

# MARCH 4TH 2022 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

# 1. Welcome

#### In attendance

CRE: Clive Rowe-Evans KC: Kerry Carruthers KB: Karl Battersby JE: Cllr J Evison

JD: Janet Deacon (RB Alternate)

MG: Michael Graham JH: John Harding JN: Jayne Nendick BG: Ben Gilligan

MC: Martyn Coltman

# **Proxy**

N/A

# **Apologies**

PG: Pete Gibson MD: Mo Driffield



# MARCH 4TH 2022 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

#### 2. Minutes

1 x Action outstanding: KC review of Flexi-Grant system: KC still awaiting a date CRE/MC/MG KPI Meeting: Meeting completed and review prepared for directors

Minutes: All in agreement and accepted

# 3. Member Register

Payment register received from SBC, and amendments accepted as per Articles of Association

# 4. Evaluating Success

CRE outlined the discussions had with MC/MG and feedback from British BIDs on current practices. Members of the board raised concerns over how the company is communicating its successes and awareness of the scale of projects supported against the business plan.

KC: Requested the board again to outline communication to whom and via what medium.

JH: Provided feedback around comms strategies and different messaging that could be used

JD: Highlighted positively members of the BID team attending meetings where businesses participate to share news about the BID.

KB: Passed feedback on how other BIDs engage with the press via a dedicated member of the board.

JN: Suggested looking at the social impact review of projects to share with businesses.

MG: Requested a monthly summary for the directors

CRE: Requested permission from the board to form a working party to review BID comms and provide feedback.

Board agreed and JH/KB to join CRE

Action: KC to issue a monthly email update to directors

Action: KC to look at an alternative to directors' intranet due to directors' unable to use the current system where everything is stored.

Action: KC to review the outcome of BID Comms working group meeting

CRE: Advised the board that he will instruct a formal review by British BIDs in September



## 5. Local Authority Collections

\*Page 6-7 includes a summary for years 1-3

The review was discussed and shared with the board.

CRE: Brought attention to SBC collections and provided a breakdown to the board of the collection process and problems experienced by SBC

CRE: Confirm that ERYC had been fulfilling their legal obligations as per the operating agreement.

JD: Confirmed SBC collection dates and confirmed CRE outline of the problems experienced by SBC CRE: Confirmed that the delays would not affect the BIDs delivery, but will affect additional funding of applications received and created.

JH: Questioned why the BID should be made to alter its plans due to a local authority not fulfilling its legal obligations

JN: Questioned how a local authority can delay and not notify when they are paid to perform a service

CRE: Confirmed that payment for collection services SBC provide is on hold to SBC until resolved

JH: Questioned the timeline of knowing when the BID will see the results of actions being taken, and what measures BID is making to ensure that SBC upholds its legal duty

JE: Raised that ERYC has been fulfilling their full legal duties and the unfairness on businesses that have paid that this action has created.

JH: Reiterated that questions being raised should not be directed at individuals at SBC, but at the management not recognising the pressures the team are obviously under and not providing them with support.

CRE: Confirmed that KC has sent SBC details of an agent they could outsource the collections to and they are reviewing.

KB: Suggested that a letter is sent from the board to SBC executives to highlight the problem they have created and invite a conversation on how to resolve it as they could advance funds to the BID to cover shortfalls while they are looking at their resource problems.

Additional discussions were had within the board before action was created for CRE.

Action: CRE to write to SBC executives

#### 6. Financial Review

All documents reviewed

## 7. Applications for funding

"Bridlington Open Topper" proposal: BG and MC unable to vote on this proposal due to COI

MC/KC provided an overview of the proposal to the board, before opening for questions

JE: Requested that the marketing involved was visual so the investment can be widely recognised.

CRE put project to vote:

All directors able to vote in 100% agreement



External applications for review and discussions

Scarborough Studios: The Old Parcels Office

Scarburgh to Scarborough

SBC: 12 Month plan, inclusive of Welcome Ambassadors

Whitby in Bloom

ACTION: Board postponed decision dates until response received from SBC

Internal applications for review timescale discussions

Coastal In Bloom
YCB 100
Al Data Benchmarking

Business features and placemaking

ACTION: Board postponed decision dates until response received from SBC

•

5. AOB

Coastal Sculpture Collection: Dates and next steps shared with the board

Odyssey: Dates and next steps shared with the board Puffins Galore!: Date revision shared with the board

Action: KC requested directors to confirm their attendance at the above projects

Minutes Accepted 8.4.2022