

Homes in Somerset (HiS) Board Meeting

The primary purpose of the board meeting is to provide oversight and strategic guidance to the business, to address important matters, to assess emerging risks and trends, and make decisions.

APPROVED Minutes of the Non-Confidential Board Meeting held in the Sedgemoor Room at Bridgwater House on Tuesday 28 July 2026 at 12:33

Board Members:	Cllr Pauline Ham Craig Green Marie Hide Oliver Keates Paul Stephenson (Chair) Sarah O'Neill	Pauline H Craig Marie Olly Paul S Sarah
In Attendance:	Alice Pearce, Governance Manager (minutes) Ben Lane, Director of Finance & Performance Claire Tough, Director of Communities & Customer Service Naomi Macey, Director of Asset Management, Safety and Development Pauline Kelly, Executive Assistant (admin support) Peter Hatch, Chief Executive	Alice Ben Claire Naomi Pauline K Peter
Guests:	Chris Hall, Executive Director Community, Place & Economy, Somerset Council (arrived at 13:15) Denise Reeves, Head of Transformation and Integration Cllr Fran Smith – Council nominee for Board Member (via Teams) Glen Carlin – H&S Advisor Greg Trimmer – potential co-optee to the Board John Hardy – Sedgemoor Tenants Assurance Committee Josh Legget – Acuity Lorna Curtis-Davies - Sedgemoor Tenants Assurance Committee Michael Hooper - Sedgemoor Tenants Assurance Committee Nima Tehranchi - Sedgemoor Tenants Assurance Committee Pete Lomax – Acuity Sujitha Herren – Finance Manager Wendy Lewis - HRA Development Manager, Somerset Council	Chris Denise Fran Glen Greg John Josh Lorna Michael Nima Pete Sujitha Wendy
NO.	ITEM	
1.	Welcome Guest and Apologies	
	Paul S welcomed everyone to the meeting, including Chris and Wendy from Somerset Council (SC), Cllr Fran Smith and Greg Trimmer (prospective new members), Pete Lomax and Josh Legget from Acuity, Glen, (H&S advisor), Sujitha, Denise and Michael, Nima, Lorna and John from Sedgemoor Tenants Assurance Committee STAC. Paul welcomed Kathy back to the Board.	

	Apologies Apologies were received from Cllr Federica Smith-Roberts, Cllr Lance Duddridge and Paul Hackett.
2.	Presentation Slot Strategy Theme: Thoughtful Enterprise/Good Governance Topic: Mock Inspection Feedback (10k – both HiS and SC Services) Pete from Acuity introduced the slides, which were taken as read. Acuity carried out approximately 100 surveys a month, the results of which were combined into an annual report. It was noted that some analysis was created using AI (Artificial Intelligence), and the slides referred to <i>five</i> open questions, it should read <i>three</i>. HiS were in the top quartile for all TSMs (Tenant Satisfaction Measures) with many improving over the year. Complaints handling was the only one that was not top quartile. The complaints handling score was 36% satisfied; although for the first time in Q4 those satisfied exceeded those dissatisfied. It was common across the sector for tenants answering the questions to see service requests as complaints. Acuity asked additional questions around complaints, and most of the complaints were about ASB (Anti-Social Behaviour), and 87% of respondents were not sure what level of the complaint process it was at. This could indicate that they were actually talking about a service request. Additional comments brought up a common request for improvements in "being listened to" and "communicated with better". Acuity used "Sentiment Index score" which uses AI to evaluate open comments. It extracts the main themes and provides a satisfaction score. Scores were broadly positive, with the exception being complaints. Paul S. felt it was reassuring that the areas raised were things we were aware of and were working on. Marie raised the complaint's numbers accuracy as they were all percentages of the number of people who said they had lodged a complaint (19%) and were fairly small. Pete felt they were still representative but would provide the error rates. It was clarified that the ASB questions were asked to all, not those we knew had reported ASB. For context Claire said 224 people said they had made a complaint in last 12 months and 150 were satisfied/fairly satisfied. For ASB responses only 37 people left us contact details so we could respond to them after the survey. Of those that did leave details, we contacted them and asked if they wanted to log a complaint, and only one respondent said yes, the rest just wanted the issue fixed. They were then directed to the ASB process.

	Pete and Josh left at 13:04
	ACTION Pete Lomax to provide error rates for the complaints scores.
3.	Declarations of Interest
	The declarations listed in the pack were noted. No new declarations were added. Greg and Fran would remain in the meeting for the item relating to their appointment. As Greg was not yet a co-optee the questions he had submitted would not be included in the minutes. They would be uploaded to the document library. For item 18, Customer Influence & Engagement Framework, members of STAC would remain and take part in the discussions, however Paul reserved the right to ask them to leave if it was felt appropriate at any point in the discussion.
4.	Minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2026
	Members agreed the minutes recorded were a true record of the meeting on 26 May 2026.
	RESOLVED The Board NOTED and APPROVED the minutes of 26 May 2026.
5.	Matters Arising from meeting held on the 26 May 2026
	No comments were made on the matters arising from the meeting on 26 May 2026
	RESOLVED The Board NOTED the matters arising.
6.	Chair's Update
	No questions were raised on the report. Marie asked if there were discussions happening around the changes arising from the new Prime Minister (PM), Andy Burnham. Paul S. had been speaking with the National Federation of ALMOs (NFA) which has links into "No 10 North". We don't yet know what the new housing minister's agenda will be; it could be she retains her predecessor's plans or her own previous plans. The new PM said during his first speech that "social and council housing was to be put front and centre" - which was positive. The CIH (Chartered Institute of Housing), NFA, NHF (National Housing Federation) are all lobbying parliament. However, the PM may also target welfare reforms, impacting our tenants.
	RESOLVED The Board NOTED the contents of the report.

7.	Chief Executive's Update
	Marie raised that considering the SC (Somerset Council) financial situation, would we, as a stand-alone organisation benefit from an individual review of our financial plans. Ben responded that once we bring the Medium-Term Financial Plan refresh and the key risks of "plan B" we will initiate an independent review of our financial plan and corporate risk register. ACTION Ben to arrange an independent review of our financial plan and corporate risk register after November Board. RESOLVED The Board NOTED the contents of the report.
8.	Chair of Audit & Risk (ARC) Update
	No questions were raised. Marie reminded the Board there was an open invitation to attend ARC, where <i>all</i> risks are discussed. This morning ARC discussed the Project Fusion risk register, including the impact of moving to "Plan B". Paul S. was grateful to ARC for the extra time committed to Project Fusion. ARC will meet again on 26 August to consider Project Fusion risks again and one of our top risks - Cyber. Olly highlighted that SC's presentation on Cyber had highlighted the work they do and provided a lot of assurance. Chris arrived at 13:15 during this item. RESOLVED The Board NOTED the contents of the report.
9.	Chair of Sedgemoor Tenants' Assurance Committee (STAC) Update
	No questions were raised. RESOLVED The Board NOTED the contents of the report.
10.	Chair of Development Committee Update
	Greg highlighted the risk of service costs increasing faster than permitted rent increases, and we (HiS) having to absorb the excess cost because the service element is embedded within the affordable rent envelope. Naomi would add this to the development risk register. Wedmore and Cannington had been approved, bringing 60 new council homes. ACTION Naomi to amend the Development risk register and add the risk of service costs increasing faster than permitted rent increase when they are contained in the Affordable Rent envelope.

	RESOLVED The Board NOTED the contents of the report.
11.	Chair of Remuneration and Nominations Committee Update
	No questions were raised.
	RESOLVED The Board NOTED the contents of the report.
12.	Appointments for Councillor Board Member Nominee and Co-optee
	Paul S. gave considerable thanks to Lance for his contributions over many years. We had a card and gift for him, which, as Lance was not present, Peter will ensure he receives. Greg and Fran stayed in the meeting for this item, and the Board approved their appointments.
	RESOLVED The Board: - The Board NOTED and APPROVED the nomination of Fran Smith received from Somerset Council (SC) as Councillor Board Member, as of 28 July 2026 until the AGM on 28 September 2026 with a view to appointment until the new SC nominations process in May 2027 (or sooner if an alternative Councillor nominee is provided in the interim). - The Board APPROVED the proposal to appoint Greg Trimmer as a co-optee to the Board from 28 July 2026 until the AGM on 28 September 2026, with a view to reappointing for one year. - The Board APPROVED the proposal to appoint Greg Trimmer as a co-optee to the Audit and Risk Committee from 28 July 2026 until the AGM on 28 September 2026, with a view to re-appoint for one year.
13.	Policy Review
	The Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) Policy and the Hate Crime Policy had been reviewed and developed with service leads from SC in-house and HiS teams, the customer policy group, Bevan Brittan LLP, and HQN (Housing Quality Network) and reflects the work of the complaints Ombudsman. They had been considered by STAC, who had included some EDI amends to the ASB policy. As there had been a number of EDI amends, Sarah requested a step be added for these types of policies to go to the EDI champion too. It was felt that these were key areas from a human, as well as business perspective. The compliance policies had been reviewed to align approaches within the SC and HiS teams. Due to other work pressures, they had been delayed and the consultation was not complete. If approved here, material changes only,

	will come back to Board for approval. Savills had reviewed the policies for compliance. It was agreed the acronyms would be spelled out before publication and Greg had highlighted some areas for improvement, which the team would work with him on (Greg's questions and answers attached in the library). Naomi explained for Marie, that the second phase of regulations on fire safety from Grenfell and the Building and Resident Safety Strategy was being revised. Work was underway and after consultation would come back to Board probably in November. If approved, we would have refreshed policies for all key compliance areas for the "big six". RESOLVED The Board APPROVED the four policies and associated management plans subject to the minor amendments noted.
14.	Final Annual Report and Financial Statements, Key Issues for Discussion and Letter of Representation 2025/26 (Annual) (4k)
	Ben reported that HiS was presenting good, solid finances and performances in the preceding year. The Auditors had reported at the June Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) that Sujitha's team had delivered a smooth process, and audit work was largely complete. Auditors need to review the June management accounts, receive this approval and the management letter. When finalised the accounts would be signed and submitted to Companies House and the Council at the AGM in September. There had been two amber and two green control issues identified, which we would address. Craig enquired what number of voids were awaiting disposal, how long they had been waiting, and how does this affect void turnarounds for KPIs and TSMs. Other organisations seem to have quicker turn arounds; however, we appear to more transparent on what was included. Ben responded that we had one policy void at the end of March 2026 and two at the end of June. Six properties were held for disposal at the end of March, and the same six at end of June. All were now sold (subject to contract). Four flats had been void for 1841, 1862, 791 and 706 days. Two other properties were void for 357 and 538 days. We were investigating the steps involved, from when a property becomes vacant, through assessing the viability, to a recommendation for disposal. Once completed we would look at the steps to shorten this period. Disposals do not affect relet times; however major voids do have an impact. The reasons for policy void vary, examples include, major adaptations, extending the property, working with social care and waiting for nominations to identify a candidate. Overall times had reduced; Naomi's team were working with the lettings team and had been making efficiencies and improvements in each key process. We had also been working with SC

	to bring in a consultant to understand the process challenges. At Paul's request it was agreed Claire would share a description of a policy void in a briefing note. The meeting adjourned at 13.57 and re-started at 14.10pm.
	ACTION Claire to share, in a briefing note, a description of a policy void.
	RESOLVED The Board: • APPROVED the Annual Report and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 March 2026 and authorise the Chair to sign them on behalf of the Board. • NOTED the findings contained within the Independent Auditors' Key Issues for Discussion report. • APPROVED the Letter of Representation and authorised the Chair to sign it on behalf of the Board. • AUTHORISED the Director of Finance & Performance, in consultation with the Chair, to make any final non-material presentational, narrative or disclosure amendments required prior to publication.
15.	Medium Term Financial Plan (Annual) (10k) Ben explained the new Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP) using the presentation (attached to the agenda pack). He set out the pertinent points and explained that the plans aligned with the corporate strategy and set out the impacts of moving to 'Plan B'. A few key points were: - There would be some unavoidable abortive costs due to a significant change in the project plan. - The identified efficiencies will only happen when we have gone through the transformation period. This period would be longer with 'Plan B'. Initial savings would repay the transition payments. - The transition period would be extended to 3 years and 7 months. The financial year 30/31 should bring a single model. - The normal cycle for the management agreement will continue including fee and the uplift. - KPIs will start reporting joint data to monitor the transformation. Board were asked to consider if they were comfortable with the prudent

plans set out on the MTFP. The plans will be reviewed every six months. The next step will be to review reserves in Q3 and in November update the MTFP. We were working with SC on the final management fee figure.

Marie asked for future clarity in relation to efficiencies to ensure that they were not lost within inflationary uplifts.

Sarah enquired what else, besides the core housing costs comes out of the HRA (Housing Revenue Account). Ben explained the HRA will cover the cost for democratic services for SC to manage their houses and the clienting role, managing the processes, finance expertise, the relationship with the regulator, the capital programme, 30-year business plan, and development planning.

Greg raised a concern that we don't know the management fee 6 weeks before go-live. Ben explained the pivot from the original fee with Plan A to Plan B had delayed the final fee agreement. We were 98% there with the final figure, we were clarifying details and the final decisions were being made around which services would transferring to HiS. It was a methodical calculation, rather than a negotiation and Ben was not concerned.

Ben confirmed for Greg, that the target reserve for a £30 million organisation would be different to a £55 million organisation, and we were working on this. Chris also pointed out that SC also had a HRA reserve (about £5.5 million minimum although they currently hold £17 million). The report talks about HiS's reserves and does not reflect the properties themselves as they fall under SC. ARC had discussed reserves extensively and Board had discussed it several times over the previous year.

Greg also highlighted that we would be picking up costs from September but will not be making savings for 2 years, he enquired if there were any cash-flow issues. Ben explained we had an arrangement with SC where we incur costs and bill at the end of each month. We were moving towards receiving money up front for estimated capital costs with a reconciling step at the end of the month. We were monitoring the HRA and would keep on top of 10k costs and budgets.

Paul S. asked if there was a place for a Board representative in the Options Appraisal business case. It was agreed there would be and we would consider who was best placed and what was the most appropriate involvement method.

ACTION

Peter to create a role to allow a Board representative to be involved in the Options Appraisal business case.

RESOLVED

	The Board: • APPROVED the Medium-Term Financial Plan 2026/27 - 2030/31 • ENDORSED the key planning assumptions contained within the MTFP, including: - the revised savings profile under Plan B; - inflation assumptions by income and expenditure category; - workforce and FTE assumptions; - reserve planning principles; - capital management fee assumptions; - sensitivity analysis and risk mitigations. • NOTED that the 10,000-home Management Agreement fee has not yet been formally agreed and that the MTFP will require re-baselining once the confirmed fee, retained HRA budgets and future operating model assumptions are finalised. • NOTED that the delivery of the £3.5m savings requirement remains a key financial dependency within the MTFP, with the revised Plan B profile now assuming delivery by 2030/31 rather than 2029/30. • AGREED that the MTFP should be reviewed every six months during the Project Fusion transformation period, with updates provided to Board.
16.	Housing Ombudsman Annual Submission – Annual Complaints Performance & Improvement Review (4k) This was the third paper out of three around compliance with the Complaint Handling Code. All would be submitted to the ombudsman by 30 September. The key message was that learning and improvement was vital; we were encouraging increased customer feedback and know that customers feeling listened to was important for satisfaction. There was a lot of improvement work ongoing, and it was felt we were compliant with the code. Nima enquired if we had a separate complaint department or could anyone take a complaint? Claire explained there was one person who managed complaints, but anyone could take the complaint. Going forward the in-house team will come over to HiS. Nima suggested if we had one person or team that dealt with all things relating to complaints then it would be clearer when people had raised an official complaint. This could really help our complaint satisfactions responses as it would be clearer if someone had raised an official complaint. Claire explained when we talked to customers we were trying to be clear what was a complaint and what a service request. Paul S. asked if, like many other organisations, we received complaints generated by AI, and how do we handle them? The NFA was engaging with an AI specialist to consider how to support providers. The Ombudsman said

	approximately 35% of their complaints were AI generated. Claire explained we do receive AI generated complaints and how we manage them was within our improvement plan. It can be helpful as they were clearly written, but resolving the complaint wasn't as simple. We need to ensure our response was robust and we were clear what we were responsible for. Sarah suggested that we need to be clear what a complaint was when we update the website. The website can direct people down different pathways for a formal complaint about HiS or our staff, or to report a service dissatisfaction. We can use different pathways and colours to make it clear when something was a complaint. We need to also offer the opportunity to speak to a person. It was clarified that do not get feedback on the submission, although the Ombudsman was likely to talk to the Regulator before our inspection. RESOLVED The Board: • APPROVED the annual report for submission to the Housing Ombudsman by 30 September 2026. • Board also: – Considered it provided adequate assurance on complaint handling performance and compliance; – Scrutinised the proposed improvement actions; – Endorsed publication of the annual report, self-assessment and governing body response; – Recommended actions around the website and utilising the resource base from September as set out in the minutes.
17.	Risk Management - PESTEL, SWOT and Risk Appetite Statement
	Ben explained that this annual review had been considered by ARC. The risk appetite had been set for the 12 coming months but could be reviewed at any point if appropriate. We would report to the Board, by the most appropriate method, if events took us outside of our appetite. Paul S. felt it was helpful to see the tracked changes, and he was re-assured by the report. Greg raised if 'local economy' should feature in the SWOT and whether the PESTEL, covered demographic challenges for a 10k organisation. It was agreed that Claire would obtain the data on demographics so that Ben could reconsider it. We would report back to Board within the regular "Know Your Customers and Stock" report. Greg also enquired about climate change in relation to management of stock; Ben explained it was in the climate resilience section. We do need to build climate change into our development plans for the future. Naomi said that it was in our discussions, it was live, and it was part of the development appraisal, and there were requirements in the Future Homes standard, MEES (Minimum

	Energy Efficiency Standards) and others. Sujitha noted that we had added to the TSM survey, the following three questions. <i>During the recent hot weather spells how well did your home cope with the heat? What impact, if any, did the hot weather have on your health and wellbeing? In your opinion what changes need to be made to your property?</i> Sarah asked if we could amend risk headings; one word was too vague. A one-line definition of the risk would be preferable. For members to gain assurance she would also like to see the risk register that sits under each one. Marie reminded people that everyone has access to Ideagen and the risks were all on there. The Board discussed the balance between seeing everything in full and their responsibilities as a Director, and the delegations to ARC. It was agreed that Ben would review the descriptors of all the key risks. One Advanced also provided a risk module that we can consider using in the future. Members were reminded that the regulator would question all members on risk. ACTION • Claire to obtain demographic data for the 10k organisation • Ben to review the PESTEL • Ben to review corporate risk descriptors to ensure that they sufficiently captured actual risks RESOLVED The Board: • APPROVED the refreshed Risk Appetite Statement • APPROVED the refreshed SWOT analysis • APPROVED the refreshed PESTEL Analysis
18.	Customer Influence & Engagement Framework - new Customer Committee (10k) Claire outlined the work behind the report with TPAS (Tenant Participation Advisory Service) and a tenant project team made up of members from SC and HiS tenants. They had developed a framework proposing a single tenant Committee (the Strategic Tenant Committee (STC)). A new Terms of Reference (ToR) using the current HiS Committee ToR format was proposed with a number of changes in the new TOR proposed by the tenant project group. Board members, and STAC members (attending as observers) discussed the proposals at length. TPAS had advised that HiS needed to widen engagement methods and we plan to work with them and involved tenants to create the full engagement framework, beneath the Committee which will be brought back to Board in November. The following details were discussed at length within the Terms of Reference: Membership The ToR proposed a maximum of 12 members, which includes the Chair, a

tenant Board member and Cllr. member. The tenant project panel had raised concerns and ideally wanted all 12 members to be tenants, with no Board members. They would like to maximise the number of tenants on the Committee. This was discussed in depth; the Board felt there needed to be links to the Board by having Board members on the Committee membership, particularly at the current critical time with taking on SC properties, and an imminent inspection. A number of ways the Board can get assurance on the Committee's work were discussed, points raised including:

- the Chair of the Committee attends the Board meeting.
- Sarah felt having an additional tenant member brought more value than a Cllr. Board member.
- Greg raised that tenants may feel having a Cllr. present could give them an important route to access the Council, particularly post transfer.
- Claire reminded members that when STAC was set up the Council wanted to have representation on the Committee hence it included a Cllr. Board member.

After significant discussion, it was agreed to remove the Cllr. member from the STC membership, it was agreed to remove the section around "Nor Chair of any other Committee" from "Neither the Board's Chair nor Chair of any Committees shall not be a member of the Tenant Committee..." This line was felt too restrictive for the tenant Board members. Claire would communicate the membership to SC and Cllrs currently sitting on the SC TAGS (Tenants Action Group)

Quoracy

Both the project group and the Board had expressed concerns around the numbers required to be quorate. Although it was high the project group had hoped that remuneration and attendance management would support them being quorate. This was discussed in detail. Greg suggested that we consider a percentage of current membership, i.e. quoracy would be 50% of current membership plus one. This was approved.

Remuneration

STAC were involved and supported the original decision to reward and recognise the tenant Committees work, and it was agreed that remuneration would remain as agreed previously. The project group had concerns around individual's circumstances and whilst board members understood this, they felt that on balance the roles should be on a par with all committee remuneration. If committee members were concerned about the implications of payment they would be directed to obtain independent advice from Citizens Advice.

Other points of discussion – Chair's recruitment

The normal Governance Framework sets out how the interview panel for Committee Chairs will include the Chair of the Board, and the Board would appoint the Committee Chair and Vice Chair. The project panel wanted the Chair to be appointed by members of the Committee. All of SC's groups appoint their own Chairs.

Paul S. explained that we need to comply with our governance framework and we want to provide parity with the STC and other Committees. Greg highlighted that as a Ltd Company the Board had slightly different requirements of its Committees than SC. In contrast Marie highlighted that appointing their own Chair was empowering, and the Board appointing the Chair was not. Sarah felt she had a closer perspective. She supported the existing practice for STAC i.e. that the Board recruits the chair as this provided parity with other committees. The STC was a critical committee and would come under close scrutiny with the regulator. The Chair was a difficult role, and an ineffective Chair brings high risk to the organisation's governance. Recruiting was a skill and the people making these decisions need to know the requirements of the Board. After discussion the Board agreed that they needed to retain the right to appoint the Committee Chair.

However, the Board considered the views of the panel were important and discussed a number of alternatives that allowed the Committee to have an input into the decision. They discussed if the Committee could recommend a Chair to the Board for ratification - which was rejected due to the same reasons as for the Committee appointing its own Chair.

Sarah continued that she understood why the members want to have a say in such an important decision as who is the Chair of their committee. She suggested the new tenant committee could nominate someone to be on the recruitment panel so they would be heard and represented. This option had an impact on the recruitment timeframe as we had planned to run the two recruitment processes concurrently.

Having a member of the committee on the panel and the recruitment timeframes were discussed in depth. It was agreed that a member of the Committee would be on the Chair's recruitment panel and the recruitment would follow after the Committee member recruitment.

Marie reminded people that a Chair needed the right skills and experience, plus the confidence to put themselves forward and suggested we should consider every applicant could be a Chair, if they have Chaired previously or not. Nima, also highlighted that people may not yet understand what a Chair's role was until they had experience of it.

	Sarah also highlighted that if we can't find someone interested and with the skills needed to be Chair we could recruit an independent (according to the ToR) while developing a tenant. Nima highlighted it was great to hear the Board consider all of these points so carefully and asked if the Vice Chair role could be used for development of a Chair. It was explained this was a common process. We would support Committee members to develop so they can stand as Chair or Vice Chair. Marie stated that she didn't support an independent, unless it was completely necessary and we could not find a tenant. It was agreed that there would be recruitment for Committee members and separate recruitment for Chair. During this process and until a new chair was appointed, Sarah would continue to chair STAC and the new STC. There would be representation of the newly recruited Committee on the interview panel. RemNom Committee would be provided with details of the process so they can add value. Maximum tenure terms Within the ToR it states members will be appointed "for a term of three years to a maximum of 6 years (as set out in the NHF Code of Governance 2020)". This was approved, however the Board discussed how previous time on Committees should be considered. For STAC members previous time would have to be included in the total served (as per the NHF Code of Governance), however the SC member's previous terms do not have to count. Following discussion on this matter, it was felt that it would be appropriate to treat each former committee equally. If any members, on either previous committee had already served 6 years then they would be restricted to the initial 3 years. Any other Committee members could serve the full 6 years maximum term. It was agreed that it was more appropriate to use the term "facilitated by" or the "lead officer" rather than "led by" in the report (and future documents), as the group was led by tenants and this term was more empowering for tenant members. <i>Nima left the meeting and 16.24pm and Kathy left at 16:29pm.</i> ACTION Claire to communicate the new STC membership make up, of 12 members including one tenant Board member to SC and Cllrs. Alice to amend the TOR to reflect changes recorded in the minutes
	RESOLVED The Board: The Board DECIDED to retain decision making authority for the role of STC Chair appointment but APPROVED a member of the newly formed

	STC to be on the interview panel. • NOTED concerns from some tenants regarding Committee remuneration and DECIDED to leave remuneration as previously set. • APPROVED the establishment and key attributes of the Strategic Tenant Committee. • APPROVED the Terms of Reference of the Strategic Tenant Committee, with the changes set out in the minutes. • APPROVED the recruitment approach outlined with the change that the Chair's recruitment would follow the members' recruitment.
19	Contract Award and Sealing for Retrofit Works - Bell Group
	This contract was a new contract with Bell group to provide retrofit work for a 10k organisation. Bell had successfully delivered on its previous contracts. The process was fully compliant with our procurement policies and after approval the document would be sealed on behalf of the organisation. RESOLVED The Board: • APPROVED the award of a contract to Bell Group for up to three years for the provision of retrofit and associated refurbishment services, up to a maximum value of £4m, to support Wave 3 delivery and maintain programme continuity. • APPROVED the sealing of the contract to provide enhanced contractual protection, strengthen assurance over delivery and quality risks, and secure longer-term recourse in respect of completed works.
20	Risk Register Update - June 2026 (Monthly)
	The risk register was noted. RESOLVED The Board: • NOTED this summary • NOTED the role of ARC to provide assurance to the Board regarding the management of Project Fusion risks and the summary Project Fusion register attached for reference.
21.	Board Behavioural, Experience, Competencies Skills (BECS) (Annual)
	The BECS report was noted. RESOLVED • Board NOTED the report.
22.	Corporate Strategy 2023-26 Final Review (4k)
	Peter provided a closure report on the 23-26 Corporate Strategy. Progress had been very good. The internal auditors had reviewed the strategy and had reported to Ben. The final audit report will be reviewed by ARC.

	RESOLVED Board NOTED the report
23.	Customer Influence and Engagement Strategy (Six Monthly Review) (4k)
	The Strategy was noted.
	RESOLVED Board NOTED progress against the Customer Influence and Engagement Strategy action plan 2026-2029.
24.	Information, Digital, Communications & Technology (IDCT) Strategy 2025-2028 (Six Monthly Review) (4k)
	No questions were raised.
	RESOLVED Board NOTED the progress on the IDCT Strategy and Action Plan during the last six months.
25.	Key Performance Indicators - June 2026 (10k)
	The report was noted.
	RESOLVED The Board: NOTED the work underway to prepare the performance management framework for HiS 10k. NOTED the consolidated TSM perception performance for HiS 4k and In-House.
26.	Management Accounts – June 2026 (4k)
	The management accounts were noted.
	RESOLVED The Board NOTED the management accounts for the first three months of 26/27 (April 26 -June 26) and the incorporation ahead of 'go-live' of a new regular position statement of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), something of increasing importance as we prepare to assume management responsibility for 10,000 homes and circa £35m annual budget.
27.	Compliance Summary Report - June 2026 (10k)
	The report was noted.
	RESOLVED The Board NOTED the contents of the report
28.	Health & Safety Performance (Six Monthly Review) (4k)
	The report sets out progress on actions in the November report. As part of our due diligence, Glen had reviewed SC's approach to corporate H&S management. He took a sample gap analysis across documentation and interviewed team members against the HSE guidance document. Consistent results were seen, showing that culturally, the systems were embedded. One specific question was "what is the process for managing an error". The process again was embedded. There were a few recommendations which would be monitored via the Health & Safety Forum.

	One key area within the report was contractor management and engagement. Glen would be undertaking further site visits to ensure contractors were following processes. The Board was reassured to hear Glen's experiences with the in-house team, and Paul thanked Glen for his support. RESOLVED Board NOTED the report.
29.	Using Customer and Home Insights Update (Monthly) (this replaces Stock Condition Programme Update from July 2026) (10k) The Board were asked if the report provided sufficient information. Paul S. thought it was an excellent start, and we would build on it. RESOLVED Board NOTED the report and CONSIDERED the report provided a good starting point for oversight of customer and home data.
30.	AOB No other business was raised. Glen, John, Lorna, Michael and Sujitha left the meeting at 16:46pm

The non-confidential meeting finished at 16:46pm

Confirmed as a true record of the meeting

Signed: 

Name (Chair): Paul Stephenson

Date: 29 September 2026