

Coin Street Secondary Housing Co-operative

Minutes of Cross Co-operative Arrangements Review Meeting – Wednesday 18 June 2025

Present

Clare Solomon	Redwood Housing Co-operative – Chair (and Chair of mtg)
Cait Sanders	Coin Street Head of External Relations
Paul Field	Palm Housing Co-operative MC Member
Robert Lindsey	Redwood Housing Co-operative – Vice chair
Mark Bailey	Redwood Housing Co-operative
Tom Keller	Palm Housing Co-operative – Chair
Richard Mallet	Iroko Housing Co-operative – MC member
Helen Manley	Coin Street Chief Financial Officer
Phil Morris	CSS Advisor Change Working Group Member- (via zoom)
David Hopkins	Coin Street Director of Community (minutes)
Nic Bliss	Coin Street Facilitators/Project Manager Consultant – Implementation Phase (via zoom)
Simon Basey	Coin Street Facilitators/Project Manager Implementation Phase

Apologies

Caroline Bryant	Iroko Housing Co-operative Member
Marie Kapszewicz	Coin Street Housing Lead
Carol Thom	Palm Housing Co-operative MC Member
Jack Elderton	Redwood Housing Co-operative MC Member
Angela Harris	Redwood Housing Co-operative MC Member
Dearbhla Molloy	Iroko Housing Co-operative

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

1. Welcome, Declarations of interest and Code of Conduct

The minutes of the last meeting were agreed with no amendments.

No new declarations of interest were offered.

2. Minutes of last meeting and matters arising

Re actions from last meeting

- Action 1 reshare Code of Conduct outstanding
- Action 2 confirmation of sign off by Iroko and Redwood complete
- Action 3-7 – Nic has amended and circulated the materials for Shadow Board recruitment
- Actions 8 & 9 – still live (recruitment of Shadow Board)
- Action 10 – Nic has arranged a meeting on July 3rd
- Action 11 – complete – Nic has spoken with the longlist of potential managing agents agreed at last meeting

Matters arising

- David reported that CSS's request to CSCB to extend the headleases for Iroko, Palm and Redwood to their original 125 yr duration has been agreed in principle. This will assist the co-op in securing additional loan finance in the short and longer term
- David drew colleagues attention to the governance timeline included in the board papers and highlighted the proposals to run board training in summer / autumn and Shadow Board selection in October
- Members were reminded that we agreed to arrive at our 4 nominees for the Shadow Board (which will reduce to 2 ultimately) by the end of the month. It was agreed we would have this as a main item for the next CCAR meeting on the 2nd July 2025, with each co-op bringing its 4 nominees to that meeting. Tom shared his feedback that so far it has been a struggle finding the right people within Palm HC, and Paul reminded us that it is important to get the right gender balance across the whole board.

Action Agreed.

- a. All co-ops to bring back their 4 nominees for Shadow Board training (and later selection) to the next CCAR meeting on 2nd July 2025

3. Remuneration report

Simon presented the report by Campbell Tickell prepared for us to consider the question of whether any, all or none of the new Management Committee should be remunerated.

Simon reflected that based on the report it is unusual for a co-op to pay members of the management committee, and that CSS's experience is that they have been able to attract high quality candidates without payment as a result of the strong recognition of the Coin St "brand". He reported that all but one of the current CSS board members have said they would be happy to be considered for the independent MC member roles.

He is reflected that given the demands of the role and need to act as a representative there is a stronger case for paying the chair initially, and it would be possible to revisit the issue of payment to other management committee members in the future. He reminded us that any decision we make now is not forever it can be revisited again and this is just a starting point.

Robert asked based on the way the report is written who this makes this decision? **It was clarified this is a decision for the CCAR group to make**, which will later be ratified by the Shadow Board.

Robert asked if introducing paid management committee members would impact any of the co-ops indemnities – Helen confirmed it would not.

Tom shared his appreciation for the report which he found balanced and informative. His instinct is not to pay MC members, but he noted the report's finding that remuneration tends to bring better performance. Tom noted that the amounts of money are not huge and wouldn't replace a wage but might cause complications for any members on benefits.

There was much discussion about the impact of payment for MC duties on benefits and Clare agreed to follow up and look into the legal position. Nic made the point that there is no way of paying people on benefits that it wouldn't impact there. They would have to declare the income and that would then be taken into account - you can earn that money The issue of payment in kind also arose as an alternative to cash payment (inc. offering rent reduction).

Action Agreed.

- b. Clare to research and report back on the impact of accepting payment for MC duties on those in receipt of benefits including thresholds.

The proposal to pay the Chair was put to the vote, but did not gain enough consensus either for or against to make a decision on.

The related yet separate issue of whether the Management Committee should have an independent Chair (i.e. non-tenant). Nic confirmed that this is permissible under the draft rules. **It was agreed retaining the flexibility under the rules to be able to appoint an independent Chair as an option is helpful.**

Action Agreed.

It was agreed that:

- c. We will return to the issue of independent Chair at the next meeting and Simon will draft a paper on the pros and cons to inform decision making
- d. We will return to the issue of MC payment at the next meeting. All members will read the Campbell Tickell report and Clare is researching the position on impact to welfare benefits.
- e. We will amend draft rule clauses both to be able to appoint an independent Chair and to be able to pay MC members to give maximum manoeuvrability

4. Management solutions

Simon summarised the hybrid structure. Key features include

- Managing agent working alongside small directly employed staff team. Clear differentiation of roles between the two
- Staff roles (based on earlier CCAR discussions) – a lead officer for the co-op and a member participation role. The roles are set out but we have left open the precise details (full or part time; seconded via a partner or directly employed, job title etc)

Simon noted the general approach is not dissimilar from the changes that Redwood are currently implementing. **Robert agreed to share any processes with Simon that might be useful.**

Tom pointed out that the handyperson role currently in the structure as staff would need to be defined really clearly in terms of how they fit in, who they report to, how their work is set etc.

There was some discussion around the identity of the individual co-ops remaining post-merger. **It was generally agreed we wanted to transition away from holding onto the three names** and build something new everyone could feel part of. Tom reflected that there will always be different issues that affect different properties due to their distinct features. Pointing to the fact that this happens today within the existing co-ops – reflecting on the fact that in Palm members who live in the houses have different challenges to those who live in flats in the tower. He suggested we just need to focus on creating a mechanism for surfacing those distinct issues and interests within the co-op and have the means of addressing them effectively.

Richard suggested that working up a real life case study of how the arrangements would work based on a maintenance challenge within one of the co-ops would really help everyone understand. He gave the example of Iroko members not being able to access stores in the building.

The CCAR members approved the proposed structure unanimously.

Action Agreed.

It was agreed that:

- f. We will move forward on the basis of this structure and approach
- g. Simon will sketch out the substructure of the committees and working groups that will feed up to this top layer, and illustrate the approach using a case study example (for a forthcoming CCAR meeting).

5. Managing agent – informal discussions

Nic presented this item and explained this is more for information at this stage. He spoke to all of the managing agents on the longlist agreed at the last CCAR and reported all of them said they would put in a tender. All were enthusiastic and were keen to do so. The feedback received indicates the tender period as drafted was too short, so we have adjusted the timeline accordingly.

Nic reported we were keen to establish that there is a pool of managing agents capable and interested in taking this on– this exercise shows this is the case. Next step is to produce a draft tender document for the CCAR to review.

Tom reflected on Leathermarket having their own direct labour workforce – is this helpful? Nic explained that there have a new CEO, are keen to partner and that given that one of the challenges is trying to get good quality contractors this aspect could be interesting. He pointed out though that even if they were not selected as the managing agent the co-op could still work with the direct labour side of the organisation separately.

Clare raised the issue of London Living Wage. Are we going to be a London Living Wage org and require this for the managing agent? **It was agreed we should and this will be included into the final specification. It was also agreed to include this on a future CCAR agenda.**

Nic shared that each MA will need specific data on number of repairs, numbers of voids, number of ASB incidents etc. He pointed out he is putting together a list of bits of info we need and that CSS will be asking for each co-ops help in populating this info to inform the tender process. Richard pointed out that lots of our doors / windows in Coin St Co-ops are non-standard, and that this should be highlighted as part of the tender docs.

It was agreed unanimously that we approve the progress on this area so far and are happy to move onto the next stage now.

Action Agreed.

It was agreed that:

- h. We approve the approach taken and are happy to move to the next stage
- i. Nic will draft a tender document for the CCAR to review
- j. We will further consider London Living Wage at the next CCAR meeting

6. Naming of the co-op

It was reported that there had been one name suggestion emerge from the membership as well as others from around the CCAR table. We agreed we need a process for determining the name and it is felt by all this is an excellent opportunity to engage the wider membership.

The “boaty mcboat face” factor was considered and it was agreed that we should begin by asking members for name suggestions, these come back to the CCAR (anonymously) to be put into a shortlist of names (ruling out any daft ones) and then this can be put to a vote by the membership.

Paul suggested as part of this call to the membership for suggestions we should emphasise we are looking for a name that reflects the community setting we are operating in.

The pros and cons of having “Coin St” somewhere in the name were debated and it was felt in any shortlist put to the members for a vote it would make sense to have a “Coin St” option for members to consider.

It was pointed out further down the track there would be a number of practical issues to do with any name change to sort out (signs, post office addresses etc).

Nic asked us to agree a working title to use between now and the final name being selected. The CCAR agreed the working title should be “Coin St Housing Co-op”.

Action Agreed.

It was agreed that:

- k. The membership should decide on the name via a democratic process
- l. Cait will design a process to invite members to suggest names and then collate these anonymously to present back to CCAR to arrive at a shortlist to put to a member vote

7. Reflections, recap and AOB

It was agreed items for the following future CCAR meetings will include

- Independent Chair
- Payment for Board members
- Shadow Board nominees report back
- Governance substructure (next layer down)
- Managing agent next stage
- London Living Wage
- Progress on naming project

It was agreed the CSS team will email out ahead of the meeting to call for any further agenda items for inclusion.

It was further agreed that Clare’s suggestion that we commit to avoid making decisions on key issues via email and commit to bringing them to a meeting for agreement.

Clare was thanked by members for chairing the meeting so effectively. It was suggested that Clare take on the role of chairing CCAR meetings for this next period, and Clare said she would be willing to do so, availability permitting (she is away in August).

Cait raised the possibility of another co-op BBQ over the summer, offering her help to organise. The suggestion of Iroko hosting this in their garden space was suggested and welcomed, with Richard’s caveat that we need to explore this carefully bearing in mind sensitivities about inviting a large group of new people in a private space next to people’s homes.

Action Agreed.

It was agreed that:

- m. Clare will take on the role of CCAR Chair for the next phase, availability permitting
- n. Simon and Marie will email everyone ahead of the next CCAR meeting to invite suggestions for agenda items
- o. We should avoid as a general rule trying to take decisions via email, unless explicitly agreed by CCAR members
- p. Cait will follow up with Richard initially on the suggestion of a BBQ hosted in the Iroko garden

8, Date of next meetings

- 2 July
- 23 July
- 13 August
- 3 September