

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
Tuesday 21 October 2025

Present:- Councillor McKiernan (in the Chair); Councillors Adair, Allen, Beck, Clarke, Mault, Rashid, Sheppard, Steele, Taylor, Thorp and Tinsley.

Also in attendance:- Co-optees Mrs Kay Bacon & Mrs M. Jacques (Rotherfed)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ahmed, C. Carter, Jackson, Lelliott and Stables.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-
<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

26. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 2ND SEPTEMBER 2025

Councillor Allen referred to the minutes at page 8 of the agenda pack where she had raised concerns around the use of the word “happy” in Priority 4 of the draft Housing Strategy 2025-2030. This had led to a proposal for some alternative wording to be put forward to Cabinet - “*safe, thriving and places people want to live in*”. Councillor Allen asked whether this alternative wording had been put to Cabinet for consideration and whether there had been any feedback.

Councillor Steele confirmed that the recommendation from Improving Places Select Commission (IPSC) for the alternative wording for Priority 4 of the Housing Strategy 2025-2030 had been put to Cabinet at its meeting on 15th September 2025 but that Cabinet had rejected the proposal and approved the original wording.

The Governance Advisor informed members that a small typographical error had been spotted at minute 24 where an incorrect reference to “Improving *Lives* Select Commission” had been made rather than “Improving *Places* Select Commission”. The Governance Advisor sought members’ approval of this amendment, which had already been made to the printed copy of the minutes ready for the Chair to sign. Members approved this amendment.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 2nd September 2025 be approved, as amended, as a true and correct record of the proceedings.

27. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Sheppard declared a personal interest in Minute No. 31 (Pride in Place Programme for Rotherham Central (previously Plan for Neighbourhoods) 2025-2035 on the grounds of being the former Deputy

Leader and Cabinet Member involved in some of the funds mentioned in the presentation.

28. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

The Chair advised that there were no members of the public or representatives of media organisations present at the meeting and there were no questions in respect of matters on the agenda.

29. 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 or public from the meeting.

30. HOUSING STRATEGY 2025-2030 DRAFT ACTION PLAN

At the Chair's invitation, the Cabinet Member for Housing, Councillor Beresford, introduced the item and explained that the Draft Action Plan was being brought to IPSC following its review of the draft Housing Strategy 2025-2030 at September's meeting. The Housing Strategy had since been approved by Cabinet on 15th September 2025.

Councillor Beresford thanked members of IPSC for their involvement during the development of the Housing Strategy and confirmed that IPSC's request to add some specific text around ASB and a further case study had also been approved at Cabinet. Councillor Beresford was also pleased to confirm that a date had been arranged for the "deep dive" workshop on ASB which IPSC members had expressed an interest in at the September meeting. This was due to take place on 4th December 2025. The Chair noted that more information regarding this workshop would be provided in the Work Programme item later in the agenda.

Councillor Beresford explained that the Housing Strategy Action Plan would be approved by the Strategic Director for Adults, Housing & Public Health and it would be published on the Council website, alongside the approved Housing Strategy. Progress on the Action Plan would be monitored by the Strategic Housing Team and it was intended to bring the Action Plan back to IPSC to oversee performance on an annual basis at the end of each financial year.

Garry Newton, Housing Development Intelligence Coordinator went through the presentation which accompanied the Report and Action Plan, making the following points –

- The four priorities of the Housing Strategy and the key aims under each priority formed the basis of the Action Plan.
- There were three cross-cutting themes which underpinned the Council's approach and were woven through every target in the Action Plan – 1) to keep residents healthy and warm, 2) to reduce

carbon emissions and 3) to reduce inequalities in and between communities.

- Each of the four priorities had its own individual Action Plan with key performance indicators (KPIs) that would measure the success of the strategy. There would be a total of 16 KPIs through the four priorities.
- Each individual Action Plan would set out what the Council and its partners and stakeholders would do over the five years of the Strategy to ensure that the aims were met. The data and the actions that would be used to measure against the KPIs were also set out.
- Key milestones were highlighted for each of the four priorities:-

Priority 1 Building high quality, sustainable and affordable new homes) – progress being made on key housing sites around the borough (e.g Bassingthorpe Farm) and the Council's own delivery programme to build social housing (714 new homes had been built since 2018 and the target of 1000 homes by summer 2027 should be achieved).

Priority 2 Improving the safety, quality and energy efficiency of homes - tenant satisfaction measures being monitored; a good outcome from the upcoming inspection by the Regulator of Social Housing; and all emergency repairs, complaints, damp and mould and gas safety issues being dealt with on time. Energy efficiency improvements would help residents reduce fuel bills whilst also reducing the impact of carbon emissions. A key indicator under this Priority would be to ensure that all council homes achieved energy performance rating C by 2030.

Priority 3 Supporting residents to live independently, including through prevention of homelessness - waiting times being reduced for adaptations to existing homes; new homes designed and built to meet a range of physical needs; and the provision of affordable and temporary accommodation increased to help prevent and relieve homelessness.

Priority 4 Ensuring that neighbourhoods are safe, happy, and thriving – the number of long-term empty homes being reduced; positive impacts being made in neighbourhoods through tenant engagement work; and the engagement of residents on environmental improvements.

- A high-level spreadsheet tracker would sit behind the Action Plan and would be used to monitor the performance of KPIs. This tracker had been shared with the Chair but it was not intended to publish the tracker due to the high level of detail. The tracker would

identify all data used to monitor each measure, where the data is held and reported and how often it is updated. The tracker would link to the Council's existing performance reporting through the Housing Quality Improvement & Performance Board and would be monitored monthly in-house, with data presented to IPSC every July.

- Softer intelligence would also be gathered - for example, via the Place and Quality Panel, to ensure schemes were delivered with input from cross-council services and that lessons were learnt from outcomes of recent delivery. Case studies would be used to present these outcomes rather than hard data.
- Some measures would be monitored by using external data, often government data such as fuel poverty levels. It was noted that data published at a national level would usually lag between six months to two years behind. Therefore, some impact of the strategy would not be reported on for up to two years afterwards.
- An example KPI score card was worked through for members which demonstrated different ways in which performance would be measured under the Action Plan.

The Chair invited members of IPSC to raise questions and queries on the Report, draft Action Plan and presentation and in the ensuing question and answer session the following points were raised:-

Councillor Beck asked about the current level of Right to Buy purchases and whether some were still going through from before the deadline of 21 November 2024 (whereafter the Government revised the Right to Buy scheme and significantly reduced the available discount under the scheme).

The Housing Development Intelligence Coordinator explained that this data was not readily available but that the number of completions was reported on monthly so this data could be provided to Councillor Beck outside of the meeting.

The Chair referred to the ongoing target of 1,000 new homes by 2027 and noted that the Housing Strategy was to last for five years, beyond this target date. Was there a plan in place for beyond 2027 in respect of new council houses?

Sarah Watts, Strategic Housing Manager, responded that the council was not far off the target of 1,000 new homes by 2027 and that plans for after 2027 were already developing. The Strategic Housing manager stated that there would need to be a balance struck between delivering more new homes and improving existing stock. John Holman, the Interim Assistant Director of Housing added that some of this preparatory work would come out in the budget planning that the Housing team were

currently undertaking.

Councillor Thorp asked a question around Priority 3 and the aim to build and acquire a range of housing types to meet the needs of older residents. Councillor Thorp asked whether this meant building clusters of bungalows in one area or building the odd bungalow in different areas.

The Strategic Housing Manager confirmed that service would take a mixed approach to development for older residents, which would be led by what land was available and what opportunities were presented. Each option would be considered on its merits and either one-off developments or larger packages would be considered if they provided good value for money and met the needs of local communities. The Strategic Housing Manager also commented that not all elderly residents wanted to live in bungalows so options for lower-level blocks of flats could also be considered as such developments were less land hungry and provided alternative opportunities for accessible living.

In a supplementary question, the Chair asked for more information on the use of adaptation grants and whether this funding came from central government or was Council-funded.

The Strategic Housing Manager explained that there were different pots of funding available for adaptations – some for properties that were in private ownership and some for Council housing. The Council would need to work smart to ensure that where a property was right for a particular person or family, they could be enabled to stay there via adaptations. If a property was no longer deemed suitable, the Allocations Policy could potentially be used to find something more suitable within existing Council stock. Service would endeavour to work with that person's needs to support them to be independent.

In a follow-on question surrounding Priority 3, Councillor Thorp raised some concerns around the Allocations Policy and applicants being confused as to where they sat on the priority list, referencing an ongoing case he was dealing with. Councillor Thorp referred to a conversation he had had with the Monitoring Officer who had advised him to consult with the Interim Assistant Director of Housing, but he understood that the Interim Assistant Director of Housing would shortly be leaving the council.

The Interim Assistant Director of Housing confirmed that the newly appointed Assistant Director of Housing would be starting on 3rd November 2025 but that he would be happy to meet with Councillor Thorp to discuss his concerns prior to that date. The Interim Assistant Director of Housing also suggested that members might benefit from a “deep dive” look at the new Housing Allocations Policy that had been recently developed, potentially via a member briefing.

Councillor Beresford stated that she was aware of the case Councillor Thorp referred to and whilst she accepted that there had been some

confusion around the advert in that instance, she was satisfied that the Allocation Policy itself was clear and fair. Councillor Beresford explained that the policy in respect of rural allocations had been explained to Councillor Thorp and that work had been done to streamline the priorities down to four, and that rather than having a waiting list, each applicant sat under a different priority. Councillor Beresford reinforced the offer to bring the Housing Allocations Policy back to IPSC for further consideration.

The Chair asked for confirmation that the new Housing Allocations Policy was agreed and finalised. Councillor Beresford confirmed that that it was in the process of being implemented and would be going live in December 2025.

Councillor Steele referred to the stated aim to end fuel poverty and asked what was being done to support residents in their homes who live in fuel poverty. Councillor Beresford commented that one of the key priorities under the Housing Strategy was to make homes more fuel efficient and that there were examples of this being done across the borough by installing more efficient heating systems (such as air source heat pumps), increasing insulation and ensuring work was done on properties to meet the minimum EPC C rating. The Financial Inclusion team would also work to support struggling tenants and grants were available to residents in fuel poverty. Councillor Beresford also mentioned the work of partner agencies such as Energy Wise, which the Council signposted residents to.

In a supplementary question, Councillor Steele asked how the work Rotherham Council did measured up against the work of other local authorities in the area of fuel poverty and whether the Council works with neighbouring authorities on projects. Councillor Beresford confirmed that the Council does work with neighbouring authorities but couldn't comment on how the Council engages nationally in this area and would get back to Councillor Steele with this information.

The Interim Assistant Director for Housing added that the work on getting existing properties up to EPC C rating was funded by a government grant and that the Council match-funded it. There was a budget of around £18 million to spend and the Council followed the national agenda of "fabric first", whereby improvements to the fabric of the property were prioritised to improve efficiencies across the housing stock. It was explained that the government grant only allowed the Council to bring current EPC rated D properties up to a C rating so where there were properties with an E rating, the Council would have to self-fund these. The programme was based on "worst first" and where further prioritisation was necessary, deprivation levels would be considered to build up to 2030. If more government grants were to become available, the council would apply for these.

Councillor Tinsley asked whether when the Council looked to acquire properties it would only consider properties with a minimum of EPC C

rating or whether it would carry out work on lower rated properties to ensure that they were a minimum C rating “when let”. The Interim Assistant Director for Housing confirmed that the Council could acquire a property and then carry out work to bring it up to an EPC C rating. Most properties now, when acquired, had this minimum C rating, but there could be examples of the Council buying back former Right to Buy stock where the EPC rating was lower than a C so remedial work would be required.

In a follow up question, Councillor Tinsley asked whether the Council engaged with the private housing market and commented that there were private housing estates within his ward of Maltby which could benefit from Council investment to bring them up to standard. The Interim Assistant director confirmed that the Council did buy property in the open market and also, had first option built in to buy back former Right to Buy properties. Officers scanned the market in areas where properties were required and there was value to be obtained.

The Chair requested more information on the new Caretaking Teams referred to in Priority 4 and whether these would be brand new teams or would be a shared role with the Places team? Councillor Beresford explained that this was an area that service was focusing on following low satisfaction responses to surveys on current caretaking services. Caretaking services were currently run by contractors and there would be an exercise undertaken to scope a remodel of the service. Councillor Beresford confirmed that once a decision on this had been made, IPSC would be informed.

In relation to Priority 3, Councillor Sheppard asked for more information on the work that was already done with health partners, the Health & Wellbeing Board and third sector organisations to ensure that the Council built properties that benefit both the physical and mental health of residents and also what opportunities there were in terms of funding by working with partners to get schemes off the ground.

The Strategic Housing Manager confirmed that regular conversations took place at the Strategic Housing Forum. The Housing Team worked closely with registered housing providers that provided housing to meet a range of needs. There were links through the Health and Wellbeing Board and service engaged with colleagues within the different NHS structures and attended various external boards on a regular basis which considered issues such as hospital discharge, learning disability and autism needs. The Strategic Housing Manager emphasised that service did not just look at the Council’s own housing intelligence in isolation, but in the context of data from other services and providers within the community to build a holistic picture. This overview enabled service to formulate plans around the needs of an area or group of particular need that might not have been met.

The Strategic Housing Manager gave the example of current plans to update the Housing Need Assessment. This would be pulled into a Housing Needs Study that would be used to help shape the future delivery programme and would contribute to the development of the local plan. Conversations would continue with developers and other local organisations to support with this.

In a follow up question around Priority 4, Councillor Sheppard asked what was being done to foster good social behaviour within communities, for example younger families keeping an eye on elderly neighbours. Could this work be developed with the new caretaking teams and fostered into a new strategic opportunity to strengthen communities?

The Interim Assistant Director of Housing confirmed that the plans for the new caretaking scheme were in their infancy and that service was looking to a more joined up approach generally with other services and external partners – for example, Adult Social Care, Public Health, the NHS and the police. A number of opportunities would be considered to develop the housing service for the future and engage tenants more, including the possibility of neighbourhood satellite offices. These conversations would be taking place over the next 12-18 months, with the first meeting of officers to consider new proposals due to take place in December. The Interim Assistance Director of Housing encouraged members to provide any useful input they might have.

In response, Councillor Sheppard asked how service was planning to ensure that communities were involved from the start of this process to shape what the new plans looked like. Councillor Beresford responded that tenant engagement was very important and referenced the involvement of the two co-optee members from Rotherfed who sat on IPSC. It was essential to involve and seek the views of the people who lived within the neighbourhoods themselves so work would be done with tenant engagement groups and community groups and Councillor Beresford confirmed that service would be looking at ways to expand the groups of tenants involved.

The Chair thanked officers for their input and members for the questions asked.

Resolved:-

- (1) That the contents of the Housing Strategy 2025–2030 draft Action Plan be noted;
- (2) That IPSC would review the progress of the Action Plan on an annual basis throughout the Strategy period. As performance would be measured April-March, it is requested that the Action Plan progress report is presented to IPSC every July throughout the life of the Strategy period; and

(3) That service provides updates on any changes made to either the Action Plan or the Housing Strategy in each annual progress report, given the delegated authority to the Strategic Director to approve the Action Plan and make any minor data amendments to the Housing Strategy.

31. PRIDE IN PLACE PROGRAMME FOR ROTHERHAM CENTRAL (PREVIOUSLY PLAN FOR NEIGHBOURHOODS) 2025-2035

At the Chair's invitation, the Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs & the Local Economy, Councillor Williams, introduced the update presentation and explained that the Pride in Place programme was a further rebranding of the former Plan for Neighbourhoods. Councillor Williams confirmed that this rebrand did not change what had been reported to IPSC at September's meeting – namely, the funding of £20 million available to the Rotherham Central area over a 10- year period. The aims of the programme also remained the same - thriving places, stronger communities and giving residents more control.

Councillor Williams referred to the recently announced additional scheme within the Rotherham borough at Maltby East where £20 million of funding would also be made available over a 10-year period to fund projects and interventions within that area.

Councillor Williams mentioned Councillor Allen's previously minuted request to be provided with a better overview of the wider regeneration programmes and strategy and how the different funding streams fitted together. Officers had met with the Chair and Councillor Allen prior to this meeting and additional slides had been incorporated into the presentation to provide more context and information in this respect.

Councillor Williams confirmed that since September's meeting, officers had been developing the possible interventions and themes that could come out of the funding and would be taking members through these within the presentation. The deadline to make submissions to government with confirmed plans would be at the end of November and prior to this, service would take a report to Cabinet for approval earlier in November.

Simon Moss, the Assistant Director of Planning, Regeneration & Transport provided an update on the strategic intent behind the Council's regeneration programme and how that related to the funding which had been allocated. The Council had been very successful in securing funding over the last five years via various government funding streams but these funding streams had often been disparate funds that hadn't always fitted together well. The Assistant Director of Planning, Regeneration & Transport explained the importance of focusing on the strategic plans first so that when the funding came in, there were already projects identified that it could be applied to – strategy driving investment rather than funding.

The Assistant Director of Planning, Regeneration & Transport went through the first few slides of the presentation for members, highlighting the timeline of recent regeneration projects (in blue text) with the different funding streams set out underneath (in black text). This began with the Town Centre Masterplan in 2017, followed by the Town Investment Plan, which began connecting opportunities outside of the main town centre footprint. When the Levelling-Up money became available in 2021, this led to the regeneration model beginning to strain slightly as the Council had to make quick decisions as to where to spend the money. This led to investment beyond the town centre in the principal towns and opportunities to improve the visitor and leisure economy, post-pandemic. The trend of borough-wide investment had continued further with the Towns & Villages Programme and the Our Places Fund.

The Assistant Director of Planning, Regeneration & Transport explained that the Pride in Place programme was the next stage of this evolution. It would include a significant amount of revenue as well as capital funding which opened up a wider range of projects. The Pride in Place programme looked beyond the core town centre footprint and also proactively included input and collaboration with communities. The maps provided within the presentation set out geographically how the different projects and schemes fitted together.

Lorna Vertigan, the Head of Regeneration, provided a recap on the current situation with the Pride in Place programme. It would be a 10-year programme with a split between capital and revenue. It represented the first time the Council had a revenue allocation within a government-led grant scheme for regeneration. The consultation process, which IPSC had been updated on in September's meeting, had completed and service were preparing the item to go before Cabinet on 17th November 2025, ahead of submission of the "regeneration plan" to government on 28th November 2025.

The Head of Regeneration referred to the request from members in the previous meeting for a clearer map displaying the boundaries of the government-defined area subject to the programme and explained that further detail and recognisable landmarks had been added to the map included within the presentation to help members orientate.

The Head of Regeneration talked members through the Roles & Responsibilities pie-chart included within the presentation, which set out the four clear roles to be played in the development of Pride in Place programme, three of which would sit with the Council and one, with the Neighbourhood Board:

- Accountable Body – legal and financial (Council)
- Delivery role – project leads for each intervention (Council)

- Strategic Influence – where the money is spent and how the Neighbourhood Board is directing the money (Council)
- Lead on engagement (Neighbourhood Board)

The Neighbourhood Board was an obligatory body, intended to put local people at the forefront of the regeneration plan. An independent Chairperson would be appointed and since the last meeting, the current Town Board and preliminary Neighbourhood Board had been approached to see if there were any members wishing to make an expression of interest in the Chair role. One nomination had been put forward and there would be a formal interview process to be conducted. If this person was not deemed suitable, a wider recruitment process would be launched.

The Neighbourhood Board must have a maximum of 20 members. This was prescribed by government, as were the types of member set out in black font in the presentation – namely, an MP, 2 local councillors and a senior representative from the police. The other suggested members (set out in blue font) were for guidance and were not prescribed. The Head of Regeneration confirmed that a number of people had already been identified but that there were some under-represented groups and demographics that service would be looking to engage with. Members were asked to put forward any suggestions they might have in this respect.

The Head of Regeneration explained to members that service was currently focusing on the range of interventions that the funding could be applied to. There were a number of pre-approved interventions which did not require a business case to be put forward to government and could be progressed straight away. For the proposal to Cabinet and the submission to government, service had set out the planned high-level interventions. Through consultation, service were proposing to focus on areas which don't have easy access to alternative streams of funding and had therefore taken out areas such as housing and transport. The top six proposed interventions had been identified as:

- Cohesion
- Education and opportunity
- Health and wellbeing
- Regeneration, high streets and heritage
- Safety and security
- Work, productivity and skills

It was a government requirement to allocate a particular sum of money to each identified intervention but there would be flexibility and the ability to shift money around during the initial first four-year period. The detail of each project would be worked on over the next 6-12 months. Some funding would also need to be set aside to manage the programme and manage the Board. The Head of Regeneration explained that the allocations were currently indicative, in line with what the government had asked the Council to provide.

The Head of Regeneration explained that after submission of plans to government on 28th November 2025, the period between December 2025 and March 2026 would be when government considered the submitted proposals. During this time, service would be working on project initiation documents and the details of each project.

The Chair invited members of IPSC to raise questions and queries on the presentation and in the ensuing question and answer session the following points were raised:-

Co-optee Ms M Jacques asked a question regarding the Neighbourhood Board and whether tenants would be able to join the Board. The Head of Regeneration confirmed that if there were tenant representatives within the relevant areas that were interested in being involved in the Neighbourhood Board, then service would engage with them. Ms M Jacques asked how tenants would be aware of this and the Head of Regeneration suggested that the geography of the areas and the relevant tenants associations were looked at.

The Governance Advisor asked the Head of Regeneration to explain the difference in the total on the Intervention Allocations slide of the presentation. This had been updated from the presentation included within the agenda pack. The Head of Regeneration explained that it had been decided to balance deliverability and push some of the spend back into later years of the programme, hence the difference of approximately £1 million in the overall figure in the presentation before members, compared to the figure in the agenda pack.

Councillor McKiernan asked whether the Neighbourhood Board could step in and not agree to the level of spending in certain areas or could request entirely different spending proposals. The Head of Regeneration commented that it would not be possible for the Neighbourhood Board to ask the Council to start plans from scratch as the government would have already agreed to those outline proposals. However, it could have some influence on how the different projects develop and there would be some flexibility on moving funding between projects. The Council would also have some influence over this and there would be a hope that the Neighbourhood Board would generally approve of plans as a preliminary board had already been involved in shaping them.

Councillor Thorp asked whether the plan would be for officers to put to their spending proposals to the Neighbourhood Board and the Board then consider and make decisions. The Head of Regeneration confirmed that the Council, being the experts on what would be deliverable, would be able to advise the Board but that it would be a collaborative and consultative process. Selection of the right Chair for the Neighbourhood Board would be imperative to ensure that someone had independent and objective oversight.

In a supplemental question, Councillor Thorp commented that he would not want the Neighbourhood Board to be seen as merely “rubber stamping” decisions already made. The Head of Regeneration provided assurance that this would not be the case and that there would be no point in having a Neighbourhood Board if the Council had a veto on decisions. The Council would need to be mindful of its role as accountable body but would not be forcing opinion.

Councillor Steele asked for more information on the projected administration costs. The Head of Regeneration explained that with this programme, the Council had been able to take some revenue costs straight out of the fund to support delivery and administration costs. The Assistant Director of Planning, Regeneration & Transport explained that with wider capital programmes a financial mechanism could be utilised for recovering any costs associated with delivering projects.

Councillor Steele further commented that whilst he had seen the line of £248,000 in the allocations slide for “Programme Management/Delivery Costs” he wanted to know more specifically how much it was likely to cost to draw up contracts etc and whether it could go above this figure. The Head of Regeneration explained that the costs of contract management could depend on the type of project involved and confirmed that service could look to run an exercise to provide some indicative figures based on likely fees and officer time on similar projects.

Councillor Tinsley asked for an explanation as to why housing and transport had not been included in the list of proposed interventions. The Head of Regeneration explained that the decision had been made to focus on areas where it could generally be harder to find available funding streams.

In a supplementary question, Councillor Tinsley asked whether during the consultation process, transport had been considered. Councillor Tinsley expressed the opinion that opportunities may have been missed by excluding transport and housing and asked whether it should have been put to the Neighbourhood Board to decide which areas to prioritise? The Head of Regeneration explained that various workshops had already taken place with the preliminary Board to help shape the interventions which formed the proposal to government.

Councillor Allen raised a point in relation to the Roles & Responsibilities pie-chart and asked what service considered the role of IPSC to be within this programme? The Head of Regeneration commented that IPSC would sit within strategic influence and that the input of IPSC would be very much appreciated. Councillor Allen suggested that IPSC should be added to that quadrant of the pie-chart and the Assistant Director of Planning, Regeneration & Transport apologised for the omission and confirmed, for the record, that IPSC played an important part in strategic influence.

Co-optee, Ms K. Bacon wished to have a comment noted, that she found it interesting that the "Programme Management Costs/Delivery Costs" line in the Intervention Allocations slide was more than "Education and Opportunity".

Co-optee, Ms M. Jacques referred to a previous similar project called Pathfinder which she had been involved in where unfortunately, money ran out. Ms M. Jacques asked how the Council would ensure that this would not happen with this programme? The Head of Regeneration responded by commenting that the government were now taking a longer-term view with these kind of regeneration projects. This would be the longest fund the Council had ever had and part of the function of the Neighbourhood Board would be to try and generate more income so that initiatives could be strengthened and could continue to be self-funded.

Councillor Clarke asked a question about the new town square project in her ward of Dinnington. The Chair explained that this did not directly relate to the area within the Pride in Place programme and asked service to contact Councillor Clarke directly on this issue.

Councillor Sheppard asked how the Council would make sure that the Neighbourhood Board represented the voices of the different communities which straddle the geography of the area in question. In response, the Head of Regeneration explained that there were already a number of groups and areas represented on the Town Board and on the preliminary Neighbourhood Board. Through this, service could see where geographical and demographic gaps existed and were currently undertaking a gap analysis exercise. It was hoped that by utilising knowledge and connections from the Neighbourhood Service and members, the Council would be able to identify additional representatives.

On this point, Councillor Williams stressed that when considering the Pride in Place programme, members needed to consider the area within the scheme as a whole and not just their own local wards. It was hoped that the interventions that come out of the programme would ultimately benefit the wider Rotherham geography.

Councillor Steele asked if a Chair had been identified for the Neighbourhood Board yet. The Head of Regeneration explained that expressions of interest had been requested from members of the current Town Board and preliminary Neighbourhood Board who had helped to

shape the plans. There had been one formal approach, and the Council would respond to ask that person to set out how they meet the government criteria for the Chair. If that person was not successful, the post would be advertised more widely.

In a supplemental question, Councillor Steele asked if the Chair, when appointed, would then be involved in appointing the other members of the Neighbourhood Board. The Head of Regeneration confirmed that this would be the case.

In discussing the proposed recommendations, Councillor McKiernan asked members to consider if they would like an annual update to come to IPSC on progress under the scheme. Councillor Tinsley asked whether within that update, details of the new fund for Maltby could be included.

Andrew Bramidge, the Strategic Director for Regeneration & Environment explained that the timetable for the Maltby element of the scheme was slightly different. More detail on the scheme was expected from the government in early 2026 and the Council would need to respond, confirming acceptance of the geography of the scheme and providing details of the proposed Neighbourhood Board, by July 2026. Therefore, the Strategic Director for Regeneration & Environment proposed that the Maltby scheme be brought to IPSC for input in March/April 2026.

Councillor McKiernan made a further suggestion that the Chair of the Neighbourhood Board, once appointed, is invited to future updates to IPSC.

The Chair thanked officers for their input and members for the questions asked.

Resolved:-

(1) That the contents of the presentation providing an update on the Pride in Place Programme for Rotherham Central 2025-2035 (formerly Plan for Neighbourhoods) be noted; and

(2) That it is requested that service present an Annual Update to IPSC on progress against the Pride in Place scheme and that the Chair of the Neighbourhood Board is invited to attend these updates. Future updates should also include further detail on the recently announced extension of the Pride in Place scheme and funding to Maltby.

(Councillor Sheppard declared a personal interest in Minute No. 31 (Pride in Place Programme for Rotherham Central (previously Plan for Neighbourhoods) 2025-2035 on the grounds of being the former Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member involved in some of the funds mentioned in the presentation.)

32. IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - WORK PROGRAMME 2025 - 2026

The Governance Advisor introduced the work programme report and made members aware of the following updates –

- **School Road Safety Review:**

A meeting had taken place on 17th October 2025 to re-start this review with members of the sub-group and the relevant officers. As a result of this constructive discussion, further meetings, visits and evidence gathering sessions would be scheduled.

- **Members' Suggestions for Work Programme topics**

Suggestions for work programme topics that had been submitted to Councillor Steele over the summer had been considered and incorporated into the IPSC Work Programme, where suitable. The Governance Advisor confirmed that members had been contacted separately to confirm how their suggestions had been incorporated or where they would be considered via an off-agenda method. Members were asked to contact the Governance Advisor if they had any queries.

- **Proposed ASB Workshop – 4th December 2025**

The Governance Advisor informed members that an invite would shortly be coming out to them for a dedicated workshop on ASB to be delivered by the Housing team on the morning of 4th December 2025. This workshop had been arranged further to discussions surrounding ASB at the September IPSC meeting. Members were encouraged to attend in person, if possible, as the workshop had been designed to be interactive, with case studies to discuss and work through.

Resolved:-

- 1) That the update on the Work Programme be received and noted; and
- 2) That the Governance Advisor be authorised to make any required changes to the work programme in consultation with the Chair/Vice Chair and to report any such changes back at the next meeting for endorsement.

33. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair advised that there were no urgent items of business requiring the Commission's consideration.