

**Coin Street Secondary Housing Co-operative**

**Minutes of Cross Co-operative Arrangements Review Meeting – Wednesday 17 September 2025**

---

**Present**

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| Robert Lindsey  | Redwood Housing Co-operative MC Member (Meeting Chair)                  |
| Clare Solomon   | Redwood Housing Co-operative Chair                                      |
| Angela Harris   | Redwood Housing Co-operative MC Member (via Zoom)                       |
| Jack Elderton   | Redwood Housing Co-operative MC Member (via Zoom)                       |
| Dearbhla Molloy | Iroko Housing Co-operative (via Zoom)                                   |
| Richard Mallett | Iroko Housing Co-operative MC Member (via Zoom)                         |
| Caroline Bryant | Iroko Housing Co-operative  |
| David Hopkins   | Coin Street Director of Community                                       |
| Helen Manley    | Coin Street Director of Finance (via Zoom)                              |
| Cait Saunders   | Coin Street Head of External Relations (via Zoom)                       |
| Paul Kelly      | Coin Street Project Manager Consultant (via Zoom)                       |
| Simon Basey     | Coin Street Facilitators/Project Manager Implementation Phase (minutes) |

**Apologies**

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Tom Keller       | Palm Housing Co-operative Chair  |
| Mark Bailey      | Redwood Housing Co-operative MC Member                                     |
| Alison Robert    | Redwood Housing Co-operative MC Member                                     |
| Marie Kapszewicz | Coin Street Housing Lead   |
| Nic Bliss        | Coin Street Facilitators/Project Manager Consultant – Implementation Phase |
| Paul Field       | Palm Housing Co-operative MC Member  |
| Phil Morris      | CSS Change Working Group Adviser   |

**1. Welcome and Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were noted

**2. Minutes and Actions Arising**

The Chair highlighted that he had received two requests to discuss the EDL march that had occurred the previous weekend, starting around the Coin Street Estate. He proposed that this be covered in AOB and that other agenda items would be shaved to provide enough time to discuss this topic properly. Clare Solomon queried why this wouldn't be an action arising and therefore discussed at the front of the meeting?

Actions arising was not included on the agenda as a separate heading on this occasion. Clare Solomon (CS) proposed that it should be a standing item on the agenda as she found it very useful. The was unanimously **approved**.

Simon Basey (SB) introduced the minutes. There were some clarifications received from Clare, Caroline Bryant (CB) and Tom Keller (TK) regarding comments attributed to them from the meeting. None of these impacted any decision or actions from the meeting. SB outlined there was one material clarification put up by CB regarding the Chair proxy entitlement – she clarified that as well as deciding that the Chair should not hold more than one proxy, it was also confirmed in the meeting that the Chair did not have a casting vote on any motion. If a vote is tied, then the motion fails. The rest of the members had no objection to this amendment to the minutes.

The minutes were then **approved unanimously**.

The Chair added an additional point of matters arising and confirmed that the members had chosen **South Bank Cooperative** as the new name for the Co-op. He was congratulated by CS who reminded him that he had suggested the name in the first place! CB also noted that we would have to potentially tweak the name to decide the final configuration. SB agreed and noted that there were two possible areas for tweaks – firstly the exact wording (not affecting the South Bank name) and whether to include 'Housing' or 'Community' in the name. Secondly, the formal legal name for registration, which would not affect what the co-op would choose to be known by publicly.

CS agreed and noted that a couple of members had questioned why it would be changed, but she noted that throughout it had been clearly communicated that small changes may be made to formulate the final name and get it registered.

David Hopkins (DH) also added a short update at this point (in the absence of Nic Bliss) on the rules review by Anthony Collins Solicitors (ACS). He shared that the solicitors had been very positive on their assessment of the rules and had commented supportively on some of the additions made to the standard CCH wordings. ACS advised that there were some points – as they were non-standard – that might need explaining carefully to the FCA as part of the clearance process and minor alterations may be needed to enable this. None of these changes would materially affect the Rules as approved by CCAR. A further update would be brought by NB to the next meeting. The CCAR was satisfied with this update and had no further questions.

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| Actions: | a) SB to ensure that Matters Arising is a standing item on the agenda for CCAR<br>b) Final name for the Co-op to be on the next CCAR meeting agenda<br>c) NB to provide an update to the next CCAR on the legal review of the rules and FCA registration |
|----------|--|

### 3. CCAR Terms of Reference

SB introduced the CCAR ToR – the CCAR asked for these to be brought to this meeting for review and approval. SB shared that he had updated the previous version based on the minutes of the last meeting where this item was discussed. He also added clause 1.4 to clarify where the decision-making responsibility would pass over from CCAR to the Shadow MC as this was raised at the last CCAR meeting.

CS raised a question on the decision-making remit. CCAR doesn't make decisions about everything, and CSS has some role to play in this as well. She asked if it could be clarified in clause 1.4 that what passes over to the Shadow MC is decision-making responsibility in certain areas. Other members agreed and suggested that the clause be amended to be specific that it relates only to decision-making in the areas that CCAR is currently responsible. This suggestion was agreed by other members of the CCAR.

The Chair also noted he had picked up two corrections that needed to be made. The first was in clause 3.5, where it should be removed that the CSS team will chair considering clause 3.8 that has been added. The second was to specify in clause 4.4 that the quorum is of 5 tenant members. Both these changes were agreed.

The Chair proposed a vote on the ToR including the changes. This was **unanimously approved**. The Chair suggested that this could be added to the Housing Hub now that this is an approved document.

Actions: d) SB to make amendments as proposed. CS to add to the Housing Hub once done.

#### 4. South Bank Co-op Shadow Management Committee

SB introduce the paper sharing the background that this paper has been written on behalf of the CSS Nominations Committee but was brought to CCAR for review and comment. In writing it he had used previous CCAR discussions to generate the process, particularly in terms of designing the approach to make it suitable for members who may feel excluded by a very corporate and formal way of working.

He shared that the Nominations Committee had reviewed the process earlier in the day and asked for changes to allow either a written or video application (at the option of the applicant), to specify how DEI will be included in the selection criteria and to open up the interview location to permit applicants to choose somewhere that they will feel comfortable.

CS commented that she agreed with the choice to add the option to apply either via video or written as she was going to raise the question of the video application. SB confirmed that the intention was to allow either, whichever applicants preferred, but that in either approach the same content should be included. CB asked how or why the ENC might exclude anyone from standing – what would be the assessment criteria? SB answered that this linked to the application form where you must declare details such as if you have had any previous convictions, had to declare bankruptcy or been struck off as a director and these would be the criteria for assessing poor character.

There was some discussion held around training that will commence in October and how this might feed into the selection process. It was commented that members had heard of people who might be interested in attending training but did not know whether they could take part without automatically putting themselves forward for selection for the Shadow MC. SB replied that it was envisaged that anyone should be able to attend training if they were interested, but you then only get considered for the Shadow MC if you submit an application.

Discussion expanded as to whether the membership should be reminded about the training and encouraged to attend, especially since in speaking to Paul Kelly (PK) many had shown an interest in there being more training offered to members. It was suggested that Cait Saunders could produce a flyer to let people know about training sessions so more people might be encouraged to attend. Against this it was noted that perhaps due to the nature of the sessions in preparing attendees for MC roles the content may not be right for all members and encouraging them to attend could be counter-productive if they do not find it engaging.

Richard Mallett (RM) proposed holding mandatory training sessions for all members leading up to signing the new tenancy agreement. There was support for this idea and PK said he would take this away and work a proposal into his feedback/recommendations present from discussions with members. He will be bringing this to CCAR on October 8.

CS checked how in practice DEI would be handled and how CCAR could be confident that the ENC will take this properly into account when selecting the Shadow MC. SB confirmed that the Nominations Committee suggestion was to state in the process that both CCAR and CSS Nominations Committee may provide specific guidance to the ENC as to both the importance of this issue and how they would like them to approach it. The ENC can then use this guidance to directly influence how they conduct assessments for the Shadow MC. SB also commented that by using the assessment scoring proposed by NB at a previous CCAR meeting this would allow the selection panel to consider a more rounded assessment of a candidate's suitability rather than focussing only on knowledge and governance experience.

SB asked for suggestions from CCAR members as to who they would want to propose as their nominees to join the interview panel for the Shadow MC. CS asked for more time to discuss as she did not feel the recommendation of members should be rushed through the meeting. She requested it be brought back to the October 8 meeting, but SB advised that to meet the selection timelines the CCAR nominees would need to be confirmed on that date.

It was agreed to give a week for each Co-op's CCAR members to discuss possible nominees for the ENC and agree between themselves who they would put forward. This would allow for multiple perspectives to go into the nomination rather than just one person's view and to potentially check interest with the potential nominees. Once SB has the names from each Co-op then he will speak to the people proposed to check their willingness to be involved and time availability ahead of the October 8 meeting.

Actions: e) SB/PK/NB to incorporate training proposal for all members into decision and engagement timeline to be presented at the October 8 CCAR meeting  
f) Each Co-op to send suggestions for CCAR reps on interview panel to SB by Sep 24  
g) SB to check with nominees as to interest and availability and bring back a final shortlist to CCAR for decision on October 8

## 5. Managing Agent Selection Process

SB gave an update on the selection process, confirming that 5 possible agents were still currently in the tender process. Regrets had been received from Novo, MB Housing and Soho Housing Association.

Discussion for this meeting was to focus on the selection criteria for the Managing Agent and an initial brainstorm of who might make that selection decision. SB highlighted that the tender pack had already been sent with selection criteria included (which CCAR approved) but that small changes would be possible. In particular, it had been suggested by CSS that the short-listed agents be invited to meet residents at a drop-in session so they can share their thoughts on who they would like to be appointed.

CS asked how we might capture people's views. PK spoke about his experiences in Liverpool and how inviting members to meet potential agents was a very positive thing to do as it made residents feel more engaged in the process. He suggested capturing feedback either via comments on post-it notes or simply by writing down the agent they liked the best. There was discussion as to whether people should turn up to see presentations by all the short-listed agents during a set timeline, but SB suggested that it would be simpler to have agents be in one place for a period of time to allow residents to drop-in whenever it could fit into their day – that route might be more likely to get better attendance. If all agents were presenting, then it could be a long meeting which might put some members off from getting involved.

DH suggested it could be done on a Saturday. CCAR members generally were not in favour of this as weekends can be very busy for many people. CB thought a weekday would be better and noted that October Half Term should be avoided as a lot of people will be away. It was agreed that SB should circulate some possible dates/times via a doodle poll to help agree a date for the event – it was noted that we wanted to decide well in advance to mean early communications can be sent out to Co-op members.

SB moved discussion on to who could make the selection on the managing agent. He outlined a possible approach for discussion which would involve the following selection panel composition:

- 3 x CCAR members
- 1 x CSS representative
- 1 x CSCB representative
- 1-2 x Co-op members

DH mentioned that the new Estates Manager at CSCB would be a good person to include since he will be able to feed in experience of the current services provided to help inform selection. CB wondered whether some of the existing agents could be included if they are not participating as they also will bring experience of managing on behalf of the current co-ops. Caution was advised on doing this both because they may need paying for this service and it might also cause conflicts since they could be competing against the short-listed agents to win other contracts.

RL thought that there were skills held by members, particularly those involved as Maintenance Officers that could be useful to have on the panel, and it would be worth including them.

SB agreed to feed the suggestions into a proposal to be discussed at the next meeting.

|  |
|--|
| <p>Actions:    h) SB to circulate possible dates for a 'Meet the Agents' drop-in event for residents<br/>              j) SB to bring back proposal around Managing Agent selection group to October 8<br/>                  CCAR for decision</p> |
|--|

## **6. Communications Update**

Cait Saunders followed up on the discussions held at the last CCAR meeting regarding sharing information on the Housing Hub. She checked that members had received the minutes sent out with the Agenda and asked if anyone wanted to request amendments before they were added to the Housing Hub. CCAR members were happy as they were, and Cait said she would get those added along with any other approved policies that would be relevant to members (Terms of Reference already noted from this meeting).

It was noted that some members claim not to be aware of the new upcoming co-op changes. Paul Kelly said he has reminded co-op members that the information can be found in the co-op Bulletin. Cait noted there are several significant communications projects coming up – communications about the new shadow board, communicating the change of managing agent/property services and the crucial transfer vote. Cait asked members for help to plan effective communication over the coming months. Clare Solomon suggested the CCAR have a longer session on comms at the next meeting.

Cait noted the success of the co-op BBQ. Jack Elderton noted that it would be good to have a multicultural co-op event following the Tommy Robinson march. Cait confirmed that Coin Street is hoping to host something like this for the whole community and, if this gets confirmed, Coin Street would welcome co-op participation.

## **7. AOB / Meetings**

The Chair raised the topic of Tommy Robinson's 'Unite the Kingdom' rally. He indicated that he did not wish for it to be a postmortem, but to look at what happens next and how we work to ensure it does not happen again.

It was commented that members were disappointed that Coin Street had not been more active around the event in bringing people together and helping to prepare residents for the event. It was felt that Coin Street is not campaigning as it used to and this is an issue that it can really use its voice on behalf of the local community. DH responded that Coin Street did make sure that communications went out to all residents and tried to support as much as possible. He agreed that there was a role for Coin Street to play going forward in co-ordinating for the whole community and accessing forums to raise how this march was handled and why it was given approval.

It was noted by a number of members that the police presence was totally inadequate and meant that the community did not feel safe or protected, and in many cases could not leave their homes throughout the day.

The question was raised as to what local MPs were doing about this and how they were engaged. DH advised that they have had several contacts with Florence Eshalomi (MP for Vauxhall and Camberwell Green), but Neil Coyle (MP for Bermondsey and Old Southwark) had been less active recently. It was suggested that the South Bank Forum could be an appropriate route to raise unhappiness with the approval of the march and the police management of the day. DH clarified that there are two forums – one is residential, and the other includes businesses as well. Florence and Neil are the Chairs of SoWN but are also active in South Bank Employers Group. It was felt that it would be appropriate to speak to the Employers Group for this to be discussed at the next meeting. DH agreed to take an action on this.

CCAR members requested that a senior police representative, who had direct involvement with approving the march, should be present to answer questions and hear from impacted local residents/businesses. Feeding back to a local police rep who was not involved in making the decision to allow the event would not be useful.

Some CCAR members then described the serious emotional impact that the march had on them – leaving them trapped at home, unable to leave the building or be visited by friends/family, while march attendees remained in the area creating noise, disturbance and waste until late in the evening on that day. They expressed that this was an extremely traumatic experience and has caused a huge amount of anxiety.

It was asked that Coin Street lead on working to bring all the Co-ops together – it should be an effort across all neighbourhood groups (including Mulberry) and not just guided by CCAR. As mentioned above, Cait Saunders shared that there are plans to hold a community event in the aftermath of the march and she would keep all Co-op members informed on plans.

|  |
|--|
| <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>k) DH to liaise with South Bank Forum to schedule discussion regarding approval and policing of the march with other local community stakeholders. This discussion should include local MPs and senior Police representatives</li><li>l) DH to consider Coin Street role in supporting the community and lessons learned for any future event</li><li>m) Cait S to keep all Co-ops informed regarding planning for a community event</li></ul> |
|--|

Next meetings: October 8 / October 22 / November 5