

THE CABINET
8th June, 2026

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

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

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Allen.

Officers in attendance:

John Edwards	Chief Executive
Judith Badger	Executive Director of Corporate Services
Nicola Curley	Executive Director of Children and Young People's Services
Andrew Bramidge	Executive Director of Regeneration and Environment
Chris Paddock	Interim Director of Policy, Strategy and Engagement
Phil Horsfield	Service Director of Legal Services and Monitoring Officer
Rebecca Wilson	Interim Service Director of Adult Care and Integration
Alex Hawley	Consultant in Public Health
Sam Barstow	Service Director of Community Safety and Street Scene
Polly Hamilton	Service Director of Culture, Sport and Tourism
Kevin Fisher	Service Director of Property and Facilities
Lynsey Linton	Service Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development
James Kitchen	Head of Health and Safety
Emma Hill	Head of Democratic Services
Lesley Harrison	Cabinet and Management Support Manager
Samantha Mullarkey	Governance Advisor and Clerk

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

2. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

There were 6 public questions:

1. Councillor Thorp asked a question regarding Minute No. 9 on the agenda (Disposal of Land at Worrygoose Lane, Whiston). He asked how the development had got planning permission if it was landlocked with no way out. He was also concerned with how the £4.5million would be spent. Councillor Thorp asked if the money could be spent in the Sitwell Ward, like had happened with a development in Swinton Ward.

The Monitoring Officer explained that the ownership of this particular piece of land was not known at the time planning permission was granted.

For the purposes of planning permission, land ownership was irrelevant. The matter before Cabinet was to address land ownership. They did not have the authority to address planning matters.

The Leader stated that the Swinton scheme was different in that it was always intended as a regeneration scheme in which the Council did a deal with the developer. However, he would be happy to have conversations with Councillor Thorp regarding the options that could be delivered to benefit residents in the local area.

Councillor Thorp accepted the invitation to hold a conversation with the Leader.

2. Andrew Claxton also asked a question in relation to Minute No. 9 on the agenda (Disposal of land at Worrygoose Lane, Whiston). He confirmed that he had already submitted a formal complaint regarding this matter. Mr. Claxton stated that the Council Planning Department granted a lucrative outline planning permission which artificially inflated the value of the ransom strip. He said he was concerned because the Council should strictly separate regulatory duties (like Planning) and the corporate financial interests of the Council. He asked if there was a conflict of interest because of this and what proof existed that the £4.5million valuation had been obtained from independent valuations.

The Monitoring Officer explained that the Planning Board Members did not have a conflict of interest when granting the planning permission as they were unaware of the land ownership matter when making this decision. In relation to ensuring safeguards were in place for when the Council was a landowner of a site seeking planning permission, it was confirmed that all matters were dealt with through the formal Committee process and in public. This was done in this circumstance. The Monitoring Officer directed Mr Claxton to the publicly available Cabinet report for the legal implications.

Mr. Claxton asked if the issues raised concerns regarding the competence of the Planning Department as they had failed to identify this issue.

The Leader explained that the Planning Department was not responsible for knowing the ownership of the land and it was not a matter considered as part of the planning application process. The Leader did agree that not knowing the ownership did not speak highly of the Council.

3. Dawn Ordish asked a question in relation to fly tipping in Eastwood and Rotherham generally. She asked why some rubbish was removed by Enviro-Crime but other bits were ignored. Ms. Ordish stated that just cleaning up at great expense each time was not the solution but something needed to be done, particularly in Eastwood, as residents did not want to live on a rubbish tip.

The Leader agreed that residents should not have to put up with fly tipping. The circumstance that existed in Eastwood was not acceptable, nor was it acceptable anywhere. He explained that an investment had been made in the 2026/27 budget for additional Civil Enforcement staff for Selective Licensing areas and it was expected that there would be a marked improvement in enforcement.

The Service Director of Community Safety and Street Scene explained that the Council was seeking to achieve consistent outcomes across the whole Borough in terms of the cleanliness of communities. There were some areas, including Eastwood, that suffered higher levels of fly tipping, and the Council needed to act accordingly. The Council did seek to take action in all possible circumstances, but it was not always possible to identify perpetrators. In terms of national data, Rotherham did perform quite well in terms of taking action.

Ms. Ordish stated that she could not believe that anywhere in the country was worse than Eastwood. As soon as the rubbish was cleared, more was back the following day. Enviro-Crime attended to put stickers on the rubbish but did not remove it. Ms. Ordish stated that St Ann's Road looked awful and could lead to racism.

The Leader reiterated that the situation in Eastwood was not acceptable. The tape being used by Enforcement Officers was part of the investigation process. Whilst the waste was easy to remove, in order to find the perpetrators, a full investigation was required. It was confirmed that if rubbish was dumped in the garden of a private property, it was the responsibility of the owner of that property to remove it.

The Leader confirmed that the Council would look into the matter if Ms. Ordish provided the details of the property. The Leader also confirmed that a Selective Licensing Board was being brought together, for residents, landlords, tenants and Council staff, to make sure everyone was working together to find solutions to matters like this.

4. Rachel Johnson expressed concerns regarding an overgrown hedge that was obstructing a public footpath and preventing wheelchair users, mobility scooter users, parents with pushchairs and other pedestrians from using the pavement safely. She stated that she had reported this to the Council but was told that people could use the footpath on the opposite side of the road instead. Ms. Johnson asked what action the Council would take and within what timescale to remove the obstruction and restore full access to the pavement.

The Leader and Service Director stated that they would need to know the specific location but stated that, on the face of it, the proposed action of using the footpath on the opposite side of the road did not seem right.

Ms. Johnson stated that she had reported several hedges and instances where footpaths were unavailable. The Council said DEFRA guidance

meant hedges could not be cut until September because of bird nesting season. Ms. Johnson did not feel this was correct.

The Leader confirmed a written response would be provided.

5. Kath Reeder asked a question regarding empty properties on Cambridge Street that had been empty for 25 years. Ms. Reeder stated that she had been trying to find out who owned the properties for 20 years but had never got an answer. She was concerned that they had been taken over by stealth and used EU funding.

The Leader stated that he did not know the particular circumstances of this matter. In general terms, if people owned buildings, they could keep them empty as long as they were kept safe. The Leader confirmed that he would get officers to look into the matter and provide a written response.

6. Mohammad Ashraf asked for the names, roles and functions of the people on the Selective Licensing Board and Stakeholder Steering Group. He also asked if all of the roles had been filled.

It was confirmed that the Terms of Reference had been drafted and were being consulted on. The roles had not yet been recruited to and there was still plenty of opportunities to get involved.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Resolved:-

That the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 11th May, 2026, be approved as a true and correct record of the proceedings.

4. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Chair advised that Appendix 2 to Item 10 was exempt, but the meeting remained open to the press and public throughout.

5. OUTCOME OF THE CARE QUALITY COMMISSION ASSESSMENT OF ROTHERHAM ADULT SOCIAL CARE

Consideration was given to the report which outlined the achievements regarding the Council's Social Care Service in achieving a 'Good' rating. It also summarised the key strengths and opportunities for development as detailed in the Care Quality Commission's (CQC) assessment report, which was attached at Appendix 1, of how well the Council was meeting its duties under Part 1 of the Care Act (2014). The assessment took place from 14th to 17th July, 2025, with publication of the final CQC report in March 2026.

The Assessment Notice was received from the CQC on 10th February, 2025, officially beginning the assessment period. Over 300 pieces of

evidence were submitted on 28th February, 2025, covering 38 Information Return statements which formed the basis of the CQC's understanding of how the Local Authority functioned and delivered its care functions. Following this, 50 case files were submitted and a 3 hour online opening presentation took place. The on-site assessment, undertaken by a 7 person CQC team, consisted of 3 days of group and individual interviews, with the experience described as positive by staff, partners, stakeholders and people with lived experience.

The draft report was received on 3rd February, 2026, with the delay due to sickness within the CQC Assessment Team, and the final report was returned on 4th March, 2026, rating Rotherham Adult Care as 'Good' with a score of 73%, placing it joint second in Yorkshire and the Humber. The report was published on 20th March, 2026, and reflection sessions and a celebration event were taking place to acknowledge strengths and inform development actions.

Local authorities were assessed against 4 themes:

1. Working with people
2. Providing support
3. How the local authority ensures safety
4. Leadership

Paragraph 2.4 of the report highlighted key strengths for each of the 4 themes. Paragraph 2.5 highlighted areas to be considered for development for each of the 4 themes.

During the meeting, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, the Leader and Deputy Leader placed on record their thanks to all the teams involved in achieving the "good" rating and to former Councillor Roche who had led on the improvements.

Resolved:

That Cabinet:

1. Notes the achievements of the Council's Adult Social Care Service in achieving a 'Good' rating.
2. Notes the contents of this report highlighting the areas of strength and the opportunities for development, reflected in the CQC assessment report.
3. Supports the intention to address the areas for development as detailed in the report via a development plan to be agreed by the Executive Director for Adult Care, Housing and Public Health in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health.

4. Agree to receive a progress update on delivery of the development plan in June 2027.

6. RESPONSE TO THE HEALTH SELECT COMMISSIONS RECOMMENDATIONS - ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTION SCRUTINY REVIEW

Consideration was given to the report which presented Cabinet's response to the Health Select Commission's recommendations following a review of Access to Contraception in Rotherham. At its meeting on 21st November, 2024, the Health Select Commission agreed to proceed with undertaking a scrutiny review into access to contraception in Rotherham, recognising the importance of supporting residents to make informed choices about their reproductive health. The findings of the Review were approved by the Health Select Commission on 22nd January, 2026, endorsed by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB) at its meeting on 3rd February, 2026 and presented to Cabinet on 16th March, 2026.

The evidence gathered was structured around 5 key themes, within which the resulting recommendations were grouped. The response to these was as follows:

- Commissioning and Service Delivery – accepted (section 2.4 of the report.)
- Education, Public Awareness and Messaging – partially accepted (section 2.5.)
- Digital Access and Information – partially accepted (section 2.6.)
- Youth Access and Confidentiality – partially accepted (section 2.7.)
- Data, Monitoring and Strategic Alignment – partially accepted (section 2.8.)

Proposed responses to each review recommendation were detailed in Appendix 1 to the report and each proposed response had an associated timescale for delivery or further consideration.

Scrutiny Members were thanked for their work on this matter.

Resolved:

That the proposed Cabinet response to the Health Select Commission recommendations in respect of the Access to Contraception Review, as set out in Appendix 1 of this report, be approved.

7. HEALTH AND SAFETY POLICY AND STATEMENT OF INTENT

Consideration was given to the report which outlined the statutory requirement for the Council to maintain a Health and Safety Policy that set out the organisation's approach to managing health and safety. The revised Policy and Statement of Intent was presented for consideration

and recommended for approval, following extensive consultation with a wide range of stakeholders.

The report also summarised the key changes made since the Policy was last approved by Cabinet, reflecting findings from recent reviews and consultation exercises. It also set out how the Policy's key objectives would be delivered and monitored, with specific Standard Operating Procedures (SOP's) referenced as the primary route through which the Policy would be implemented, embedded, and operationally managed across the Council. The Policy further took account of the change in Chief Executive since the Policy was last approved.

Section 2(3) of the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 placed a statutory duty on the Council, as an employer, to prepare, implement and maintain a written Health and Safety Policy that set out the organisation's approach to managing health and safety. The Act also required the Council to ensure that this Policy was effectively communicated to all employees, so they understood the standards, responsibilities and procedures expected of them. Compliance with this duty was essential to ensure that the Council demonstrated robust governance, promoted safe working practices and fulfilled its legal obligations in protecting employees and others affected by its activities.

The Health and Safety Executive (HSE), who regulated Health and Safety Practice, state in their guidance that as a minimum the Policy should address 3 clear areas:

- A statement of intent – articulating a clear commitment from the organisation to protect the health and safety of its employees and those affected by its work activities. This should be signed by the most senior person in the organisation and reviewed regularly.
- Responsibilities and accountability for health and safety - a clear expression of officers, positions and roles that have specific responsibilities for health and safety across the organisation, including reporting lines and any relevant delegations of this responsibility.
- Arrangements for health and safety – aimed to provide details of the practical arrangements in place and how the Council will achieve its Policy aims.

The Council's Health and Safety Policy & Statement of Intent (Appendix 1) was constructed in line with the guidance and good practice recommendations made through statutory bodies such as the HSE. A detailed Standing Operating Procedures representing the Organisational Arrangements for the Management of the Health and Safety Management System (HSMS) was referenced at Appendix 2 to provide assurance on the robust nature of the Council's arrangements for Health and Safety.

The introduction of an annual Health and Safety report into Cabinet would further strengthen corporate governance and oversight.

Resolved:

That Cabinet:

1. Approve the revised Health and Safety Policy and Statement of Intent.
2. Agree to receive an annual report relating to Health and Safety performance.

8. FINANCE UPDATE JUNE 2026

Consideration was given to the report which provided an update to Cabinet on a number of financial matters. The report was provided as an interim update for Cabinet on the Council's financial outturn 2025/26, in advance of the more detailed Financial Outturn 2025/26 report to be submitted to Cabinet in July 2026. The updates follow on from the approval of the Budget and Council Tax 2026/27 report at Council on 4th March, 2026, which set out the forecast outturn position for 2025/26.

The report reflected that the Council's financial outturn position for 2025/26 had improved from a projected £3.4m overspend, as reported to Cabinet as part of December's Financial Monitoring report, to an overspend of £0.3m. Headline information explaining the improvements was detailed within the report.

The report also provided updates on the Council's delivery of the Local Council Tax Support Top Up Scheme. The 2025/26 Scheme provided additional support of up to £126.12 to low income households most vulnerable to rising household costs, through reduced Council Tax bills. A total of £1.777m had been awarded across 17,558 accounts with 10,989 being reduced to nil in 2025/26.

An update on the Household Support Fund (HSF) was also provided. The Council was awarded a full year HSF grant for 2025/26 of just under £4.4m. This was to support vulnerable households with energy, food and other cost of living pressures. As of 31st March ,2026, the Council had fully spent this grant allocation, including through delivering 141,748 Free School Meals vouchers to support families across the school holidays. HSF contributed over £413k to the delivery of the Council's Energy Crisis Support Scheme, supporting 1,657 households with £250 towards their fuel bills. Care leavers were supported with £90k of HSF covering energy and food costs and over 17,558 households received extra support towards their Council Tax bills. In addition, the HSF supported Voluntary and Community Sector provision to provide 657 vulnerable households over the Christmas and New Year period and distributed crisis food parcels throughout the year.

The report provided updates on a series of proposed variations to the Council's Capital Programme that required Cabinet approval. These were:

- The Corporate ICT Capital Programme (2.4.2 of the report)
- Matrix and Century Fire Stopping Works (2.4.3)
- Rother Valley Country Park Waterfront Café and Events Space (2.4.4)
- Ash Dieback Mitigation (2.4.5)
- Property Flood Resilience (2.4.6)

During the meeting, the Leader highlighted the Property Flood Resilience work. Following Storm Babet, communities impacted by flooding were entitled to apply for property flood resilience measures through a Grant arranged by Central Government (DEFRA) but administered by Local Authorities, known as the Property Flood Resilience (PFR) Grant. Eligible flood-hit property owners would be able to apply for up to £5,000 to help make their homes and businesses more resilient to future flooding via the Property Flood Resilience Repair Grant Scheme. It was noted that the Grant was set up to allow residents to pay more to enhance protection beyond the minimum offered through the Grant. However, top up by the Council was recommended as this may be unaffordable in a number of cases and residents had incurred significant costs and disruption as a result of the floods to date. The works would support the overall aims of the Council's Drainage Capital Programme. It would also lead to cost avoidance for the Council in the future, for example in clean-up costs and diverted staff time.

The scheme would utilise £171,026 of unallocated budget (corporate borrowing) from the Drainage Capital Programme to fund any works which could not be covered by the grant.

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

Resolved:

That Cabinet:

1. Note the update on the revenue budget financial outturn 2025/26.
2. Note the Council's progress on the delivery of the Local Council Tax Support Top Up payment scheme.
3. Note the update to the Household Support Fund for 2025-26.
4. Approve the capital budget variations as detailed in section 2.4 of the report.

9. DISPOSAL OF LAND AT WORRYGOOSE LANE, WHISTON

Consideration was given to the report which sought approval for the disposal of the Council's freehold interest in land at Worrygoose Lane, Whiston, and to delegate authority to the Service Director Property and Facilities Services to complete all matters necessary to give effect to that disposal.

The land, which was surplus to operational requirements, was required to provide lawful access to a residential site allocated within the Council's adopted Local Plan and, therefore, represented a ransom strip, without control of which the wider site could not be developed. Following engagement with the adjoining landowners and the developer, the Council obtained independent valuation advice from the District Valuer to establish the value of the Council's land as a ransom strip. This valuation informed subsequent negotiations and provided assurance that the terms ultimately agreed reflected market value, taking account of relevant abnormal development costs.

During the course of negotiations, a number of offers were made by the developer and adjoining landowners. At one stage, all offers were withdrawn while alternative options for accessing the site were explored, resulting in a period of limited engagement with the Council. At a later stage, a change in developer and a refreshed commercial approach led to negotiations being re-opened and ultimately concluding in a final agreed offer of £4.5m for the Council's land.

An Option Agreement relating to the disposal had already been entered into and exercised. This report, therefore, sought approval to regularise the governance position and to determine whether the disposal should now proceed. The decision was in relation to the disposal of a Council-owned asset, taken in accordance with the Council's property and financial governance arrangements.

Notice under the Option Agreement was served on 21st April requiring completion by 6th May, which has since passed. While this position had contractual implications for the Council, this did not diminish or fetter Cabinet's ability to determine whether the disposal should proceed. Cabinet were being asked to consider and determine the disposal notwithstanding the contractual position. Should Cabinet resolve not to approve the disposal, the Council would be required to address and manage the resulting legal and financial implications. These were set out in Sections 5 and 6 of the report with additional information provided in Exempt Appendix 2.

The disposal enabled the realisation of value from a Council-owned asset and also enabled delivery of a wider residential development, including affordable housing, as already identified within the Council's Local Plan and wider objectives to deliver new residential and affordable residential across the Borough.

During the meeting, the Monitoring Officer confirmed that the decision before Cabinet related only to the sale of the land, and not to any related planning matters.

Resolved:

That Cabinet:-

1. Approve the disposal of the Council's freehold interest in land at Worrygoose Lane, Whiston, as per the attached plan in Appendix 1.
2. Delegate authority to the Service Director Property and Facilities Services to carry out and complete all necessary and related activities to give effect to the disposal, including completion of legal documentation and receipt of all monies due to the Council, net of any fees or charges due.

10. NEW APPLICATION FOR BUSINESS RATES DISCRETIONARY RELIEF FOR ROTHERHAM OPEN ARTS RENAISSANCE

Consideration was given to the report which presented the application for the award of Discretionary Business Rates Relief for Rotherham Open Arts Renaissance in accordance with the Council's Business Rates Discretionary Relief Policy.

Rotherham Open Arts Renaissance, Hope Centre, Grove Road, Rotherham, South Yorkshire, S60 2ER, was a registered Community Interest Company (CIC), not-for-profit organisation which was registered on Companies House as a private company limited by guarantee without share capital. The organisation was dedicated to supporting creative practices and promoting arts in Rotherham. The organisation provided free and low-cost access to creative spaces for local artists and creatives working with people of all ages and backgrounds. They aimed to remove financial and social barriers to participation and ensure the activities and studios were welcoming, inclusive and accessible to all.

The organisation had taken on an additional property to enable them to meet the local demand. This was allowing them to extend their existing work, providing more opportunities for local creatives and community groups with the provision of additional studio space, a pottery studio and a small gallery space for local artists to share their work with the community.

Rotherham Open Arts Renaissance had benefitted from an award of discretionary rate relief on their long-term property at Westgate Chambers, Westgate since 2011. They were now seeking additional support, backdated to 2025/26 for the property they occupied from 1st May, 2025, which had recently been added to the rating list by the Valuation Office.

The cost to RMBC for the 2025/26 year would be £3,815.03 and £4,115.02 for 2026/27.

Resolved:

That Cabinet approve the application for Discretionary Business Rates Relief for Rotherham Open Arts Renaissance in accordance with the details set out in Section 6 to this report for the 2025/26 and 2026/27 financial years.

11. RENTERS RIGHTS ACT POLICY CONSULTATION

Consideration was given to the report which sought approval to consult on a Private Sector Housing Enforcement Policy to sit alongside the Council's General Enforcement Policy and a Civil Penalty Calculation Mechanism, for delivering Civil penalties under the Renters' Rights Act 2025 and other relevant legislation. This was necessary to comply with national legislation and guidance, delivering a transparent process for applying Civil Penalties across a range of housing legislation. It offered a consistent approach with other local authorities in the region and provided an option to tailor the financial impact of the legislation to the local housing market.

The Renters' Rights Act 2025 ["the Act"], and associated Statutory Guidance, introduced significant changes to Local Housing Authority enforcement powers, including expanded civil penalties, statutory "starting points" for financial penalties, and a range of new investigatory powers. The Act had not been included within the 'Legislative and Regulatory Reform (Regulatory Functions) Order 2007' and, therefore, was outside of the scope of the Regulator's Code and the principles of good regulation which were outlined within the Council's General Enforcement Policy.

The proposed Private Sector Housing Enforcement Policy, along with the Civil Penalty Calculation Mechanism, consolidated housing enforcement tools, including those outside the national Regulator's Code, ensuring consistency, proportionality, and compliance with the legislation which would not disproportionately impact the local private rented sector.

As a result of the new legislation and guidance, there were 6 areas which required inclusion or amendment in relation to the Council's Policy. These were all addressed in the draft Private Sector Housing Enforcement Policy, attached as Appendix 1, and the Civil Financial Penalty Calculation Mechanism, attached as Appendix 2 and 3 respectively. These were:

- New offences and powers under the Renters' Rights Act 2025.
- Updated Civil Penalty calculation methodologies.
- Statutory "starting points" for penalty calculations.
- The ACEHO National Model Enforcement Framework.
- Local economic conditions impacting penalty viability.
- Increases in the level of Rent Repayment Orders.

It was proposed that the consultation would commence in late June 2026 and run for 6 weeks. It would be designed to reach residents, businesses, neighbourhood groups, local charities, faith groups, landlord groups, tenants, owner occupiers and visitors, focused on those impacted by the private rented sector. The approach would concentrate on online and email engagement, utilising the corporate consultation mechanism where possible. Paper-based opportunities would be included. It was expected that the response to the consultation, and the final proposed Policy, would be presented to Cabinet in November 2026 after full consideration of the responses.

The report was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board who advised that the recommendations be supported. OSMB requested that the consultation period be extended into September. During the meeting, the Chair of OSMB requested that the consultation be extended for a further 4 weeks. Cabinet agreed to extend the consultation by 2 weeks. This reflected the concerns raised by OSMB but meant that the original timeframe could still be adhered to.

Resolved:

That Cabinet:

1. Approve consultation on the draft:
 - a. Private Sector Housing Enforcement Policy, derived from the Association of Chief Environmental Health Officers (ACEHO) National Model Enforcement Policy; and
 - b. Civil Penalty Calculation Mechanism, including local market adjustment.
2. Note that a future report with the outcome of the consultation and revised policy documents will be presented to Cabinet in November 2026.
3. Agree that the consultation run for a period of 8 weeks.

12. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

Consideration was given to the report which presented the nominations received for appointments to outside bodies. Outside bodies were external organisations which had requested that the Council appoint a representative to them. Outside bodies had separate governance structures to the Council. Appointments to outside bodies could be an important mechanism for community leadership, partnership and joint working and knowledge and information sharing.

The Council's Constitution stated that Cabinet was responsible for the appointments to Outside Bodies. This report presented the nominations received and recommended the appointment of the nominees to the various organisations and partnerships. Details of the appointments were attached in Appendix 1 to the report.

Resolved:

That Cabinet:

1. Agree that Councillors be appointed to serve on outside bodies, as detailed on the schedule in Appendix 1.
2. Agree that any in year changes are delegated to the Chief Executive in conjunction with the Leader of the Council.

13. LOCAL NATURE RECOVERY STRATEGY

Consideration was given to the report which provided an overview of the pre-consultation draft of the South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (Appendix 1), outlined the governance and consultation timetable, and sought Cabinet support for the Council's participation in the formal consultation process.

The South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy was being prepared by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA), which was the designated Responsible Authority under the Environment Act 2021, working collaboratively with Rotherham, Sheffield, Barnsley and Doncaster local authorities and the Peak District National Park Authority as Supporting Authorities. The South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (SYLNRS) sought to identify existing valuable habitats, priority species, priorities for nature recovery, and opportunities for enhancing biodiversity across the sub-region. The Strategy had been developed collaboratively with the 4 South Yorkshire Local Authorities and the Peak District National Park Authority, alongside voluntary and public sector partners.

The SYLNRS provided a strategic evidence base for nature recovery. While it did not place legal obligations on landowners, it would support funding bids, inform wider policy, and help attract public, voluntary and

private sector investment into South Yorkshire's green environment. Local planning authorities, in preparing new local plans and in development management decision-taking, would have regard to the LNRS and reflect the requirements of the LNRS within the preparation of a new Local Plan.

The draft Strategy was supported by a series of technical annexes (Annexes A–E), which provided the underlying evidence base, mapping and methodological detail that informed the preparation of the Strategy.

The Strategy was scrutinised by the Improving Places Select Commission who advised that the recommendations be support. They made an additional recommendation in relation to additional habitat banks which was accepted by Cabinet.

Resolved:

That Cabinet:

1. Note the pre-consultation draft of the South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy, including the proposed governance and consultation arrangements led by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority.
2. Delegate authority to the Executive Director for Regeneration and Environment, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Waste Services, Leisure and Green Spaces, to:
 - a. agree and submit the Council's final consultation response to SYMCA on the draft South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy, as set out in paragraph 3.1.
 - b. Endorse the final version of the South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy in autumn 2026, following the public consultation process and prior to final sign-off by South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority.
3. Agree that, as part of the Council's wider work on biodiversity net gain, it be requested that the Service give consideration to prioritising the development of additional habitat banks within the Borough, to ensure that these are established in advance of any large-scale infrastructure projects which could create an urgent requirement to compensate for habitat loss.

14. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD

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

15. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:-

That the next meeting of the Cabinet be held on 6th July, 2026, commencing at 10.00 a.m.