.

JH: PR to be aimed at levy payers, not the public.

Cover information such as “what is a BID”.

D-B: Emails to be sent by directors and to have access to company data.

KC: Advised that data was retained by the company and not for individuals own use.

MG: Explained that fact sheets are ways to engage dialogue and would be beneficial

Additional suggestion for the Chair to write a letter to the levy payers

KC: Showed examples of fact sheets and other methods used before requesting further clarification on how the Board wanted the information to be better communicated.

MK: Suggested a directors blog – proves beneficial for NYCC

D-B: Agreed he would write a blog to send to the rest of the board

RB: Expressed that he would not want emails/blogs by his name until the investigation was concluded

ACTION: Directors to provide a draft of what they would like including in a blog which can be launched post investigation

6. Projects

Scarborough Stories

Project outline, budget and background provided to the Board

VOTE: 100% In Favour (Including Proxies)

Protect Agenda

Reminder of the protect agenda, as per the business plan discussed with the Board.

REQUEST: KC requested guidance from the Board on whether they wished to proceed with small scale projects, or look to fund larger, long term ambitious projects.

Open discussion encouraged

SUGGESTIONS: MK: EV Points

JD: Proposed a survey is created and presented to businesses re on site charging

MM: Dispose waste responsibly signs

ACTION: KC to put together a series of ideas for the Board to consider

International event opportunity.

Project outline, scoping budget and background provided to the Board

Full and frank discussion around logistics, scoping costs and BID ability to create independently without the associated brand and support of international artists

ACTION: MM to arrange meeting with local artist to discuss commissioning of sculptures.

Decision supported by JH/RB/DB

Approved project updates: PA Equipment: 6.2.2020-12.2.2020

Option 1: Equipment to be provided to Scarborough group to manage and maintain (Scarborough Fund)

3 Local Authorities: 6.33% voting share each (1 Abstain)
7 Private Sector: 11.57% voting share each (2 Abstain)
Board Vote: In favour: 3 (29.47%)
Against: 7 (70.51%)
Abstain: 3

Option 2: Equipment to be managed and maintained by BID for all areas (Coastal Fund)

3 Local Authorities: 6.33% voting share each (1 Abstain)
7 Private Sector: 11.57% voting share each (2 Abstain)
Board Vote: **In favour: 5 (52.61%) Vote carried**
Against: 5 (47.37%)
Abstain: 3



Option 3: Equipment to be managed and maintained by BID for Scarborough only (Scarborough Fund)

3 Local Authorities: 6.33% voting share each (1 Abstain)
7 Private Sector: 11.57% voting share each (2 Abstain)
Board Vote: In favour: 5 (47.37%)
Against: 5 (52.61%)
Abstain: 3

AOB:

No issues raised

Actions:

- MM: To arrange meeting with local artist to discuss commissioning of sculptures 
- BOARD: To all provide a draft of what they would like including in a blog which can be launched post investigation
- KC: Put together a series of ideas for the Board to consider ref protect agenda 
- KC: To write to Nick Edwards on behalf of the Board and request an update and access to SBC report. 