

Coin Street Secondary Housing Co-operative

Minutes of Cross Co-operative Arrangements Review Meeting – Wednesday 2 July 2025

Present

Clare Solomon	Redwood Housing Co-operative – Chair (and Chair of mtg)
Cait Saunders	Coin Street Head of External Relations
Paul Field	Palm Housing Co-operative MC Member
Caroline Bryant	Iroko Housing Co-operative
Mark Bailey	Redwood Housing Co-operative MC Member
Tom Keller	Palm Housing Co-operative – Chair
Dearbhla Molloy	Iroko Housing Co-operative
Jack Elderton	Redwood Housing Co-operative MC Member
Angela Harris	Redwood Housing Co-operative MC Member (via Zoom)
Alison Pinner	Coin Street Deputy Group Director
David Hopkins	Coin Street Director of Community
Marie Kapszewicz	Coin Street Housing Lead
Nic Bliss	Coin Street Facilitators/Project Manager Consultant – Implementation Phase
Simon Basey	Coin Street Facilitators/Project Manager Implementation Phase (minutes)

Apologies

Robert Lindsay	Redwood Housing Co-operative MC Member
Helen Manley	Coin Street Chief Financial Officer

Circulation

Alison Robert	Redwood Housing Co-operative MC Member
---------------	----------------------------------------

1. Welcome & Declarations of interest: There were no declarations of interest

2. Minutes & actions arising

The Chair proposed that going forward any corrections or amendments to the minutes should be proposed ahead of the meeting and the minutes should then be put forward for approval in the meeting as amended. **The proposal was unanimously approved.**

No amendments were proposed to the minutes in the meeting. These were approved by those attending.

Marie noted that she had an outstanding action around Terms of Reference (ToR) and Code of Conduct (CoC) to circulate these.

Actions:

- a. Marie to send ToR and CoC to CCAR members

3. Nominations to the Shadow MC

David introduced this item and outlined that we hoped to have the nominations from each of the co-ops today. He shared for information the timeline around Shadow Management Committee process as follows:

1. *Assemble pool of up to 4 candidates from each co-op (Redwood, Palm, Iroko) who will form the pool from which Shadow Board are selected (and other key committees may draw from this pool)*
2. *Assemble pool of candidates from CSS for same*
3. *Undertake training together as one group in Summer 25*
4. *Post-training (i.e. in Sept or Oct) go through a process together to arrive at the 12 people who will form the Shadow Board. This will be undertaken by the candidate pool working with the CCAR (lots of overlap anticipated)*
5. *Once the shadow MC are agreed, the Shadow MC should agree exec roles (Chair, Secretary etc)*
6. *Shadow MC will then start working formally with the CSS board to “shadow”*
7. *When the new co-op is officially formed the governance structure and the MC and key committee members will be ratified by the membership.*

There was a point of information raised to clarify when the final constitution of the MC was planned for – **confirm that the project timeline has this in October 2025.**

The Chair opened the topic up for discussion. A question of gender balance/diversity on the MC was raised. It was agreed to revisit this as part of the narrowing process to select the final MC and this will be broad back to the CCAR in 2-3 meetings time.

It was requested that each co-op outline if they have nominees:

Iroko – none to propose

Palm – 1 definite / 1 reluctant

Redwood – 2 names so far put forward, the Redwood MC have reached out to 3 other people in the co-op to encourage them to join.

A point was raised around the accessibility of the communications to encourage people to be involved – Dearbhla felt that they needed to be more engaging and use less business speak. Tom countered that they do need to be professionally constructed so potential members know what they are taking on.

A late agenda point was raised by Robert querying the initial process for the co-ops selecting the potential MC members. It was clarified that this was always intended to be informal and left to the co-ops to propose members by whatever process they choose since there will be a uniform selection process to follow when selecting the final MC members. It was requested by the other Co-ops that Redwood share the note sent out in case they might be able to use it to target potential MC members who could be excellent candidates in this informal way.

David and Marie offered to meet with the co-ops to explore how they could support and encourage suitable candidates to come forward.

Simon gave an update regarding a funding proposal discussed at a previous CCAR meeting for CSS/CSCB to fund an engagement project to reach out to all members and get a better understanding of barriers to participation and to encourage greater engagement. It was discussed how this should be approved in order to ensure it can move forward swiftly. Agreement was reached that depending on what the ask will be of the CCAR in approving it can either be done via email or brought to the next CCAR. Simon to deliver this.

Actions:

- b. Clare to ask Robert to share the email template for approaching possible MC members
- c. David and Marie to liaise with co-ops to support them in the MC member nomination process
- d. Simon to progress funding proposal for engagement project and propose to CCAR for approve in an appropriate manner

4. Board Pay & Independent Chair

The Chair recapped the discussions at the previous meeting and report back on the benefits action.

Caroline proposed that the role of the Chair should be members only. Paul supported this based on the skills and experience of co-op members. **The committee approved this proposal.**

Discussion moved on to the topic of remuneration for the board. Members spoke in favour citing preference for sliding scale based on role, and to encourage people with professional skills to be involved. David cautioned that any decision to pay has to be made with an eye on accountability to the membership as any expenditure directly affects their service charge and rent, however added that this is an important body for the co-op and you want the right people managing affairs.

Tom highlighted that the Chair roles are significantly more work and should be paid accordingly. There was debate around whether board pay should be 'token' but the majority feeling is that if you want the best possible MC members you have to pay fairly, also noting the discussion at the previous CCAR around aspirations to be a London Living Wage employer. Attention was drawn to the comment in the Campbell Tickell report that paid boards tend to have better outcomes.

Marie noted that having discussed the topic, the CSS Governance Committee view was that the Chair alone should be remunerated.

Caroline highlighted that there is a sense of frustration with people not being willing to participate and paying a decent amount can encourage members to be involved and reward them for doing this.

The Chair moved to ask for a vote on the principle of being able to pay the MC members. **This was unanimously approved.**

Discussion moved to considering which MC members should be paid. It was noted that the CT indicative pay scale would generate a cost to the co-op of between £15-22k. General feeling is that this would be affordable if it was agreed that this is the best use of money to ensure good outcomes for the co-op. It was agreed to bring a draft proposal to the next CCAR meeting to discuss specifics about pay for MC members.

Actions:

- e. Simon to note the need for a discussion at next CCAR to discuss what the expected time commitments would be for MC members
- f. Proposal to be brought to next CCAR meeting (July 23) with indicative pay for MC members for discussion

5. Managing Agent Tender Pack

The Chair indicated that they were not in favour of discussion around technical details at a meeting and that this should be done by a sub-group to save time of all CCAR members. It was also noted that the main tender document had been circulated late, which had prevented many CCAR members having time to review.

A further concern was flagged around timeline for the managing agent hire as the co-ops will not vote on merge until Jan/Feb, which is after the planned November date to appoint a managing agent. Nic responded that we do need to move forward with the tender process and prospective agents are well aware of the risk that tender submissions do not guarantee that they will win the business. He also confirmed that any contract would not come into force until after the new co-op is established. David added that we would be completely transparent with prospective agents regarding the project timelines and the steps to follow. He did highlight the extensive process that has been undertaken to date as part of this transition, including the consultation, which clearly backed proceeding with a merger.

It was discussed how to proceed with the review of this document, especially in view of the tender doc needing to be approved by August 13, 2025. Simon proposed that CCAR members read through and deliver any comments to Nic ahead of the next meeting, and this item can then be brought back with suggestions/amendments for approval. **This suggestion was agreed.**

Actions:

g. Members to review the tender documents and provide any comments or amendments to Nic ahead of the next CCAR on July 23, 2025.

It was proposed at this point to extend the meeting by 10 minutes – this was not supported.

6. Progress on naming project

Cait shared that there are currently 4 suggestions, of which one is not possible to progress, and one cannot be used as a co-op already have that name. Cait is going to push again for more idea next week via a flyer to all properties. The Chair also requested a specific email on this topic should be sent out also as this is a great opportunity where we can engage the membership directly in decision-making.

A request was made that we look again into the possibility of using South Bank Co-op since that was a favoured option by many CCAR members.

A picnic was proposed for September 6, 2025 in response to requests for a member event. Cait shared she had approached Iroko to use their garden. They have agreed in principle but asked for some more details to progress. The date was noted by members. It was suggested that this would be an opportunity to tie in with the naming and announce the new co-op name at this event.

Actions:

h. Cait to distribute flyers and email to engage membership to propose name ideas.

7. AOB

Agreed to discuss the CCH conference in London at the next meeting.

Caroline has agreed to Chair if she can make the date, Simon as a back-up if she is unable to attend.

Actions:

- i. Discuss attendance at CCH conference in London at next CCAR meeting

Date of next meetings

- 23 July
- 13 August
- 3 September