COUNCIL MEETING
9th September, 2026

Present:- The Mayor of Rotherham (Councillor Haroon Rashid) (in the Chair); Councillors Brent, Adair, Ahmed, Alam, Bacon, Baggaley, Baker-Rogers, Ball, Baum-Dixon, Beck, Bennett-Sylvester, Beresford, Blackham, Bower, A. Carter, C. Carter, Castledine-Dack, Clarke, T. Collingham, Z. Collingham, Cowen, Currie, Cusworth, Duncan, Elliott, Fisher, Garnett, Hall, Harper, Harrison, Havard, Hughes, Hussain, Ismail, Jackson, Jones, Keenan, Lelliott, Marshall, Mault, McKiernan, Monk, Robinson, Read, Reynolds, Ryalls, Sheppard, Stables, Steele, Tarmey, Taylor, Thorp, Tinsley, Williams and Yasseen.

Officers in attendance:

John Edwards	Chief Executive
Phil Horsfield	Service Director of Legal Services and Monitoring Officer
Emma Hill	Head of Democratic Services
Barbel Gale	Governance Manager
Samantha Mullarkey	Governance Advisor and Clerk

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

53. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor congratulated Rotherham's The Reytons on securing their second number one album. It was an outstanding accomplishment, particularly for an independent band that had remained true to its vision and forged its own path to success. He thanked them for their commitment, determination and for continuing to showcase Rotherham on a national stage.

It was noted that the 46th Rotherham Show had recently taken place, and the Mayor had been delighted to attend.

Members joined the Mayor in remembering Dolly Parton following her recent passing and celebrated her 2007 visit to Rotherham. She brought with her the inspirational campaign to get children reading and into literature via the launch of her Imagination Library. The Mayor offered his condolences to her family and friends.

The Mayor also asked Members to join him in remembering Pauline Heaps who had sadly passed away recently. Pauline was a dedicated community figure in Maltby and a long-serving member of Maltby Town Council, serving her community for many years. The Mayor placed on record his thanks for Pauline's years of public and community service, and sent his sincere condolences to her family, friends and everyone in Maltby who knew her.

A full list of Mayoral Engagements was set out in Appendix A to the Mayor's Letter.

54. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Allen and Sutton.

55. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous Council meeting held on 15th July 2026.

In reference to Minute 40 – Notice of Motion – Stop Polluting Our Rivers and Hiking Out Bills – Councillor Steele confirmed that Yorkshire Water and Severn Trent had been invited to a special meeting of scrutiny. To date, Severn Trent had confirmed attendance. Yorkshire Water had not yet responded. All Members would be invited to the meeting with Overview and Scrutiny Management Board Members being invited to make recommendations.

Resolved:

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on 15th July 2026 be approved for signature by the Mayor.

Mover: Councillor Read Seconder: Councillor Cusworth

56. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

57. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There was one public question from Mr. Ashraf:

Council Leader Chris Read, further to my question on 17th November 2025 and the subsequent commitments made by yourself I now ask for your public commitment to fully endorse the "Rotherham raising the Palestinian flag annually in Solidarity and Compassion" motion, and to extend the usual cordial invitations on mine and the communities of Rotherham's behalf, for this and all subsequent years.

The Leader thanked Mr. Ashraf for his question and his dedication to this cause. The Leader fully expected the Council to fly the Palestinian Flag on the day requested as it had done in the two previous years.

In his supplementary, Mr. Ashraf invited Members of Parliament, Councillors, the Mayor and Deputy Mayor, local dignitaries and Council Officers to the flag raising event. He asked that support of the Palestinian

campaign move forward in a much more co-operative way, with more compassion.

The Leader confirmed that he shared the sentiments of the question and confirmed that all wanted to do what could be done to challenge the unspeakable atrocities taking place in the Middle East on a regular basis.

58. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

There were no items requiring the exclusion of the press and public.

59. LEADER OF THE COUNCIL'S STATEMENT

The Leader started his statement by associating himself with the Mayor's comments regarding the passing of Dolly Parton. Her visit to Rotherham in 2007 was fondly remembered along with her fierce advocacy for children's education.

Since the last Council meeting:

- Five of Rotherham's Green Spaces had again been recognised with the prestigious Green Flag Status; Clifton Park, Greasbrough Park, Rother Valley Country Park, Ulley Country Park and Rotherham Crematorium and Cemetery in East Herringthorpe.

- The Council had received an award for its tenant engagement activity receiving Exemplar Status from TPAS (the national tenant involvement experts). The Council was currently one of only five organisations to hold this award.

- Thousands of children from across Rotherham had taken advantage of the free swimming places in the Council's leisure centres – totalling just short of 28,000 visits altogether. There were a further 30,000 visits to the Clifton Park Watersplash in the hot weather. There had been 4,500 visits so far this year from people aged over 65 to leisure centres, taking advantage of the half price pilot.

- Provisional data showed all Rotherham students achieved higher A Level grades this year, with 74.9% achieving A* to C grades in A Levels and equivalent qualifications, an increase of 1.8% compared with last year.

- 73.1% of students achieved a grade 4 or above in English, exceeding the national average of 71.4%, while 58.5% achieved grade 5 or above, compared with 55% nationally.

- The Rotherham Show had taken place. The Leader stated that it was lovely to see so many families enjoying the event which remained the biggest free cultural festival in the north of England. He thanked all staff involved.

The Leader of the Majority Opposition Group, Councillor Zach Collingham, was invited to respond to the statement. He agreed with the comments regarding the Rotherham Show which had been another success for the Borough. It was also good to hear that the Borough had some high standard parks and increasingly educated young people.

In relation to the 28,000 visits to the leisure centres, Councillor Collingham asked if there was any evidence as to whether those people would have gone anyway, without the discount.

He also questioned how the Council was already forecasting a £10.9 million overspend, just 4 months into the financial year. Councillor Collingham asked:

- What assurances could be provided regarding the Council's understanding of the drivers behind the overspend;
- What was being done to address those drivers within the Council's control;
- What long-term plan was in place to reduce reliance on external providers.

In relation to Dinnington, Councillor Collingham asked the Leader if he was embarrassed that a flagship regeneration project was going to take the Council over four years to deliver, having encountered numerous delays.

Reference was made to Doncaster Sheffield Airport and reports that it was due to run out of money. He asked if the Leader was concerned that it was not listed as an agenda item at SYMCA's next board meeting.

Regarding the petition due to be discussed under Minute No. 60, Councillor Collingham asked the Leader to agree with him that Councillor Thorp was an asset to the Borough. He also asked if the Leader would learn anything from Councillor Thorp who had garnered more responses on his petition than the number of responses to the last two Council Plan consultations combined.

In response, the Leader stated that it was his understanding that free swimming had driven an increase in the number of children able to attend leisure centres and he was happy to provide those figures to Councillor Collingham.

Regarding the projected overspend, the Leader explained that nearly every local authority would project an overspend in Quarter 1. Those that did not would likely have overbudgeted and the Leader did not think that was a good way of setting budgets or priorities at the start of the year. In relation to the specific pressures, it was confirmed that there were a larger number of children in external residential placements than expected. This was not something the Council could control. The Leader explained that

the most expensive 11 children in placements cost the Council more than £10million per year. One child who needed to come into care would cost one million pounds. However, that needed to be spent in order to keep children alive. In addition, it was confirmed that work had been underway for a number of years to improve early help to prevent children going into care and to build a number of in-house residential provisions which helped cut costs and improve quality for Children In Care. The Leader asked Councillor Collingham and Opposition Members to engage with reality and look at the record of the Council in balancing its budget for many consecutive years.

The Leader stated that he was concerned about the delays in Dinnington, however, many of those delays related to matters outside of the Council's control and issues that could not have been identified before the Council had ownership of the buildings or was on site. He was proud of the work being done to deliver improvements for the Dinnington residents.

The Leader did not wish to speculate on Doncaster Airport. Conversations continued and he was in regular contact with South Yorkshire's Mayor on the matter. The situation remained that they wanted to see the Airport re-open but that it could not be done at any cost.

Regarding Councillor Thorp, the Leader stated that he respected the work that had been done. However, he stated that it was not in any way comparable to engagement on the Council Plan. Asking 'would you like to stop some cycle lanes, yes or no' was not the same as asking residents to engage on a whole range of public service delivery across a half a billion pound a year budget.

Questions from Members were invited.

Councillor Reynolds asked why the overspend on the Library had not been included in the £10.9m figure. He also asked if it was open yet.

The Leader confirmed that the projected overspend related to the General Fund whereas the Library was a capital project. Work was still ongoing on the Central Library, and it was expected to open in Quarter 1 of next year.

Councillor Bacon referenced the green spaces and asked whether SYMCA would act on its promise to use money confiscated from criminals to fund big cleans. To date only £8,000 had been raised and one big clean undertaken.

The Leader stated that there was no suggestion of the Mayor reneging on the method of funding promised. He was happy to ask the question and report updates back to Councillor Bacon if there were any.

Councillor Marshall stated that it was fantastic that 28,000 children had attended the free swimming sessions. She asked the Leader if he agreed that, given the number of children who had very sadly died in open water

during the 2026 summer, every penny that had gone into free swimming was worth it if one life had been saved.

The Leader stated that this was absolutely right and he was proud to have helped keep children safe, as opposed to the many years when money was being taken away from public authorities which put children in danger.

Councillor Cusworth asked if the Leader agreed that, not only had Rotherham children achieved brilliant exam results, but they had done so in schools starved of investment, supported by exhausted teachers and parents struggling with the cost of living crisis. She wished to place on record her thanks to the teachers, non-teaching staff and parents who had supported the Borough's children in achieving the above national average results.

The Leader did associate himself with those comments and stated that an enormous debt of gratitude was owed to so many professionals who not only turned up during school hours, but who also gave their own evenings, weekends and holidays to improve the lives of children.

Councillor Baker-Rogers asked the Leader if he agreed with her that the uptake of free swimming by children and discounted swimming by senior citizens was fantastic to see. She also wished to place on record her thanks to Dolly Parton and the Imagination Library.

The Leader did agree with Councillor Baker-Rogers.

60. PETITIONS

Consideration was given to the report which provided Members with details of all petitions received by the Council since the last Council meeting on 15th July 2026. One petition had been received, asking the Council to Review and Rebalance Rotherham's CRSTS Active Travel Schemes - Prioritise Pedestrian Safety Over Dedicated Cycle & Bus Lanes. This petition had received 3,609 valid signatures.

The lead petitioner, Councillor Thorp, was given 5 minutes to present the petition at the meeting and the petition was then discussed by Councillors for a maximum of 15 minutes.

In accordance with the Petitions Scheme and Council Procedure Rule 13(7) the Council were to decide how to respond to the petition and could decide either:-

(a) to take the action the petition requested;

(b) not to take the action the petition requested for reasons stated in the debate;

(c) to commission further investigation into the matter, which might include reference to a particular Committee for its views, prior to consideration at a future meeting of the Council; or

(d) to refer the petition to the Cabinet where it related to an executive function, in which case the Council might make recommendations to the Cabinet, but Cabinet would not be bound by those recommendations in discharging its executive functions.

Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy, thanked Councillor Thorp and other Councillors for their work on this matter on behalf of their residents. Regarding the Broom Road scheme, Councillor Williams confirmed that this scheme would not be taken forward as the consultation and petition had clearly indicated that residents did not support any of the proposed measures. Regarding the Eastwood scheme, Councillor Williams explained that there had been broader support for some of the measures so officers in the Transportation Service had been tasked with producing revised proposals that better reflected the feedback received. The Leader had announced these changes in a statement in August 2026. Councillor Williams stated that he had been clear throughout that the consultation process would be meaningful and that it was part of the Labour Groups manifesto that it would not go ahead with active travel schemes if the community did not support them. The administration had engaged, listened and acted on the feedback given.

As the Cabinet Member responsible for active travel, Councillor Williams confirmed that the first ask of the petition, which was to review the schemes, had already been completed. In relation to the re-allocation of funding, it was confirmed that there was now greater flexibility in what the funding could be used for. He confirmed that the administration accepted the asks of the petition.

Councillor Yasseen wanted to thank Councillor Thorp personally for ensuring residents were listened to. She was glad that the administration were finally listening to residents as they did not listen during phase one, two or three. Residents and communities had been ignored for a long time, particularly around road safety.

Councillor Bower stated that this was being presented by the administration as a result of the consultation which was not accurate. The consultation had not reflected what Elected Members had fed back. The scheme had been driven by the Mayor of South Yorkshire, not from the residents or Elected Members. It was a top-down driven agenda that made people doubt local democracy. Councillor Bower stated that £750,000 had been spent on this so far, which could have instead funded what was actually wanted and needed in terms of road safety. He encouraged the administration to influence the Mayor and get him to listen to what people actually wanted.

Councillor Reynolds said that the petition should act as a reminder to all Members that they represented the people and it was about the people telling the Members what they wanted, not the other way around. He hoped that would continue.

Councillor Currie also praised Councillor Thorp for being an excellent Councillor. He encouraged Members to be more like Councillor Thorp, to stop being negative on social media and instead get out into communities and speak up for residents.

Councillor Adam Carter spoke in support of the petition. He also wanted to make sure that there was more flexibility within the funding and that scrutiny reviewed how much officer time and money had been spent on the process so far.

Councillor Ball refuted what Councillor Williams had said. He explained that the bus lane in Hellaby had been installed despite 70% of people saying they did not want it.

Councillor Cusworth stated that the administration had listened to the consultation. She also explained that the scheme in Boston Castle referred to by Councillor Yasseen was different in that the funding was very prescriptive around cycle lanes. In relation to the money spent on the Broom scheme to date, Councillor Cusworth stated that a certain amount had to be spent in order to have proposals to consult on. She stated that the Council could either listen to residents and stop the scheme or continue with it because money had already been spent. It could not do both.

Resolved:

That Council:

1. That the petition be received;

2. That the Executive Director of Regeneration and Environment provide a response to the lead petitioner, Councillor Thorp.

3. That the actions set out in Appendix 1 of the report submitted be agreed.

61. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2025-26

Consideration was given to the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2025/26. It provided an overview of activity undertaken by Scrutiny over the last year through key lines of inquiry, evidence gathering, and findings leading to recommendations. In addition, it also provided a selection of the year's achievements of Scrutiny as a supplement to full agendas and minutes of Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and the three Select Commission meetings throughout the year.

Councillor Steele, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, thanked all Members and Officers involved in Scrutiny. He noted that, throughout 2025/26, Scrutiny had considered 97 substantive items, completed pre-decision scrutiny on 42 reports, held 12 workshops, completed three reviews and progressed another two, had six site visits and had 15 off-agenda briefings. One decision had also been subject to the call-in procedure.

During the meeting, the Chairs of the Select Commissions set out the work they had completed and thanked all involved.

Resolved: That Council note the report.

Mover: Councillor Steele Seconder: Councillor Bacon

62. AUDIT COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2025-26

Consideration was given to the Audit Committee Annual Report 2025/26 which brought together in one document a summary of the work undertaken. The production of the report complied with current best practice for Audit Committees allowing it to demonstrate how it had fulfilled its terms of reference and shared its achievements with the Council. It also served as a useful reminder to the organisation of the role of the Committee in providing assurance about the Council's governance, risk management and financial and business controls.

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) had previously issued guidance to local authorities to help ensure that Audit Committees operated effectively. The guidance recommended that Audit Committees should report annually on how they have discharged their responsibilities. The Annual Report was attached at Appendix 1.

The Audit Committee met on six occasions in the year to 31st March 2026, in accordance with its programme of work. The frequency of meetings ensured the Audit Committee could fulfil its responsibilities in an efficient and effective way. During this period the Committee assessed the adequacy and effectiveness of the Council's governance, risk management arrangements, control environment and associated counter fraud arrangements through regular reports from officers, the internal auditors and the external auditors. The Committee sought assurance that action had been taken, or is otherwise planned, by management to address any risk related issues that had been identified during the period. The committee also sought to ensure that effective relationships continue to be maintained between the internal and external auditors, and between the auditors and management. The specific work undertaken by the Committee was set out in the report.

During the meeting, Councillor Baggaley, Chair of the Audit Committee, thanked all Members and Officers involved in Audit. He wished to place

on record his thanks to Simon Dennis, the former Policy, Improvement and Risk Manager who had retired earlier in 2026, for all of his hard work, particularly during the training sessions.

Resolved: That the Audit Committee Annual Report 2025/26 be approved.

Mover: Councillor Baggaley Seconder: Councillor Ismail

63. PLANNING REFORM AND REQUIRED PROCEDURAL AMENDMENTS

Consideration was given to the report which recommended that the Council's Constitution be amended to reflect the provisions of the Planning and Infrastructure Act 2025.

The Planning and Infrastructure Act 2025 introduced significant measures to reform Planning Committees in England, including a national scheme of delegation for Planning functions and a cap on the size of Planning Committees.

The Town & Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026 would come into force on 31st October 2026, at which time councils would be required to operate in accordance with the amended framework and statutory guidance which was published on 1st June 2026. To do so, the Council's Constitution needed to be amended.

The draft regulations set out requirements for certain types of application to be determined under officer delegation, i.e. may not be determined by a Planning Committee:-

(a) Schedule 1 to the draft regulations set out that applications for planning permission for householder, minor residential and minor commercial development, as well as a number of supplementary and technical consents which must be determined under officer delegation. Further detail on what a Schedule 1 application would be were provided in paragraph 2.2 of the report.

(b) Schedule 2 set out the types of application which could be referred to a Planning Committee subject to the Gateway Tests which were set out in Regulation 5 and this required agreement between the nominated Member (e.g. the Chair of the Committee) and officer (usually the Chief Planner or equivalent), but which otherwise must be delegated to an officer. These included any types of application for planning permission which were not in Schedule 1, variations of permissions, and special controls such as Listed Building and Tree Preservation Order consents. Further detail was provided in paragraphs 2.2 to 2.9 of the report.

The Regulations also provided for the number of Members on a Planning Committee or Sub-Committee to be no more than 13. At present, the Planning Board in Rotherham had 15 members and as such this needed to be reduced. This had also required a review of the entitlement of the political groups to seats on the Committees of the Council.

During the debate on the item, Councillors Adair and Currie were thanked for their contributions to Planning Board and Councillor Blackham was thanked for his work on the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

Resolved:

That Council:-

1. Note the content of the report;

2. Approve amendment of the Constitution as set out in the Report and in particular the additions of Schedule 1 and 2 detailed in Appendix 1;

3. Note the reduction in size of the Planning Board to the maximum 13 Councillors permitted;

4. Approve the allocation of seats, in accordance with the political balance calculations, as set out in report;

5. Approve the appointment of the Head of Planning Services and the Chair of Planning Board as the Proper Officer and the Nominated Member as per the statutory guidance; and

6. Delegate authority to make consequential amendments to guidance documents and the Scheme of Delegation (such as to the Probity in Planning: Code of Practice) to the Service Director: Legal Services and Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Head of Planning Services, the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy and the Chair and Vice-Chair of Planning Board.

The following changes to nominations to Committees, Boards and Panels, as set out in Appendix B to the Mayor's Letter, were also approved:

Audit Committee

Councillor Lelliott (Vice Chair) – Remove
Councillor Ismail (Vice Chair) – Add

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (as of 31st October 2026)

Councillor Blackham – Remove
Councillor Currie – Add

Planning Board (as of 31st October 2026)

Councillor Adair – Remove
Councillor Currie – Remove

JOINT AND COMBINED AUTHORITIES

South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority Audit, Standards and Risk Committee

Councillor Lelliott (Substitute) – Remove
Councillor Ismail (Substitute) – Add

Mover: Councillor Mault Seconder: Councillor Jackson

64. THRIVING NEIGHBOURHOODS - UPDATES FROM WARD COUNCILLORS FOR KILNHURST AND SWINTON EAST

Further to Minute No. 55 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 19th November 2018, consideration was given to the Ward update for Kilnhurst and Swinton East as part of the Thriving Neighbourhood Strategy. An update report had been provided as part of the agenda and each Ward Member was invited to speak.

Councillor Cusworth moved the report. She noted that the Ward priorities had been aligned with those of the Council in order to address serious levels of deprivation, low car ownership and low educational attainment across Kilnhurst and Swinton East. There had been a heavy focus on supporting children and giving them the opportunities to achieve their potential. Annual Christmas events were held which also encouraged families and neighbours to get to know each other. This helped with community cohesion. Further, a substantial amount of money had been provided to reinvent the Swinton Academy Library. All of the improvements made would be transferrable into the new building once complete. This had been a joint effort with the Ward Members from Swinton Rockingham Ward. It was also confirmed that £500 had been awarded to each of the primary schools in the Ward for books or other library equipment.

Councillor Harper seconded the report. He thanked Nicole Mighali, Neighbourhood Co-Ordinator for all of the incredible work she had done throughout the Ward. Work had been undertaken to clear the stream and a community forum had been established to enable the community to continue making improvements to Kilnhurst and Swinton East. Events had been held in the area known locally as The Patios, such as the Summer Bash which had been a great success. Councillors were still working to make improvements to the MUGA, to improve road safety and to support the British Legion. A Park and Stride event had been very successful, with a number of children walking to school and learning about road safety.

Resolved:

That the update report be noted.

65. THRIVING NEIGHBOURHOODS - UPDATES FROM WARD COUNCILLORS FOR MALTBY EAST

Further to Minute No. 55 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 19th November 2018, consideration was given to the Ward update for Maltby East as part of the Thriving Neighbourhood Strategy. An update report had been provided as part of the agenda and each Ward Member was invited to speak. Due to a family bereavement, Councillor Sutton was not present at the meeting to speak on the update.

Councillor Tinsley BEM moved the report and set out the Ward priorities for Maltby East. It was noted that the CAP meetings were always well attended and involved regular walkarounds in the community. Tea and coffee were provided for community groups and the Maltby Beach Festival had run for the previous two years. The Silver Dollar event was incredibly successful and had encouraged over 60s to dance. A cultural kitchen had been run in partnership with Rotherham United Community Trust and others to introduce different foods and activities into Maltby East. Progress was being made on the refurbishment of the community centre.

Work continued on improving Maltby High Street and the local economy. This involved listening to and working with residents and businesses to address local issues such as pavement parking, anti-social behaviour and the appearance of the High Street. The Shopfront Grants scheme had been used by a number of businesses in Maltby. A large amount of work had been done on Coronation Park, including improving the inclusivity of the play equipment.

Councillor Tinsley thanked Claire Moseley, Neighbourhood Co-Ordinator, along with other partners who worked across the Maltby East Ward.

Councillor Cusworth seconded the report, and in doing so, passed on the condolences of the Chamber to Councillor Sutton.

Councillor Currie encouraged those in Maltby to get involved with the Pride in Place Programme where up to £20million of funding was available.

Resolved:

That the update report be noted.

66. NOTICE OF MOTION - WE DESERVE OUR FAIR SHARE OF SPEEDING FINE REVENUE TO HELP MAKE OUR ROADS SAFER

It was moved by Councillor Tarmey and seconded by Councillor C. Carter that:

This Council notes:

1. That speeding fines across England generate around £100 million per year, all of which is paid directly to HM Treasury, with no share returned to local authorities.

2. That councils are responsible for maintaining highways, improving road safety, delivering traffic calming schemes, and responding to persistent community concerns about speeding and dangerous driving.

3. That local authorities frequently fund enforcement infrastructure – such as average speed cameras, ANPR enforcement points, signage, and engineering works – yet receive no income from the fines issued as a result of these measures.

4. That communities across the Borough consistently call for greater investment in traffic calming, crossings, school street safety, and active travel protection.

5. That the South Yorkshire Safety Camera Partnership brings together law enforcement agencies and local councils across the region. However, Council also notes that there are currently no robust mechanisms for Elected Members to direct the placement of safety cameras within their Wards. This leads to a mismatch between public and Elected Member perceptions of the need for enforcement activities and the observed locations of mobile cameras.

This Council believes:

1. That a fairer national funding model is required to ensure that money raised from speeding offences is reinvested into the communities where those offences occur.

2. That enabling councils to retain a proportion of speeding fine revenue would create a stable, locally controlled funding stream for road safety improvements.

3. That ring fencing such funding would directly support the Council's objectives to reduce casualties, protect vulnerable road users, and improve public confidence in local road safety.

Therefore, this Council resolves to:

1. Write to HM Government, the Secretary of State for Transport, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer requesting that:
   a. Local authorities receive 50% of the annual revenue generated from speeding fines issued within their area; and
   b. This funding be ring fenced exclusively for road safety improvements, including average speed cameras, engineering measures, enforcement support, school safety schemes, and active travel protection.

2. Write to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime for South Yorkshire to request that robust mechanisms are put in place to allow Elected Members to better direct enforcement action within their Wards.

3. Request that the Local Government Association (LGA) and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority support this call for reform and lobby Government for a fairer distribution of speeding fine revenue.

4. Investigate the feasibility of procuring mobile pairs of average speed cameras that could be deployed across different streets in Rotherham to encourage behaviour change, improve compliance with speed limits, and increase awareness of the consequences of dangerous driving.

An amendment to the Motion was then moved by Councillor Baum-Dixon and seconded by Councillor Z Collingham that:

The title of the Motion be "**We deserve our fair share of funding to help make our roads safer"** and that:

This Council notes that:

DELETE

~~1. That speeding fines across England generate around £100 million per year, all of which is pad directly to HM Treasury with no share returned to local authorities.~~

INSERT

1. That revenue from fixed penalties issued through speed enforcement is paid into the Consolidated Fund.

2. That councils are responsible for maintaining highways, improving road safety, delivering traffic calming schemes, and responding to persistent community concerns about speeding and dangerous driving.

DELETE

~~3. That local authorities frequently fund enforcement infrastructure such as average speed cameras, ANPR enforcement points, signage, and engineering works yet receive no income from the fines issues as a result of these measures.~~

INSERT

3. That local authorities invest in road safety measures, including traffic calming, crossings, signage, engineering works and, where appropriate, speed enforcement infrastructure, but face competing demands for the funding required to deliver these measures.

4. That Rotherham Council has started to apply more focus to this area, committing £160,000 to develop Ward Road Safety Plans across all 23 Wards. These identify local concerns and develop a pipeline of capital road safety schemes and this Council welcomes and supports this work.

5. That speeding enforcement activity can fluctuate significantly. South Yorkshire Police recorded 78,438 speeding Notices of Intended Prosecution in 2023, 61,703 in 2024 and 81,554 in 2025.

6. That communities across the Borough consistently call for greater investment in traffic calming, crossings, school street safety and active travel protection.

DELETE

~~4. That the South Yorkshire Camera Partnership brings together law enforcement agencies and local councils across the region. However, Council also notes that there are currently no robust mechanisms for Elected Members to direct the placement of safety cameras within their Wards. This leads to a mismatch between public and Elected Member perceptions of the need for enforcement activities and the observed locations of mobile cameras.~~

INSERT

7. That Elected Members and local communities have an important role in identifying locations of concern, while decisions on enforcement and the appropriate road safety intervention should be based upon evidence and risk.

This Council believes:

DELETE

~~1. That a fairer national funding model is required to ensure that money raised from speeding offences is reinvested into the communities where those offences occur.~~

~~2. That enabling councils to retain a proportion of speeding fine revenue would create a stable, locally controlled funding steam for road safety improvements.~~

~~3. That ring fencing such funding would directly support the Council's objectives to reduce casualties, protect vulnerable road users and improve public confidence in local road safety.~~

INSERT

1. That the consequences of speeding and unsafe roads are experienced locally, and communities should have the resources necessary to address those problems.

2. That the purpose of speeding fines should be to deter speeding and improve road safety, not to provide a source of revenue upon which either Central or local Government becomes financially dependent.

3. That Rotherham needs a clear, long-term and guaranteed road safety funding stream to enable the Council to actually deliver its Ward Road Safety Plans and other schemes.

4. That road safety funding should follow evidence of need and risk rather than the number of fines issued.

5. That successful enforcement should reduce speeding and therefore reduce fine income; it should not also reduce the resources available to make roads safer.

6. That delivery of Rotherham's Ward Road Safety Plans should not depend upon annual fluctuations in enforcement activity, the number or location of active cameras, the number of offences detected or how individual offences are disposed of.

7. That enforcement activity and the deployment of cameras should be determined by road safety evidence and risk, not by their potential to generate revenue.

8. That greater evolution provides an opportunity to give Rotherham the long-term funding certainty required to deliver locally identified road safety priorities.

9. That enforcement has an important role in road safety, alongside highway design and engineering measures which encourage safe and appropriate speeds.

Therefore, this Council resolves:-

DELETE

~~1. Write to HM Government, the Secretary of State for Transport, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer requesting that:~~
   ~~a. Local authorities receive 50% of the annual revenue generated from speeding fines issues within their area; and~~
   ~~b. This funding be ring-fenced exclusively for road safety improvements, including average speed cameras, engineering measures, enforcement support, school safety schemes, and active travel protection.~~

INSERT

1. Write to HM Government, the Secretary of State for Transport and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and through No. 10 North, calling for a clear long-term and guaranteed devolved road safety funding settlement, with a fair and transparent needs-based allocation to Rotherham, to enable the Council to deliver evidence-led schemes identified through its Ward Road Safety Plans.

2. Write to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime for South Yorkshire to request that robust mechanisms are put in place to allow Elected Members to better direct enforcement action within their Wards.

DELETE

~~3. Request that the Local Government Association (LGA) and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority support this call for reform and lobby Government for a fairer distribution of speeding fine revenue.~~

INSERT

3. Request that the Local Government Association and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority support the call for a clear, long-term and guaranteed devolved road safety funding settlement based upon evidence of need and risk and ask the Mayor of South Yorkshire and the Leader of Rotherham Council to make representations to Government in support of this approach.

4. Investigate the feasibility of procuring mobile pairs of average speed cameras that could be deployed across different streets in Rotherham to encourage behaviour change, improve compliance with speed limits, and increase awareness of the consequences of dangerous driving.

On being put to the vote, the amendment fell.

The original motion was then debated and voted on.

The motion was carried.

67. MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEETING

Consideration was given to the reports, recommendations and minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 6th July 2026.

Councillor Tinsley referenced Cabinet Minute No. 22 – Neighbourhood Leadership Strategy. He asked if the Leader was willing to engage with any Councillors that had concerns over the rotation of Neighbourhood Co-ordinators at the next elections.

The Leader confirmed that he and Councillor Cusworth were willing to listen if there were particular concerns but he stood by the point made in the Cabinet meeting, that it was dangerous, from an organisational standpoint, to allow Members to choose which Neighbourhood Co-ordinators worked in which Wards.

Resolved:

That the reports, recommendations and minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 6th July 2026 be received.

Mover: Councillor Read Seconder: Councillor Cusworth

68. AUDIT COMMITTEE

Resolved: That the reports, recommendations and minutes of the meeting of the Audit Committee be noted.

Mover: Councillor Baggaley Seconder: Councillor Ismail

69. LICENSING BOARD AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

Resolved: That the reports, recommendations and minutes of the meetings of the Licensing Board Sub-Committee and the Licensing Sub-Committee be noted.

Mover: Councillor Hughes Seconder: Councillor Garnett

70. PLANNING BOARD

Resolved: That the reports, recommendations and minutes of the meetings of the Planning Board be noted.

Mover: Councillor Mault Seconder: Councillor Jackson

71. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS TO DESIGNATED SPOKESPERSONS

There was one question from Councillor Ball: Will the Pensions Authority spokesperson set out how many South Yorkshire LGPS members using salary sacrifice above £2,000 a year will now pay National Insurance on that extra saving, and what warning has gone to ordinary workplace savers that this cap hits them?

As Councillor Sutton was not present to respond to the question, a written response would be provided.

72. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS TO CABINET MEMBERS AND CHAIRPERSONS

There were 16 questions:

1. Councillor C. Carter: The new children's play area and outdoor seating at The Waterfront at Rother Valley are great for families wanting to enjoy a refreshment while children play, but I find the lack of shade concerning. Are there any plans to install any shade or provide any parasols on these tables?

   Councillor Marshall, Cabinet Member for Waste Services, Leisure and Green Spaces, stated that it was a wonderful play area but understood the concerns raised. She had asked the Service to review the options and feasibility for the provision of shaded areas through the winter months prior to the start of the summer season. Councillor Marshall committed to informing Councillor Carter on the outcome of the review.

2. Councillor Ball: Following Health and Wellbeing Board on 2nd September, will the Cabinet Member name the social housing complex with the ongoing Legionella outbreak, confirm the landlord, whether it is Council-operated, what tenants have been told, whether anyone has been ill, and the date the water will be declared safe?

   Councillor Baker Rogers, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, stated that the social housing complex was not owned or managed by the Council, but the Public Health Team was working closely with the landlord. It was noted that there was not an on-going risk to residents, who had been made aware of the circumstances.

   The social housing provider had undertaken extensive remedial work to eradicate the Legionella from the system. This has included chemical treatment of the water system, taking away redundant pipe work, installation of insulation to reduce heat transfer and also the removal of an external pond and water feature. While these interventions had significantly reduced Legionella levels, a small number of outlets continued to return positive tests results. The social housing provider was working closely with the Council and the UK Health Security Agency to bring this matter to a conclusion as soon as

possible. Further groundwork and investigative work were currently being carried out on site.

In his supplementary, Councillor Ball stated that this had been ongoing since June 2024 and was referred to at the Health and Wellbeing Board as an ongoing outbreak. He asked what happened if it was still ongoing on 1st October 2026?

Councillor Baker-Rogers confirmed that the Council would continue to work with the landlord to ensure residents were well and safe.

3. Councillor Ball: Will the Cabinet Member set out how Pride in Place and High Street investment, though Maltby East designated, will deliver measurable outcomes in Hellaby and Maltby West, and confirm what West consultation has already informed the Regeneration Plan due by end of 2026?

   As Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Communities, was not present to respond to the question, a written response would be provided.

4. Councillor Ball: Given FOI figures of over £175,000 spent clearing fly-tipping in 2024/25 and 2025/26 and Hellaby and Maltby West being named hotspots, will Ward level clearance costs, FPNs and enforcement outcomes be published, with extra patrols planned this year?

   As Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Communities, was not present to respond to the question, a written response would be provided.

5. Councillor Ball: After the loss of a direct Maltby hospital bus, what firm timetable exists for better hospital access from Maltby and Hellaby under X11 permanence plans?

   Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy, explained that the responsibility for buses and timetabling sat with South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority. They had confirmed that the X11 timetable, which had run from May 2025, was the current timetable and would not change before bus franchising in 2028.

   In his supplementary, Councillor Ball asked if the Council asked residents how many people had missed appointments at the hospital due to this inadequate bus service?

   Councillor Williams advised Councillor Ball to attend the Transport Advisory Group meetings to raise these matters and hold SYMCA and the bus operators to account.

6. Councillor Ball: Taxpayers fund the South Yorkshire Mayor through the Combined Authority levy, yet FOI 2026/5325 shows this Council then borrows tens of millions back from SYMCA at around 4.2 percent. Does Cabinet accept that this is a poor moral deal for residents?

   Councillor Alam, Cabinet Member for Finance and Community Safety, did not accept this. The Combined Authority levy and the Council's borrowing arrangements served different purposes and operated under different statutory and financial frameworks. The levy contributed towards the functions and services delivered by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority on behalf of the region. The Council's borrowing arrangements were entered into to support the Council's day-to-day cashflow requirements and financing of historical and new Capital Programme requirements as part of the Council's Treasury Management operations, with each loan taken assessed on their own merits. It would be wrong both procedurally and ethically to confuse them.

   Where the Council borrowed, whether from the Public Works Loan Board, the market, or another public sector body such as SYMCA, the overriding consideration was securing funding that was prudent, affordable and provided value for money for local taxpayers. Borrowing from other Local Authorities or Combined Authorities predominantly provided the most cost effective source of short term borrowing for the Council.

   Treasury Management decisions were made in accordance with the Local Government Act 2003 and the CIPFA Prudential and Treasury Management Codes, which required councils to ensure that borrowing was proportionate, sustainable and undertaken at the most advantageous rates available at the time.

   Any borrowing from SYMCA was therefore evaluated against alternative sources of finance and was only undertaken where it supported the Council's Capital Programme objectives while representing an appropriate use of public funds. The fact that both organisations were publicly funded bodies did not, in itself, make such arrangements inappropriate or disadvantageous to residents.

   So, in summary, the payment of the levy and the use of SYMCA as part of the Council's borrowing arrangements were not directly linked; the Council operated within the law and financial governance arrangements to secure best value for money for the Council and residents at all times.

   In his supplementary, Councillor Ball stated that the Council was basically borrowing its own money but paying interest on that money. He asked if this was morally right.

Councillor Alam stated that Councillor Ball was incorrect. The Council paid a levy which was like a membership fee. When borrowing money from SYMCA or other bodies, the Council made sure they got value for money.

7. Councillor Yasseen: The 3,609 petition led by Councillor Thorp again shows widespread opposition to cycle lanes being imposed without meaningful community input. Given longstanding objections, safety concerns and poor public support, how many times must residents say no before the Council listens? Will it revise or stop schemes that communities reject, or continue forcing badly designed infrastructure upon us?

   Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy, stated that the Council took the feedback received from consultations very seriously. Residents did not want this particular scheme to progress, and the Council has said it will not. On the Broom scheme in particular, residents told the Council that they did not support any element of it, so it was not being taken forward. In Eastwood there was some broad support, and Officers had been asked to revise that scheme to reflect that feedback. Councillor Williams stated that this was because the Council took consultation seriously.

   In her supplementary question, Councillor Yasseen stated that she hoped that would happen as it had not in Boston Castle. She asked for timescales and if the Ward Councillors would be involved.

   Councillor Williams confirmed that the Ward Councillors would be involved with the revised proposals.

8. Councillor Yasseen: Rotherham proudly became the first UK home of Mrs. Dolly Parton's Imagination Library in 2007, giving Rotherham children (5 & under) a free book monthly, sadly the Library was cut during austerity. I admired Mrs. Parton's commitment to literacy & opportunity, will the Cabinet Member reinstate this proven, affordable programme and bring back to Rotherham the gift of reading?

   Councillor Marshall, Cabinet Member for Waste Services, Leisure and Green Spaces, stated that Rotherham never lost the gift of reading. As Cabinet Member she had visited the libraries in the Borough and saw the excellent provision for under-fives that was on offer.

   There were currently no plans to reinstate the programme. When the decision was taken to cease the scheme in 2015, Council reports stated that the programme cost approximately £400,000 over a two-year period. Undoubtedly this would now be significantly higher. Reintroducing the programme would therefore require a significant and sustained funding commitment, and at this moment there was no identified funding sources available to support a scheme of that scale.

The Council did continue to support the BookStart scheme locally, which provided books and other resources to families, and it had invested heavily in the Borough's traditional libraries, the book fund, and the Home Library Service.

In her supplementary, Councillor Yasseen stated that this was disappointing and asked if it could be looked at again, possibly with a more targeted approach for areas with low literacy scores.

Councillor Marshall stated that the Council already did support literacy through BookStart and through investment in Grimm & Co. Literacy and access to books remained a priority.

9. Councillor Yasseen: During Sheffield Road Cycleways phases 1, 2 and 3, I was repeatedly told that the SY Mayoral Authority, could only support cycle lanes. The same fund supported bus corridors, crossings, public realm and other infrastructure. Why was I misled about the available options?

   Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy stated that Councillor Yasseen was not misled. The funding for the Sheffield Road cycleways was Transforming Cities Fund. This was funding allocated through the Combined Authority.

   There was a clear Government ask for carbon reduction priorities and "modal shift" to lie at the heart of the spend of Transforming Cities Funding, in which the then Conservative Government clearly prioritised cycle and bus lane schemes. That was why these had been developed by councils across the country, and indeed across South Yorkshire.

   The Council had been robust in its engagement with SYMCA on behalf of residents, supported by the feedback from residents, and assisted by a generally more relaxed approach from the current Government. As the previous questions showed, the Council had very much listened to the views of residents.

   In her supplementary, Councillor Yasseen asked if the current criteria allowed for the funding to be used to fill potholes.

   Councillor Williams stated that he was sure that potholes were not included but confirmed that he would double-check.

10. Councillor Bennett-Sylvester: Do we know or have a best estimate for the number of two or more bedroom RMBC Council houses, how many are occupied by just a couple or single person and what is the percentage of those so occupied please?

Councillor Beresford, Cabinet Member for Housing, confirmed that the number of Council houses where there was at least one bedroom more than the number of household members was 3,623 which was around 18% of Council stock. This was where there was one occupant living in a house with two or more bedrooms and where there were 2 occupants living in a house with 3 or more bedrooms.

There were 2 occupants in two-bedroomed houses in 865 instances. They might have different relationship statuses to 'couple', for example parent and adult child, and may require two separate bedrooms; the figures for this were unavailable.

In his supplementary, Councillor Bennett-Sylvester asked if the Service could look at the number of Council homes being built, the areas and whether smaller properties, such as one bedroom bungalows, could be built. He asked if the Council could adjust its offering.

Councillor Beresford confirmed that this was already taking place and the Housing Allocations Policy would be reviewed towards the end of 2026. A key indicator of demand was the number of bids for a property and this data was being monitored.

11. Councillor Bennett-Sylvester: Do we know or have a best estimate for the number of two or more bedroom private sector houses how many are occupied by just a couple or single person and what is the percentage of those so occupied please?

    Councillor Beresford, Cabinet Member for Housing, confirmed that the Council did not hold this information regarding the private sector. There was information about occupancy ratings for the private sector (rent and home ownership combined) from the 2021 Census, which calculated where homes had more or fewer bedrooms than required. The Cabinet Member offered to send this information to Councillor Bennett-Sylvester following this meeting if it would be helpful.

    In his supplementary, Councillor Bennett-Sylvester confirmed he would like the information. He asked what more could be done to encourage builders and developers to offer smaller properties, especially for retirees and disabled people.

    Councillor Beresford stated that this was a Regeneration and Development matter as the Council's Housing Service could not influence this in any way. She did confirm that the Council did work hard to ensure that Council homes lost under the Right to Buy Scheme were brought back into the ownership of the Council when they were put up for sale.

12. Councillor Bennett-Sylvester: Since 2022/23 what has been the change in real terms of the spending power of Members' Devolved Community Leadership Funds, Devolved Capital Budgets and Ward Housing funds please?

    Councillor Cusworth, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, confirmed that there had been no cash increase in the Ward Members Devolved Budgets since 2022/23. Spending power had inevitably been reduced with the impact of inflation and other rising costs: since 2022/23, based on the Consumer Prices Index, the real terms reduction was about 17%. In light of this, Councillor Cusworth stated that the budgets needed reviewing.

    In his supplementary, Councillor Bennett-Sylvester stated that Members were experiencing difficulties in stretching their budgets to cover what they had previously covered. He asked if the lost spending could be recovered in future budget settlements and if best practice could be shared to ensure the money was used well.

    Councillor Cusworth thanked Councillor Bennett-Sylvester for his suggestions and invited him to discuss this further outside of the meeting.

13. Councillor Bennett-Sylvester: Thank you for your written response to my question on bailiff usage at last full Council. Can you please clarify were the 476 cases of vulnerability mentioned identified by Enforcement Agents or Rotherham Council officers?

    Councillor Alam, Cabinet Member for Finance and Community Safety, confirmed that the 476 cases of vulnerability were identified by Enforcement Agents during visits to properties.

    Enforcement Agents had vulnerability and safeguarding policies and procedures, and welfare teams routinely signposted people to independent support organisations. They were only used as a last resort when a customer had failed to engage with the Council.

    In his supplementary, Councillor Bennett-Sylvester stated that he was angry at the Council for this approach. He asked why Enforcement Agents were identifying cases of vulnerability and why this had not been picked up earlier. He also asked the Council to review its approach and look at places like Manchester, Preston and Newcastle which operated different models for vulnerable residents.

    Councillor Alam stated that it was his understanding that this related to residents who had not previously contacted the Council but he confirmed that he would look into the other models as requested.

14. Councillor Thorp: How much did it cost to put free films on at Snail Park this summer?

Councillor Marshall, Cabinet Member for Waste Services, Leisure and Green Spaces, stated that the cost was £35,000 and it was funded in its entirety by an external grant – the Local Growth Fund.

In his supplementary, Councillor Thorp asked why the Council was taking people away from the cinema it had just built.

Councillor Marshall stated that not all children felt comfortable in a cinema and an outdoor event could be more welcoming to neurodiverse residents. Further, it brought more people into the town centre which was very much welcomed by the local businesses.

15. Councillor Thorp: Since as confirmed at the last full Council that all roundabouts are maintained by RMBC can you give me the cost to maintain the roundabout at the junction of Warren Vale Road and Wentworth Road compared to Worrygoose Island on East Bawtry Road?

    As Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Communities, was not present to respond to the question, a written response would be provided.

16. Councillor Yasseen: Rotherham's online petition portal repeatedly fails residents. Residents and my historical (and documented) experience was appalling but it continues to fail in 2026. A broken system obstructs public participation and undermines residents democratic right to be heard. Why has the Council allowed this failure to persist and will you meet with me to review, repair and improve the portal?

    The Leader disagreed that the system was broken as nearly 500 people had signed a petition currently active on the portal. The Council also accepted petitions in paper form as evidenced by the petition discussed earlier in the meeting. The Leader did, however, agree that the online process was clunky but stated it was the reality of the system that Rotherham and most other local authorities used. He agreed to arrange a meeting for Councillor Yasseen with the appropriate people to see if any improvements could be made.

    In her supplementary question, Councillor Yasseen stated that she thought it could be easily fixed, explaining that it needed to be more accessible. The need for an account and password made the system inefficient and, in her and other people's experiences, often did not work.

    The Leader understood the point but explained there was a need for an account to ensure signatures could be verified and addresses checked to ensure that signatories lived, worked or were in education in the Rotherham Borough.

73. URGENT ITEMS

There were no urgent items.