

JOINT MEETING OF EXECUTIVE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE & V&P BOARD FOR POLICY PROJECT APPLICANT DIALOGUE

Online Meeting 1330- 15.30 hours on Monday 23 March 2025

MINUTES

Present

EOC	Values & Principles Board
Chair: Cllr J Robbins – Swindon Borough Council	Chair: Cllr M Patel – Brent Council
Vice- Chair: Cllr P Cassidy – Inverclyde Council	Vice- Chair: C Ward – Anthony Collins Solicitors
Cllr M.Stubbs – Newcastle Under Lyme Labour Group	Cllr D.Grocott -
Cllr B. Brownridge – Oldham Council (CCIN Accountable Body)	L. McIvor – Coop Heritage Trust
Cllr S Smith – Rochdale Council	D.Randall - Crystalisr
	S.Webster – Cooperatives UK
	G.Nash – CMS.COOP
	J.Bland – SBI/E3M
	Cllr S.Pallis – Hackney Council (From Item 2.1)
CCIN President: N Huckerby	
CCIN Support: P. Vallance – Membership, Strategy Events – Lead,	V.Barry Stanners – Digital Marketing
J.Downs – Oldham Council (CCIN Accountable Body)	
B.Greenwood – Rochdale	
F. Gibson – Cardiff Council	

Apologies

EOC	Values & Principles Board
Cllr P.Bradbury – Cardiff Council (Council commitments)	Vice-Chair: Cllr B Arnold Halewood Town Council (Travelling)
Cllr J. Alty – South Ribble Council (Personal circumstances)	Vice-Chair Cllr A Willoughby – North Herts Council (Council commitments)
	Cllr Lisa Denton - Cheshire West and Chester Council (Council commitments)
	Cllr D Darkin – Llanelli Town Council (Work commitments)
	Cllr P Bell – UNISON (Work commitments)
	G.Dowling – Coop Party (Work commitments)
	R.Harvey – Coop News (Work commitments)

Absent

EOC	Values & Principles Board
Cllr Shanika Mahendran -Milton Keynes Council	Cllr M Osbourne
Cllr J Fahy – Greenwich CDA	

For Item 2.1:	Jennifer Rouse – GMCA.
For Item 2.2:	Elaine Wood – Trafford Council Simon Bordon – Stretford Public Hall
For Item 2.3:	Michelle Rankin & Graham Hard – Royal Borough of Greenwich
For item 2.4:	Carol Ann Vallely & Jennifer Horn – Inverclyde Council
For Item 2.5:	Daniel Wainwright – Camden Council & Daniel Pitt – Old Diaorama Arts Centre

1. Welcome, introductions and apologies

Councillor Robbins welcomed all in attendance to the meeting, Apologies and absences to this meeting were noted.

2. Policy Project Conversations

Two Policy Lab applications and three Policy Prototypes were received from CCIN Members by the deadline for application submissions.

Representatives from each Project had been invited for a conversation as part of the CCIN Application Process.

Summary and Questions from each of these conversations are below.

2.1 Policy Lab Proposal – Leveraging Local investment for Community Wealth – GMCA

Proposal: Leveraging Local Investment for Community Wealth		
LAB	Lead Council: (GMCA) Presenter: Jen Rouse	CCIN budget request: £20,000
<p><u>Conversation:</u></p> <p><i>This project seeks to tackle the “finance pillar” of community wealth building that currently sits on the margins of mainstream economic policy. Wealth retention work is often siloed from colleagues dealing with finance and investment, leading to continued extraction from sectors such as care and other sectors even while councils talk about community wealth.</i></p> <p><i>Two-level approach:</i></p> <p><i>Mapping actions and opportunities to be better leveraged for community wealth:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Local and regional funds (pension funds, good growth funds, etc.)</i> • <i>National pots (e.g. dormant assets, impact economy work)</i> <p><i>Using Live examples / case studies and legal/policy analysis to distinguish perceived barriers from real ones and identify policy changes needed.</i></p> <p><i>GMCA’s role would be convening councils, gathering examples and contributing officer time, with CLES providing specialist capacity; At this point, £20k was framed to be used as buying in CLES time alongside significant in-kind council effort, which she suggested could equate to a much larger total project value.</i></p> <p><i>For the development of this project, CLES were approached directly. There was an opportunity to use the DPS to procure support that was preferred.</i></p> <p><i>What next after the report: Immediate, practical steps for places under current rules and a second layer of policy recommendations to push the system further.</i></p> <p><i>Acknowledgement of the need to bring in devolved perspectives (e.g. Scotland’s Community Wealth Building Act) and involve members beyond England</i></p>		
<p>Question themes</p> <p>A. Leadership and accountability</p>		

- How will responsibilities be divided between GMCA, CLES and other councils?

B. Budget and route to commission

- Please supply a short budget showing how other funds and resources (e.g. officer time, publication costs, meeting space) will be brought to this project alongside the CCIN contribution.
- The current budget appears to allocate the full £20k CCIN funding to CLES. Is this the intended arrangement, and what contribution (in-kind time, discounted rates or match funding) will CLES make beyond being paid in full from CCIN funds? You may find it helpful to reference examples and precedent from other affiliate-led Policy Projects.
- This project could help inform and draw in professional advice from a wider range of experts (for example, on impact investing and financing generative local economies). Can any of the resources be used to bring in this wider opinion and experience base, rather than relying solely on one affiliate?
- CCIN’s Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) is available to members to procure services from affiliates. In light of the discussion, would using the DPS (for CLES and/or other providers) be appropriate and helpful for this project?

C. Scope and realism

- Is the proposed programme of mapping local and national investment flows, assembling case studies and undertaking policy and legal analysis realistically deliverable within the timescale and £20k CCIN budget described?

D. Impact, innovation and reach

- What will councils be able to do differently at the end of this project – in practical terms – beyond reading a final report (e.g. concrete changes to how they engage pension funds, growth funds or other investors)?
- What areas are genuinely new and innovative about this proposal, compared to existing community wealth building work that CCIN members have already seen?
- How will you ensure that the learning and recommendations are relevant to members in devolved nations as well as England – for example, considering developments such as Scotland’s Community Wealth Building Act and different regulatory contexts?

2.2 Exploring the Local Property Partnership Model - Trafford

Proposal: Exploring the Local Property Partnership Model for town centre co-operation and regeneration.		
Prototype	Lead Council: Trafford Council Presenters: Elaine Wood Simon Borkin (Stretford Public Hall)	CCIN budget request: £2,000
<p><u>Conversation:</u></p> <p><i>Stretford (Trafford, Greater Manchester) undergoing major regeneration led by a joint venture between Trafford Council and Bruntswood, which has already seen highways improvements, the old shopping mall redevelopment, and housing planned on the site. Alongside this, Simon and Stretford Public Hall set up the Stretford Town Centre Forum through a Power to Change Community Improvement District pilot, which brought in community organisations, social enterprises, co-ops and mutuals to run creative and community activity in temporary/meanwhile spaces.</i></p> <p><i>The risk is that as redevelopment advances, this activity gets displaced or crowded out, so the prototype is to test the Local Property Partnership model (developed by Platform</i></p>		

Places, already running in Plymouth and elsewhere).

This involves:

- *Mapping demand/ownership/footfall,*
- *Agreeing a shared vision;*
- *A community advisory panel for engagement;*
- *Finalising an MOU; and scoping catalyst spaces.*

Key partners are Trafford Council (planning authority), Bruntwood (developer), and the Town Centre Forum as “connecting tissue”.

Presenters emphasised a cooperative lens: co-production, community equity/development, council as platform, and replicability for the CCIN network. Trafford struggles to attract government funding due to demographics (deprived pockets too small), so they’ve relied on GMCA devolution and capital receipts; the partnership would stabilise the community group financially and support residents’ needs as more housing comes in. It could inspire Pride in Place areas even if not directly overlapping.

Question themes

A. Concrete outcomes and assets

- You mentioned that the partnership would help avoid community and creative activity being displaced as regeneration progresses and could underpin future asset transfer. Could you say more about the types of community spaces and uses you expect this work to focus on in practice?
- You referred to Stretford Public Hall’s own experience of CAT and to identifying “catalyst” spaces. What would you see as a successful outcome by the end of the project – for example, a clearer pipeline of potential community spaces, or agreed next steps on specific sites?

B. Governance and community influence

- How do you envisage decisions being shared between these parties within the Local Property Partnership model?
- How will the proposed governance arrangements ensure that community priorities and voices are protected where there is pressure for commercial or higher-value uses?

C. Public interest and wider CCIN value

- You set out the context of the Trafford–Bruntwood joint venture leading the town centre redevelopment. How does that JV arrangement shape the options for securing and holding community space in the longer term?
- You noted that Platform Places is already working with other CCIN areas (e.g. Plymouth) and that this model could be relevant to Pride in Place areas and beyond. What specific transferable outputs (for example, learning notes, templates or “how-to” steps) do you plan to produce for other CCIN councils considering similar partnerships

2.3 London CCIN Connect – Royal Borough of Greenwich

Proposal: London CCIN connect		
Prototype	Lead Council: Royal Borough of Greenwich Presenters: Michelle Rankin Graham Hart	CCIN budget request: £2,000
<u>Conversation:</u> <i>The next step in Greenwich’s cooperative journey: from community wealth building in 2022, to the “Anchored in Greenwich” partnership, to an inclusive network of London CCIN members. Greenwich would like to further the Network’s objectives through helping convene a</i>		

The core concept of a London CCIN subgroup: a light-touch network of councils and affiliates focused on cooperative development, procurement and social value, and sharing tools and case studies.

With three key elements:

(1) contacting all London members and affiliates to understand appetite, challenges and opportunities.

(2) testing communication tools and engagement models that are simple enough for pressured officers to engage with.

(3) exploring how to sustain the network beyond the prototype, including in a tough funding climate.

They highlighted that at least six/ seven London councils are already engaged/, with strong anchor affiliates and associates like GCDA and GLL (noting that GLL accounts for almost half of co-operative turnover in London).

On elections, Michelle acknowledged the risk but said they have a solid foundation in the Better Together Commission and scrutiny support, and that securing CCIN funding would strengthen the case for continuity.

On use of funds, the money would mainly support a series of events and thematic sessions, plus facilitation and some coordination capacity, with officer time largely in-kind.

The network should not become bureaucratic; instead, it should be a practical space to exchange templates, case studies and learning, with outputs like a report, microsite or online resources and presentations back to the wider CCIN membership.

They also welcomed the idea of involving sub-regional bodies (e.g. Local London, West London Alliance) and of using the work to grow CCIN membership and profile in London.

This prototype would be able to share learning for other areas with strong and emerging CCIN presence (e.g. Greater Manchester, Merseyside, etc..) and could strengthen CCIN as a part of a sub-national network.

Question themes

A. Who is involved, and where?

- What will you need from the CCIN central support function to support this Concept?
- Which councils and affiliates are actively involved at this stage, and how are they distributed across London (e.g. inner/outer, sub-regions)?

B. Elections and political change

- Will upcoming elections make a difference to this work?
- **Question for CCIN:** How are we planning for potential political change in London boroughs, and what steps will you take to protect continuity of the network through and beyond the elections?

C. What the CCIN funding covers

- What will the CCIN funds actually pay for over the prototype period (for example, number and type of sessions, coordination time, any external costs)?

D. Structure and wider value

- How do you see the London network being structured so that it remains light-touch and non-bureaucratic, but has enough shape to continue beyond the prototype and to share its learning clearly with other CCIN clusters outside London?

Proposal : Youth Retention Research

Prototype

Lead Council: Inverclyde Council
Presenters: Jennifer Horn & Carol Ann Valley

CCIN budget request: £2,000

Conversation:

Inverclyde is an area in Scotland's with the largest projected population decline (~5.4% by 2030), driven partly by young people leaving for university and not returning.

There is an aspiration to question the assumption that they simply don't want to come back, suggesting better insight into aspirations and conditions for staying/returning could strengthen the council's repopulation strategy (which already includes grants to keep young people local while studying elsewhere).

The prototype would use mixed methods (surveys, focus groups, creative engagement) with 16–25s to understand choices and test a youth retention/place impact tool. This builds on baseline research already locally funded, with CCIN supporting deeper, more innovative elements.

On the creative output, formats like graphics, film or podcast were under consideration to make findings more engaging and actionable. When challenged on "exploring" a tool versus committing to one, they clarified the ambition is a usable product for other councils, distinguishing CCIN's role from their core repopulation work

Question themes**A. What exactly will be produced?**

- What concrete output do you intend to produce by the end of the project? (e.g. a tool, framework, toolkit, set of questions) that other councils could pick up and use?)

B. Additionality and funding

- Which specific elements would CCIN funding enable that would not otherwise happen?

C. Role and value of the creative element

- How will the creative element add value to the insight and influence of the work rather than sit only as a communications piece?

D. Practical use and legacy for other councils

- How will you ensure that the findings and any tool are documented, hosted and shared in a way that enables other councils to apply them in their own youth retention and repopulation work?

A Cooperative approach to development corporations – Camden Council

Proposal: A cooperative approach to development corporations

LAB

Lead Council: Camden Council
Presenters: Daniel Wainwright
 Daniel Pitt - (Old Diorama Arts Centre)

CCIN budget request: £20,000

Conversation:

Proposal to explore co-operative approaches to Mayoral Development Corporations (MDCs) and Locally Led Development Corporations (LLDCs), using Euston as the core case. The concern is that communities are often shut out of large-scale development and that current MDC/LLDC models can sit uneasily with co-operative principles of partnership and shared power.

The prototype would combine:

- desk research and interviews with "industry insiders", residents and community organisations on how MDCs/LLDCs currently work;

- site visits and joint workshops between participating areas (e.g. Camden, Birmingham, GM/Trafford) involving officers and anchor/community organisations;
- a creative “ideas lab” in Euston, led by ODAC, bringing together residents, artists, governance specialists and urban designers to explore how co-operative principles can be embedded in future development corporation governance.

ODAC described their long-term local role in Euston/Regent’s Park – festivals and arts programmes, socially engaged public art, and recent community research which helped shape Camden’s Housing Pact on “what makes a good home/neighbourhood”. They emphasised a shift from “having your say” to “deciding together” via neighbourhood governance models and community councils.

In discussion, members welcomed the ambition, and probed how far the work would go beyond “good engagement” into the legal and governance architecture of MDCs/LLDCs and how learning and tools would be made useful for the wider CCIN membership, not just for Camden/Euston.

Question themes

A. Other partners, locations and local outputs

- You referenced potential partners/locations beyond Camden (for example Birmingham, GM/Trafford and others). Which partner councils and neighbourhoods are you currently proposing to involve alongside Euston, and what stage of commitment are they at?
- For each participating place (Euston and any others), what would you see as the expected local output by the end of the project – for example:
 - a locally-owned “ideas lab” session and write-up?
 - draft governance options for that specific development area?
 - or other agreed next steps?

B. Leadership, capacity and continuity

- How will leadership and project management be structured between Camden, ODAC and any freelance researcher, so that delivery is not dependent on a single officer or champion?
- What contingencies are in place if there is political or staffing change in Camden or a partner council during the life of the project?

C. Budget, roles and use of CCIN funds

- The proposal includes significant costs for research, site visits and creative “ideas lab” work. Can you break down, in headline terms, how CCIN funds would be used across:
 - Lead research and project management / ODAC’s creative / ideas-lab role,

D. Scope, depth and distinctiveness

- How far will the work go beyond good engagement practice into the powers, duties and governance options for MDCs/LLDCs (for example, community representation, voting rights or decision-making structures)?
- How will you ensure this project is clearly distinct from, and complementary to, other CCIN work on community ownership and development (e.g. with Locality, Power to Change, Platform Places)?

E. Wider CCIN value and transferability

- What specific outputs (for example, a practical guide, design principles or model clauses for cooperative MDC/LLDC governance) do you intend to produce for other CCIN members?
- How will councils beyond the core partner locations be involved or able to engage during the project?

Agreed: It was agreed that no applications to be removed at this stage, this was to enable scoring of applications and identification of queries to take place.

DRAFT

Action: PV to compile draft conversation notes and questions raised to members

2.2 Wider CCIN Policy Activity

Chair informed members that there were two additional areas that had been worked by the Strategy, Events & Engagement – Lead at the Chair’s request.

Further updates to be provided at the meetings of both Boards.

a. Local Government Reorganisation – Powering Up Power Down

[Work to create a online resource bank for Councils going through LGR has been delivered](#) and supplemented by a A5 Leaflet with website details and 3 key expectations.

- o *Lead with people not over them*
- o *Strengthen your role as a community advocate*
- o *Pass down power as it comes to you.*

Councils going through LGR are being contacted to ascertain levels of aspiration or proposals for Community Asset Transfer / Cooperative ownership of services & Resources with a view to further developing this draft proposal.

b. Coop Places

[A proposal focusing on strengthening and resourcing this strand has been submitted to MHCLG.](#) We will update members once feedback has been received and any implications for the 2026/27 work programme are clear.

Builds on existing Co-operative Placemaking learning and can act as a wrapper to raise the profile of the Agenda, with the ability to run alongside Policy Projects. It can provide a platform for practical support, shared tools for councils that want to deepen their place-based co-operative work and deepen relationships amongst CCIN members.

3. Next Steps

3.1 Policy Project Applications - [Indicative Timetable at www.councils.coop](#)

Members noted the broad timetable for Policy Project 2026 Applications.

Timetable

10th-12th February 2026 – Launch at Annual Conference.

Midnight 16th March 2026 – Closing date for submissions of all Bids.

Week beginning 23rd March 2026 – The Executive Oversight Committee and Values & Principles Board consider all Bids. Bidders are to present their applications at this meeting.

30th March – 10th April 2026 – Bidders are asked to respond to any further questions from the Governance.

w/b 13th April 2026 – sign-off of successful bids by EOC.

w/b 20th April 2026 – Successful applicants will be notified, guidance issued, and contract letters dispatched.

w/b 15th June 2026 – Contracts awarded/work starts

3.2 CCIN Scoring & Notes

Action: Members committed to sending their scores & notes back to hello@councils.coop by close of play Monday 30th March 2026 for compilation by Strategy, Events & Engagement – Lead.

3.3 Feedback and Further to Applicants

Presenters will be written to via email thanking them for attendance, highlighting the timeline from the CCIN Website and given some likely themes for further questions, based on the feedback from this meeting.

Action: Strategy, Engagement & Events – Lead to email applicants and compile further questions and share with CCIN Board Chairs & Vice Chairs & President for any further comments and refinement.

3.4 2026 Policy Project Approval Process

It was agreed that in light of this meeting, scoring by member and submissions from applicants based on further questions and matters to be resolved that the appropriate route was to take agreement via WhatsApp & Email, with the ability to call an online meeting if needed.

Meeting end: 15:42

24/04/21 – PJV