

**THE CABINET**  
**20th October, 2025**

Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); Councillors Baker-Rogers, Beresford, Cusworth, Marshall and Williams.

Also in attendance Councillor Steele (Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board)

An apology for absence were received from Councillor Alam.

**56.       DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations to record.

**57.       QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

There were 4 questions:

1. Mr. Ashraf asked if the Council would fly the Palestinian Flag on the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian people on 2th9 November as they had done in 2024. He stated that Rotherham had a proud history of supporting global humanitarian causes, such as resisting South African apartheid, welcoming Chilean refugees and supporting Mayors for Peace. Mr. Ashraf requested that the flag be flown for the Rotherham Palestinian families who had suffered and for the people of Palestine whose genocide was being livestreamed. He asked that the invitation to the flag raising event be sent to all Rotherham MP's, Councillors and local dignitaries. Mr. Ashraf would send through details when they had been finalised, and he would be happy to have a meeting to facilitate the event if needed.

The Leader agreed to consider the request and provide a written response.

In his supplementary, Mr. Ashraf asked a question in relation to South Yorkshire Pension Fund investments. He asked for the overall numbers and details of investments in Israeli bonds, complicit companies and companies supplying armaments to Israel before and after the 3 years of information already provided.

The Leader confirmed that the comments would be passed on to the pensions authority.

2. Mr. Mohammed asked a question in relation to Selective Licensing as he was a private landlord. He stated that he understood the legitimate reasons for the scheme but questioned why it needed to be a blanket scheme. He stated that he had properties just off from the Town Centre and, particularly on Sherwood Crescent, there were no issues

of concern. Mr. Mohammed asked if certain streets could be removed because there were no issues.

The Assistant Director of Community Safety and Street Scene explained that officers had responded following the consultation period and feedback had led to the proposals presented in the report. The proposals were based on evidence relating to issues such as deprivation, anti-social behaviour and local crime. Following the discussion at the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board it was confirmed that a review would take place 12 months after implementation to consider if there were high areas of compliance and whether or not Selective Licensing should continue there.

The Leader confirmed that he was happy for the service to speak directly to Mr. Mohammed after the meeting regarding his particular circumstances.

3. Mr. Collins asked a question on behalf of Mr. Herbert in relation to the Council's role in responding to the proposals for the development of the Whitestone Solar Farm. He asked how the Council would ensure that it effectively reflected the views, opinions, local experience and expertise of the impacted communities by the consultation milestone. He also asked how the community response would be reflected in the approach taken by the Council in the preparation of the local impact report.

Councillor Williams stated that he understood the concerns of the local residents, however, he did clarify that the Council would not be making any decisions in relation to the Whitestone development. The decision would be made by the Planning Inspectorate. Councillor Williams did confirm that the Planning Service would hear local concerns and feedback on the proposals. The Council would be submitting the Local Impact Report but that did have to present both sides of the argument. Councillor Williams confirmed that he was happy to have a conversation with Mr. Collins and/or Mr. Herbert outside of the meeting.

Simon Moss, Assistant Director of Planning, Regeneration and Transport, confirmed that the Council as the Local Planning Authority would be consulted at every stage of the process of the Development Consent Order. The Local Impact Report would take account of the views that had been collated from impacted communities. The Assistant Director also confirmed that any local residents or interested parties could make representations directly to the Planning Inspectorate. Officers would be providing Ward Members in impacted areas with advice on how they could feed local concerns into the process.

The Leader confirmed that information would be published on the Council's website detailing the best way for members of the public to share their views on the Whitestone proposals.

In his supplementary, Mr. Collins asked a question in relation to the democratic oversight and the reporting to the Planning Board that was detailed in recommendation 2 of agenda item 9. He asked how the reporting would fit into the deadlines set out by the applicant. He also asked how the impacted community would see and understand the actions and decisions made by the Council in its role as a host authority in a timely and relevant matter.

Councillor Williams confirmed that the report would be made quarterly to the Planning Board in recognition of the significant public interest in Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP's.) However, these were just for information. The Council would not be making any decisions. The submissions were technical planning matters, and they would be presented to the Planning Board to ensure the public were aware of what was going on.

The Leader confirmed that Councillor Williams and a member of the Planning Service would talk to Mr. Collins and other residents outside of the meeting.

4. Councillor Yasseen asked how the Council could claim that the Selective Licensing consultation was meaningful when 68% of residents and tenants had said no to Selective Licensing but were ignored. She asked if it was a betrayal of public consultation principles and if the Council thought it knew better than tenants.

Councillor Beresford explained that the consultation had been extensive. She detailed the various methods used in the consultation and who had been consulted. It was acknowledged that the majority of respondents had not agreed with the proposal of Selective Licensing. However, they had agreed that there were problems with anti-social behaviour, poor housing, high levels of crime and deprivation in the areas selected. Councillor Beresford stated that she understood that landlords did not want to pay but this was something that needed to be done to ensure residents were living in safe, decent homes. The Council was doing the same with its own properties. Councillor Beresford reiterated that over 8,000 hazards had been removed which showed that some landlords were not being proactive and the Council needed to step in.

In her supplementary, Councillor Yasseen stated that the Council had had the opportunity to do something progressive following the decade long Selective Licensing in Eastwood for example. She stated that going back to the same streets and same homes showed the previous schemes had failed. Councillor Yasseen wanted a more community partnership approach with all stakeholders, importantly tenants first

who did not have a good relationship with the Council, then landlord and home occupiers. Councillor Yasseen felt that the new scheme would not work, and this was reflected in residents' responses to the consultation.

Councillor Beresford did not believe that the previous schemes had failed. Removing over 8,000 hazards, seizing cannabis farms and combating organised crime was not evidence of failure. It was acknowledged that community engagement was important and that was why the Stakeholder Steering Group was being established so that those involved could help shape the scheme. Councillor Beresford referenced Maltby where, after 10 years of Selective Licensing, the standards had improved so much that it had not been included in the latest proposals. She reiterated that it was up to landlords to improve their properties for the good of the tenants.

**58. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

**Resolved:-**

That the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 15th September, 2025, be approved as a true and correct record of the proceedings.

**59. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

The Chair advised that there were no items of business on the agenda that would require the exclusion of the press and public from the meeting.

**60. OAKTREES EXTRA CARE SCHEME**

Consideration was given to the report which provided an update and the next steps in relation to the Resource Centre at the Oaktrees site, previously an Extra Care Housing Scheme. Due to significant fire safety concerns which were deemed unviable to remediate, Cabinet had made the decision to permanently close the site in September 2023. The report sought approval for Together Housing to demolish the existing building and repurpose the land, to create an outdoor asset for tenants.

Whilst Together Housing owned the Resource Centre, the Council had legal responsibilities in relation to the future of buildings as it owned the land and continued to support 13 tenancies on a responsive basis, staffed through a 24/7 satellite model of provision. 4 households opted out of the support and 2 households had moved into properties since they were reclassified as general need for older people.

Two options for consideration had been identified, including repurposing the land into additional communal garden space and/or additional car parking for tenants of the bungalows. Options proposed were based on minimising the maintenance costs and the impact this would have on tenant service charges, which formed part of the gross rent costs.

Together Housing, with support from the Council, had continued to engage with tenants since 2020 to ensure regular updates were provided. All current tenants were invited to formal consultation led by Together Housing on the future use of the land. Tenants were content with the proposal to demolish the Resource Centre and fed back on the proposed options for the future use of the land.

The options consulted on were set out in paragraphs 4.3 and 4.4 of the report. 16 out of the 19 tenancies fed back and 15 preferred option 2 which was to have a garden with seating and 2 car parking spaces.

**Resolved:**

That Cabinet:

1. Approve Together Housing to demolish the Resource Centre on the Oaktrees site.
2. Approve Together Housing to repurpose the land into an enclosed communal garden with seating and 2 additional car parking spaces, for the exclusive use of tenants.

**61. REVISED ELECTIVE HOME EDUCATION POLICY**

Consideration was given to the report which presented the Revised Elective Home Education Policy for approval. Rotherham's Elective Home Education Policy was last agreed in 2021, and a review was initiated to ensure that it was easy to navigate and understand and reflected accurately the current way in which the Elective Home Education Team worked with home educators. Home educators and partners were key to this process with a period of public consultation taking place following informal stakeholder events.

The number of children who were electively home educated was rising both locally and nationally. Paragraph 2.3 of the report detailed the reasons why parents and carers chose to home educate. These included ideological views, religious beliefs, bullying, dissatisfaction with the school system and health reasons. A lack of, or perceived lack of suitable special educational need support was also cited.

Views of elective home educators in Rotherham were invited through informal stakeholder engagement prior to the commencement of the formal review. Two drop-in sessions on 21st and 27th January, 2025, were offered in the Riverside Café with an invite sent to all home educators known to the Council by e-mail. Three parents attended events in person with a further 5 providing feedback by email. Additionally, the views of parents, carers and young people were also sought on an ongoing basis through visits and contacts undertaken by members of the Elective Home Education (EHE) team. Members of the Improving Lives

Select Commission were invited to an engagement session held on 28th February, 2025, to share information and views ahead of the formal consultation taking place. Paragraph 2.8 of the report detailed the stakeholder event held on 27th January, 2025.

Following these events, a proposed Policy was drafted, taking into account all feedback and comments received. The key changes proposed in the Policy were detailed in paragraph 2.9 of the report and included: guidelines for indicators the Council was looking for when making judgements about the provision of suitable education; simplification and removal of some of the process information detailing Council internal actions and systems; clearly stating the responsibilities of all parties involved in the process and providing clarity about the actions of the Council where it could not be satisfied that suitable education was being received by a child. Specific information about Flexi Schooling, which was an arrangement between parents and a school whereby a child who was educated at home most of the time was also registered at school and attended school for part of the week, was also included.

A period of formal consultation was agreed by an Officer Delegated Decision on 15th April, 2025, and was hosted on the Council's consultation webpages between 16th April and 17th June, 2025. There were 11 responses received to the formal consultation. These were summarised at Appendix 1. Following the consultation, no changes were made to the proposed Policy. Scrutiny was given to the proposed Policy by Improving Lives Select Commission on 22nd July, 2025, and no changes proposed.

Although legislative changes were proposed through the Children's Wellbeing and Schools Bill, these had not yet been enacted and were, therefore, not reflected within the proposed Policy. A decision was made to review the Policy at this point given that there was no defined timeline for proposed legislative changes to come into force. The report recommended that Cabinet approve any further update of Rotherham's Elective Home Education Policy via an Officer Delegated Decision to reflect any such changes as they were made.

**Resolved:**

That Cabinet:

1. Approve the revised Elective Home Education Policy at Appendix 2.
2. Delegate authority to the Strategic Director of Children and Young People Services to update the Policy if any minor changes are required as a result of the Children's Wellbeing and Schools Bill (currently passing through Parliament).

**62. SELECTIVE LICENSING POLICY**

Consideration was given to the report which asked Cabinet to determine whether or not to introduce further Selective Licensing declarations following the conclusion of the previous Scheme in April 2025. It was proposed that the revised Fee and Licence Conditions for the following areas be approved: Town Centre/Eastwood/ East Dene/ Clifton/ Boston Castle, Masbrough/ Kimberworth, Thurcroft, Dinnington, Brinsworth, and Parkgate.

Selective Licensing was a tool that sought to significantly improve living conditions for residents in the private rented sector by enforcing minimum property standards and holding landlords accountable. Government reviews, including the Ministry of Housing's 2019 evaluation, found that such schemes helped tackle poor housing quality, anti-social behaviour, and deprivation when implemented strategically. Independent research by the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine also linked licensing to reductions in mental health issues and improved housing management. Locally, schemes like Rotherham's had removed thousands of serious hazards from homes, contributing to better health outcomes and improving communities.

The Council had previously designated 2 Selective Licensing schemes (2015-2020 and 2020-2025) which were declared on the criteria of 'low demand' and 'high levels of deprivation' respectively. Areas of Eastwood, Ferham, Masbrough, Maltby, Parkgate, Thurcroft and Dinnington (6 in total) had been subject to both schemes and were under licence for 10 years. Both previous schemes had delivered significant improvements to the condition and management of private sector rented properties in the designated areas. However, the latest information available from the 2020-2025 scheme also demonstrated that landlord behaviours in the majority of cases had not changed sufficiently to achieve the desired goal.

Despite the first scheme which ran from 2015-2020, the second 2020-2025 scheme still identified and led to the removal of a further 8,176 Category 1 and 2 hazards from 1,416 homes, which delivered improved health and quality of life to Rotherham's private sector tenants. Without the scheme being in place, and the additional resources it provided, the 2,377 inspections carried out under this scheme, would not have taken place. The health consequences of poor housing conditions were significant and the removal of this many hazards from people's homes represented a societal financial benefit of £1,860,797 (BRE Housing Health Costs Calculator). Paragraphs 1.9 to 1.13 detailed further hazards and the work undertaken to address those. A more detailed breakdown of the work undertaken as part of the 2020-2025 scheme could be found at Appendix 1.

It was acknowledged that Selective Licensing in itself was not a 'silver bullet' which allowed traditional services and policing to step back. Any declaration must deliver additional provision to an area and not seek to

fund core service provision. The limitations of any declaration were explored in the 'setting expectations (section 2)' section of the Cabinet report of 16th September, 2024. The same report also highlighted the benefits of Selective Licensing, realised in areas like Maltby, which were centred on improving housing conditions, tackling deprivation, and enhancing community wellbeing. As a result of these improvements, Maltby had not been proposed as an area for a future designation and was therefore not included in the consultation exercise. The report highlighted that Selective Licensing made a significant contribution to ensuring landlords maintained safe and healthy homes, which directly contributed to better health outcomes.

At the September 2024 meeting, Cabinet considered a report on the possibility of future declarations of Selective Licensing. The report contained details of potential areas for consideration, along with risks and supporting data. The selection of areas for consultation was based on a comprehensive ranking of 28 Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) with high concentrations of Private Rented Sector (PRS) properties. These were assessed against 5 declaration criteria: low housing demand, anti-social behaviour (ASB), high migration, housing deprivation, and crime. Of these, 22 LSOAs were identified as meeting at least one mandatory criterion, making them eligible for future designation.

As a result of the information presented, Cabinet agreed to commence consultation (as required by S80(9) Housing Act 2004), with a view to developing and considering further designations which would commence after the 2020-2025 Scheme ended. 13 weeks of mandatory consultation commenced on the 6th January, 2025, and concluded on 19th March, 2025 (Phase 1), with a further period running from 30th June, to 20th July, 2025 (Phase 2) in each of the following areas:

- Town centre / Eastwood / East Dene / Clifton / Boston Castle
- Masbrough / Kimberworth
- Thurcroft
- Dinnington
- Brinsworth
- Parkgate

The consultation was extended to ensure the Council received a broad and representative range of feedback from all stakeholders, to gather comprehensive feedback from all affected parties and ensure everyone had the opportunity to voice their opinions and contribute to the decision-making process. Paragraph 4.0.4 of the report and Appendix 3 to the report detailed how the consultation was carried out and who was contacted. In Phase 1 the Council received a total of 541 responses, comprising 480 online/paper surveys and 61 direct emails or letters. In Phase 2 a further 581 survey responses were received; 201 of these were online and 380 were paper surveys. Of these, 368 were returned following a bulk request co-ordinated by an Elected Member and community group. These were submitted immediately after the survey closed and had been



manually analysed and reported separately. An additional 15 direct emails and 198 doorstep interviews were also conducted with officers providing information and signposting residents to the survey. In total, the Council received 1,335 responses across both phases, representing an estimated 8.3–9% engagement rate from the 16,000 properties contacted. This compared favourably to the previous 2020–2025 Scheme, which received 578 responses.

In Appendix 4, the responses from all aspects of the consultation were summarised. Section 4 of the report breaks down the results of the consultation and provides an overall conclusion. The conclusion reached was that the 1,335 responses gathered over the period of Selective Licensing consultation did not support Selective Licensing or the proposed fee structure. Responses seemed to more strongly support the reasons stated for the proposed schemes and its intended outcomes, (across all areas) than Selective Licensing itself, as a mechanism for delivery. The associated costs were the main issue in dispute.

Responders were also offered a range of alternative proposals to replace or supplement Selective Licensing. They were summarised in Section 4 of the report and contained in full at Appendix 7.

As detailed in Sections 4 and 5 of the report and the appendices, the Council had acted upon the feedback received and had adjusted its proposals in terms of the focus of the proposed declarations and Neighbourhood Plans, the boundaries and the associated fees.

The proposed changes to the Licence Fees were set out in Section 5 of the report. Under Part 3 of the Housing Act 2004, Section 87 allowed the local housing authority to charge a licence fee to cover all Part 3 activities including all costs incurred by the authority in the administration, enforcement, and monitoring of a scheme. These costs might include processing applications, communication with both landlords and tenants within the scheme, conducting inspections, investigating breaches of licence conditions, and wider enforcement. The fees could also be used to cover non-recoverable costs in the use of interim and final Management Orders within the scheme boundaries. The Council could not generate surplus funds from Selective Licensing schemes. The income generated, the bulk of which was collected in years one and two, was required to manage and resource the scheme for its full period of designation. Each Selective Licensing scheme had unique objectives and fee structures including discounts. They were, therefore, not directly comparable, however, the table at Paragraph 5.12 showed Selective Licence fees declared or proposed since 2024 in England. A more complete list of scheme fees was at Appendix 9.

Paragraphs 5.18 to 5.25 described the fee changes in detail. The overall Standard Licence Fee, made up from the Part 1 and Part 2 charge would be marginally reduced to £975.00 which, in turn, increased the discount on licence charges. The Part 1 charge covered administration and it was

estimated that the costs of infrastructure, including a database and administrative staff cost (x3.2 FTE), would be £1,154,287 over 5 years. Based on the reduced expected licences (4,132) costs per licence application will be £276.00. The Part 2 charge covered maintenance and was estimated from the Neighbourhood Development and Improvement Plans (Area Plan) attached at Appendix 5. The requirements from the 6 plans identified 9.65 (FTE) officers, at varying grades, to deliver the enforcement and engagement in the 6 areas. The estimated cost of the maintenance element was £2,968,163 over 5 years. The standard maintenance licence charge would be £699.00 (Budget projections were contained in Appendix 9.)

The discounts identified in the consultation would be retained or increased as follows:

- Applicants who provided complete and valid applications, assumed to be 50% of applicants, would receive a discount of 5% from the Part 2 charge
- Applicants who received a rebate in the 2020-25 scheme (37%)
- Applicants with flats in the same building would pay one Part 1 charge per building and receive a 65% discount on the Part 2 charge for all subsequent properties within that building
- Applicants with large portfolios (four or more properties) would pay a full Part 1 charge for each of their first three properties and receive a 65% discount on all subsequent properties.

Details on charges for non-compliant applications were set out in paragraph 5.21. The effects of the changes to the fees were set out in the table at paragraph 5.26.

Section 6 of the report set out the timetable for implementation. Appendix 10 was the publicity plan which outlined the prescribed actions that had to be undertaken following a declaration.

Section 3 of the report set out the options for Cabinet to consider. Option 1 was to not pursue any further Selective Licensing declarations at this time. Option 2 was to await the effect of the Renters' Rights Bill (as discussed in paragraph 2.4 of the report) and the updated data to identify relevant LSOA's and therefore postpone a decision on any declaration until the Bill was enacted and or new national/local data sets were published. These options were not recommended.

Option 3 was to proceed to make Selective Licensing declarations based on the criteria set out, the revised Licence Fee and the Licence Conditions, in all of the proposed areas, including the introduction of a Stakeholder Steering Group, as suggested in the consultation responses. This was the recommended option.

The report was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB), who advised that the recommendations be supported.

The Chair of OSMB thanked the Assistant Director for his comprehensive responses during the scrutiny of the proposals. Many questions had been asked on various aspects of the report but OSMB agreed to support the recommendations as proposed. They did ask that the annual review of the Selective Licensing planned designations be brought back to the relevant scrutiny committee to review the progress being made on the overall Selective Licensing scheme and to review any amendments to the scheme 12 months after implementation. This was accepted by Cabinet.

During the meeting, Cabinet Members expressed their support for the scheme, particularly the positive impact it would have on families and children. The Leader reiterated that the Council could not make any profit from Selective Licensing. All fund generated would go into the running of the scheme. He stated that this was about making sure tenants were safe in their homes. The consultation responses were acknowledged but the Leader explained that it was a consultation, not a referendum. He criticised landlords that had openly threatened tenants with rent increases due to the scheme. The fact that Maltby had not been included in this scheme showed that Selective Licensing could lead to such improvements that it was no longer necessary. The Leader hoped that would be the case for other areas in 5 years' time. He reiterated that he wanted landlords to work with the Council to improve properties.

**Resolved:**

That Cabinet:

1. Review all options proposed in section 3 of the report and approve Option 3, which is to proceed to approve Selective Licensing declarations, including the establishment of a stakeholder steering group (based on the criteria set out within the report and appendices);
2. Approve the revised Licence Fee and the Licence Conditions, in all of the proposed areas which are: a) Town Centre/Eastwood/East Dene/Clifton/Boston Castle b) Masbrough/Kimberworth c) Thurgroft d) Dinnington e) Brinsworth f) Parkgate.
3. Agree that the annual review of the Selective Licensing planned designations be brought back to the relevant scrutiny committee to review the progress being made on the overall Selective Licensing scheme and to review any amendments to the scheme 12 months after implementation.

**63. AUTHORISATION OF NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS (NSIP) - WHITESTONE SOLAR FARM**

Consideration was given to the report which sought approval to delegate the preparation and submission of documents to the Planning Inspectorate, both in relation to the Whitestone Solar Farm project and any future applications that fell under the legislation for Nationally

Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP), to the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy. This would ensure they were considered in an efficient and timely manner and within the curtailed timescales imposed by the Planning Inspectorate.

NSIPs were projects of certain types, over a certain size, which were considered by the Government to be so big and nationally important that permission to build them needed to be given at a national level, by the responsible Secretary of State. The thresholds for NSIPs were set out in Sections 15 to 30A of the Planning Act 2008. This process was separate from developments under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, with NSIPs having an emphasis on pre-application work shaping the design of the project.

Rotherham had recently been informed of proposals for a new solar farm and associated infrastructure, known as Whitestone which, due to its scale and energy generating capacity, would be considered as an NSIP. The process could take up to 2 years from when an application was submitted to when a decision would be made. The key milestones were set out in paragraph 1.7 of the report. The preparation of many of the documents outlined in paragraph 1.7 would be carried out in consultation with other internal departments and were not dissimilar to practices carried out on planning applications under the Town and Country Planning Act. This was with the exception of the Local Impact Report (LIR).

The LIR was a key document and was designed to give details of the likely impact of the proposed development on the authority's area, and it had to be taken into account by PINS and the Secretary of State. The timescale for submission of this was usually limited to 28 days, therefore, there would be limited or no opportunity for Cabinet or Planning Board to consider the contents of these documents. The content of this document would be 'matters of fact'. The LIR would document the impacts the proposed development would have on the Borough, both positive and negative, but there was no requirement for any analysis, or balancing of these impacts to be undertaken, as that was the role of the Planning Inspector.

The Council's Constitution pre-dated the submission of the Whitestone Solar Farm proposal and accordingly, it was necessary to determine the governance of this and any future NSIPs. In view of the factual nature of the LIR and all other associated documents, it was recommended that the Constitution be updated and approval of the aforementioned documents be delegated to the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment in consultation with the Head of Planning and Building Control and Cabinet Member. This was in relation to the Whitestone Solar Farm and any future applications that fell under the NSIP legislation.

During the meeting it was reiterated that the Council had no decision making powers in relation to the Whitestone proposals. All decisions would be taken by the Planning Inspectorate and Government. The strong local opposition to the Whitestone proposal was noted by the Leader and he stressed the need for the Government to listen to the views of the local community.

The report was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB), who advised that the recommendations be supported. It did feel that the reference to Whitestone in the title of the report was misleading and they raised some concerns during debate but overall, they supported the recommendations. OSMB requested that a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document be developed to provide clear and accessible guidance on the process for making representations to support Elected Members and residents. It was agreed that this would be produced and published on the Council's website and sent to Elected Members.

**Resolved:**

That Cabinet:

1. Delegate authority to the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment, in consultation with the Head of Planning and Building Control and Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy, to submit to the Planning Inspectorate all documentation and relevant evidence for their consideration and deal with all procedural matters that may arise in relation to this application and any future applications that fall under the legislation for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects.
2. Agree to the proposal that a report be submitted to the Planning Board on a quarterly basis to provide a summary of all responses submitted from the Council to the Planning Inspectorate in respect of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects in the previous quarter.
3. Agree that a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document be developed to provide clear and accessible guidance on the process for making representations to support Elected Members and residents and that this be published on the Council's website.

**64. HOUSEHOLDER DESIGN GUIDE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

Consideration was given to the report which presented the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for approval. Supplementary Planning Documents helped improve planning applications, which in turn could speed up the planning process and produce better outcomes for the community. The Householder Design Guide SPD was last revised in 2019 and had been updated to account for

the latest guidance on boundary treatment and renewable energy considerations.

The SPD had been revised in order to give the most up-to-date guidance to residents, planning agents and developers. The revisions included updates to general wording throughout the document, and:

- Design Guidance 2.10, which included changes to the wording for boundary walls and fences to be more concise on the design principle of boundary treatment on domestic dwellings.
- Section 2.13, Renewable Energy Technology where further guidance had been added to include more renewable energy types that could be incorporated into domestic development. Options for reducing CO<sup>2</sup> emissions on domestic dwellings had become more wide ranging in recent years and the guidance was updated to reflect this.

Consultation on the draft SPD was undertaken in line with The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. In response to the consultation, the Council received 6 representations. All representations received had been considered and Appendix 2 'Consultation Statement' provided a summary of the issues raised, the Council's response and how the SPD had been amended as a result.

**Resolved:**

1. That Cabinet approves the adoption of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

**65. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD**

Consideration was given to the circulated report, the contents of which were included as part of the relevant items and the details included accordingly.

**66. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

**Resolved:-**

That the next meeting of the Cabinet be held on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2025, commencing at 10.00 a.m.