

COUNCIL MEETING
20th May, 2026

Present:- The Mayor of Rotherham (Councillor Haroon Rashid) (in the Chair); Councillors Brent, Adair, Ahmed, Alam, Allen, Bacon, Baggaley, Baker-Rogers, Baum-Dixon, Beck, Bennett-Sylvester, Beresford, Blackham, Bower, A. Carter, C. Carter, Castledine-Dack, Clarke, T. Collingham, Z. Collingham, Currie, Cusworth, Duncan, Elliott, Fisher, Garnett, Harper, Harrison, Hughes, Hussain, Ismail, Jackson, Jones, Keenan, Lelliott, Marshall, Mault, McKiernan, Monk, Pitchley, Read, Reynolds, Ryalls, Steele, Sutton, 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>

9. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor thanked those that had attended his parade and Civic Service. He hoped everyone had enjoyed the day as much as he had. The tradition of reporting on recent mayoral activity would continue in July.

10. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Ball, Hall, Sheppard and Stables.

11. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous Council meeting held on 22nd April 2026.

Resolved:

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on 22nd April 2026 be approved for signature by the Mayor.

Mover: Councillor Read

Seconder: Councillor Cusworth

12. PETITIONS

Consideration was given to the report which set out the petitions that had been received since the last meeting. There was one petition:

- Improve Road Safety – Upper Wortley Road Slip Road (33 valid signatures – Lead Petitioner – Janet Porter)

Mrs. Porter attended the meeting and spoke to her petition. In accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme, the Executive Director of Regeneration and Environment would provide a written response within 10 working days.

Resolved:

1. That the report be received.
2. That the relevant Executive Director be required to respond to the lead petitioner, as set out in the Petition Scheme, by Thursday, 4th June 2026.

13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

14. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were 4 questions:

1. T asked: Will this Council publicly demonstrate the value and benefit to the community consequent upon the legal expenses incurred relating to the ongoing avoidance of disclosures of information concerning child sex exploitation?

As T did not attend, a written response would be provided.

2. Mr. Shepherd asked: Following my last question, do you agree that at least some of the reasons given for not distributing the 1,400 copies of 'Voices' purchased at a cost of £5,600 made no sense at all? The intended audience was crystal clear - RMBC's workforce AND it was agreed that a RMBC leaflet showing support services would be placed in each copy?

As Mr. Shepherd did not attend, a written response would be provided.

3. Mr. Cowles asked: Was your only action about serious evidenced dishonesty about Voices of Despair Voices of Hope to send an email to those potentially involved in the evidenced dishonesty?

The Leader confirmed that he had reviewed the email which had been sent 8 years ago. At the time, he had raised it with senior staff and was assured that the concerns had been looked at properly. A couple of years later, a formal documented response was provided to the person who had raised the concerns. At the time it was agreed that officers could have dealt with some matters of process better but there was not the kind of evidenced dishonesty that was claimed by the complainant. The Leader could not recall conversations that took place 8 year ago. However, any decisions taken at that time would have been overseen by the Government Commissioners and any issues should have been reported directly to the Secretary of State.

In his supplementary, Mr. Cowles stated that there had been some prosecutions of perpetrators of CSE but, in his opinion, there had been no accountability so far for those who knew what was happening but took no action to prevent the abuse. He asked the Leader if he agreed that accountability was just as essential as responsibility.

The Leader agreed and stated that he had lobbied the Government at the time to ask them to look at what more could be done to hold to account people in professional positions who had overseen long-term failings. The Leader did state that the people complained about in the email referenced were not the same people who had overseen the previous failings in Rotherham prior to 2014.

4. Mr. Ashraf asked: Council Leader Chris Read with an itemized breakdown of all financial contributions including investments, subsidies, loans, core subscriptions, specific levies for functions like transport, and any match funding, contributions etc, as well as funds received a share of, from national sources, does Rotherham Council use to fund SYMCA?

The Leader stated that he knew Councillor Alam had written to Mr. Ashraf in the last few days and had written to him previously, advising him of the right place to raise his queries. At the Cabinet meeting held on 11th May 2026, the Leader had reported that the Council paid a £35,000 subscription to SYMCA. The Leader confirmed this had been incorrect as this was the subscription that used to be paid to the Sheffield City Region. The Council did not pay a subscription to SYMCA.

The Leader confirmed that the Council did not fund the day-to-day running of SYMCA but that payments were made for the delivery of services, most notably the Passenger Transport Levy which was £1,053,737 for 2025/26.

In order to get the exact information requested, the Leader advised Mr .Ashraf to use the Freedom of Information process at SYMCA.

In his supplementary, Mr. Ashraf stated that it raised red flags when he could not ask or receive a proper answer on where Rotherham money was going and said that Councillor Alam had made mistakes. In relation to SYMCA, he asked for the projected cost for commitments made and what financial or other returns Rotherham had received in return for the financial year 2025/26 and all preceding years.

The Leader reiterated that Councillor Alam had referred Mr. Ashraf to SYMCA's FOI process which is exactly what he should have done. This was the best way for Mr. Ashraf to get the information he wanted. No one was trying to hide any information. The Leader stated that this was the third time that Mr. Ashraf had now been told the most appropriate way to get the requested information.

15. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

There were no items that required the exclusion of the press and public.

16. LEADER OF THE COUNCIL'S STATEMENT

The Leader congratulated the Mayor on his appointment and Councillor Brent on his appointment as Deputy Mayor. He also welcomed Councillor Allen back to Cabinet as Cabinet Member for Communities.

Since the last meeting:

- The Crisis Payments scheme had launched, which offered payments of between £80 and £200 to residents who found themselves in a critical financial situation.
- The 800th Council house had been completed and the Council remained on track to deliver 1,000 Council homes by Summer 2027.
- The topping out event at Larch Road/Addison Road in Maltby had taken place.
- The Housing Service had celebrated the Housing Staff Awards.
- Foster Care Fortnight had started which celebrated the incredible work done by Foster Carers.
- The Great North Investment Summit had taken place in Leeds where multi-billion pound investment opportunities were launched.
- The Chancellor announced plans for major regeneration projects in South Yorkshire which included support for the development of the Rotherham Gateway proposal.

The Leader of the Majority Opposition Group, Councillor Zach Collingham, was invited to respond to the statement. He too welcomed the Mayor to his new role. Councillor Collingham asked questions relating to:

- The bin lorry fire that had taken place the day before the meeting. He asked if there were any preliminary findings that could be shared in case there were any concerns for the rest of the fleet.
- The re-appointment of Councillor Allen to Cabinet. He welcomed the appointment but asked what it was designed to achieve.
- The results from the Local Elections held across the country in May 2026. Councillor Collingham stated that the results were a staggering rejection of the status quo and the Labour Party. He stated that, if there had been an election in Rotherham, the Labour Group would have been removed and would still likely be removed in 2 years' time. Councillor Collingham therefore asked if the Leader would deliver actions further and faster in the time remaining. This included reviewing the Capital Project delivery programme and ensuring the mistakes that had been made in relation to the Markets project were not replicated in the Housing Capital Programme.
- Basic service failures such as not collecting the bins, not cutting the grass and not knowing what was happening with lampposts. He asked should the Council be focussing on these rather than on the Street Safe Team, or the High Street Business advisors.

In response, the Leader confirmed that an internal review was taking place regarding the bin lorry fire and he was happy to share the findings when they were available. The reason for returning Councillor Allen to Cabinet and giving her the Communities Portfolio was to champion the issues that mattered most to residents.

In regard to improving the pace of delivery, the Leader stated that the ongoing work was the largest regeneration of Rotherham for some decades and this had coincided with a difficult economy and rising interest rates, particularly for the building sector. He was not satisfied with the way in which some schemes had been delivered, particularly the markets and the Chief Executive had been instructed to conduct a review into that. Given the Housing Programme was now 80% complete, the Leader did not envisage the same issues.

In response to the comments on the Local Election results, the Leader stated that he did not think any of the Conservative Members should feel confident going into an election as the results for the Conservative Party nationally were cataclysmic. He stated that the Rotherham Labour Group would continue delivering their promises, supporting the high streets and supporting communities. The Leader said that the Conservatives would remove measures to help high streets and communities.

Questions from Members were invited. Councillor Currie firstly stated that he was happy to see Councillor Allen return to Cabinet. He asked if Scrutiny could look more closely at the Council's finances and possibly have a separate Commission for finance. The Leader stated that it was not up to him how scrutiny was organised, but the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board did review financial monitoring reports and the Medium Term Financial Strategy on a regular basis.

Councillor Thorp queried the strategy behind the replacement of bin lorries, stating that the ones ordered 2 years ago were still not in the ownership of the Council. He asked how the Service would function with one less bin lorry and more houses being built. The Leader confirmed that the Council were pursuing the purchased vehicles. He stated that the Conservatives had suggested a strategy that would have seen older vehicles in service for longer which would not have helped.

Councillor Bacon referenced the regeneration schemes and stated that law and order was needed to maintain confidence. He asked the Leader and Mayor Oliver Coppoard to come up with a proper plan to combat anti-social behaviour. The Leader stated that, as Rotherham had the fastest growing economy in the north of England for the last 10 years, that should be a good sign for law and order. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety continued to work with the Police and other partners on a regular basis to tackle anti-social behaviour. The Leader also noted that the Labour Group had invested money into the high streets and via Select Licensing to improve anti-social behaviour. This was a proactive approach.

Councillor Bennett-Sylvester asked for clarification on what the Crisis Payments could be used for and what long term help was available for those that required it. The Leader confirmed that additional money was going into the Open Arms service and the Council's partners were being encouraged to work more closely with libraries and the food bank network to make sure they were co-located where possible. The Council also continued to provide support to the Laser Credit Union.

17. MEMBERSHIP OF POLITICAL GROUPS OF THE COUNCIL, POLITICAL BALANCE AND ENTITLEMENT TO SEATS

Consideration was given to the report which detailed the membership of Political Groups on the Council, the political balance and the entitlement to seats on, and the proposed appointments to Committees, Boards and Panels.

It was noted that Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 placed a duty on local authorities to set out the principles to be followed when allocating seats to political groups and for these principles to be followed when determining such allocation following formal notification of the establishment of political groups in operation on the Council. It was noted further that there was a requirement on local

authorities to annually review the entitlement of the political groups to seats on the Committees of the Council.

The report stated that the allocation of seats must follow 2 principles:

- a) Balance must be achieved across the total number of available seats on Committees; and
- b) Balance must be achieved on each individual Committee or body where seats are available.

There were three political groups in operation on the Council:

Labour

Leader – Councillor Read
Deputy Leader – Councillor Cusworth
(31 Members)

Conservative

Leader – Councillor Z Collingham
Deputy Leader – Councillor Bacon
(13 Members)

Liberal Democrat

Leader – Councillor Adam Carter
(3 Members)

There were 12 non-aligned Members: Councillors Beck, Bennett-Sylvester, Bower, Currie, Elliott, Harrison, Havard, Hussain, Jones, Ryalls, Sheppard and Yasseen.

There were 144 seats available on Committees, Boards and Panels and under the calculations the Labour Group were entitled to 80 seats, the opposition Group (Conservative) 32 seats and the Liberal Democrat Group 7 seats. The seats allocated to the non-aligned Councillors was 25 and the Council had previously enabled these Councillors to take seats on the various bodies as permitted by the Legislation.

During the meeting Members discussed low attendance rates for Select Commissions and were reminded that substitutions could be made. Members also discussed the merits of moving meetings to the evening. The Leader confirmed that it was for individual committees to decide their schedules but stated that in his experience, later meetings did not improve attendance rates.

Resolved:

1. That the entitlement of the membership of Council be agreed and such entitlements be reflected in Council's appointments of Members to Committees (as per the table at 3.2 and 4.2).

2. That approval be given to the appointment of Members to Committees, Boards and Panels, and the appointment of Chairs and Vice-Chairs, as detailed in the Mayor's Letter.
3. That approval be given to the appointment of Members to Joint Committees, as detailed in the Mayor's Letter and below:

NOMINATIONS TO COMMITTEES, BOARDS AND PANELS

Cabinet – 7L

Leader – Councillor Read

Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Children and Young People

Councillor Cusworth

Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health –

Councillor Baker-Rogers

Cabinet Member for Finance and Community Safety –

Councillor Alam

Cabinet Member for Communities – Councillor Allen

Cabinet Member for Housing – Councillor Beresford

Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy –

Councillor Williams

Cabinet Member for Waste Services, Leisure and Green Spaces

Councillor Marshall

Audit Committee – 3L, 1C, 1N-A

Councillor Baggaley (Chair)

Councillor Lelliott (Vice Chair)

Councillor Monk

Councillor Blackham

Councillor Elliott

Independent Members:

Alison Hutchinson

Michael Olugbenga-Bababola

Licensing Board – 11L, 5C, 1LD, 4N-A

Councillor Hughes (Chair)

Councillor Garnett (Vice Chair)

Councillor Adair

Councillor Ahmed

Councillor Brent

Councillor Clarke
Councillor Harper
Councillor Monk
Councillor Robinson
Councillor Steele
Councillor Sutton

Councillor Thorp
Councillor T. Collingham
Councillor Reynolds
Councillor Stables
Councillor Ball

1 x Liberal Democrat Vacancy

Councillor Bennett-Sylvester
Councillor Bower
Councillor Currie
Councillor Jones

Licensing Committee – 8L, 3C, 1LD, 3N-A

Councillor Hughes (Chair)
Councillor Garnett (Vice Chair)

Councillor Adair
Councillor Ahmed
Councillor Brent
Councillor Clarke
Councillor Harper
Councillor Monk

Councillor Ball
Councillor T. Collingham
Councillor Stables

1 x Liberal Democrat Vacancy

Councillor Bennett-Sylvester
Councillor Bower
Councillor Jones

Planning Board – 8L, 3C, 1LD, 3N-A

Councillor Mault (Chair)
Councillor Jackson (Vice Chair)

Councillor Adair
Councillor Ahmed
Councillor Duncan

COUNCIL MEETING - 20/05/26

Councillor Sutton
Councillor Taylor
1 x Labour Vacancy

Councillor Fisher
Councillor Thorp
Councillor Reynolds

Councillor Tarmey

Councillor Currie
Councillor Elliott
Councillor Hussain

Rotherham Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education (SACRE) – 3L

Councillor Alam
Councillor Cusworth
Councillor Ismail

Staffing Committee – 3L, 1C, 1N-A

Councillor Alam (Chair)
Councillor Read (Vice Chair)
1 x appropriate Cabinet Member as determined by the matter to be considered

Councillor Z. Collingham

Councillor Jones

Standards and Ethics Committee – 5L, 2C, 1N-A

Councillor Clarke (Chair)
Councillor Harper (Vice Chair)

Councillor Cowen
Councillor McKiernan
Councillor Lelliott

Councillor T. Collingham
Councillor Hall

Councillor Currie

Parish Councillor Mark Senior
Parish Councillor Anthony Griffin
Parish Council Representative Vacancy

Independent Members:

Mrs. Adela Bingham
Ms. Kate Penney
Ms Ruby Wright
Vacancy x 2

Independent Persons:

Mr. Phil Beavers
Mr. David Roper-Newman

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board – 7L, 3C, 1LD, 1N-A

Councillor Steele (Chair)
Councillor Bacon (Vice Chair)

Councillor Baggaley
Councillor Keenan
Councillor Lelliott
Councillor McKiernan
Councillor Monk
Councillor Sutton

Councillor Blackham
Councillor Tinsley

Councillor A. Carter

Councillor Yasseen

Health Select Commission –10L, 4C, 1LD, 3N-A

Councillor Keenan (Chair)
Councillor Yasseen (Vice Chair)

Councillor Adair
Councillor Ahmed
Councillor Brent
Councillor Clarke
Councillor Duncan
Councillor Garnett
Councillor Harper
Councillor Ismail
Councillor Knight

COUNCIL MEETING - 20/05/26

Councillor Baum-Dixon
Councillor Fisher
Councillor Reynolds
Councillor Thorp

Councillor Tarmey

Councillor Harrison
Councillor Havard

Improving Lives Select Commission – 10L, 4C, 1LD, 3N-A

Councillor Monk (Chair)
Councillor Sutton (Vice Chair)

Councillor Adair
Councillor Brent
Councillor Clarke
Councillor Garnett
Councillor Harper
Councillor Hughes
Councillor Ismail
Councillor Robinson

Councillor Blackham
Councillor T. Collingham
Councillor Fisher
Councillor Bennett-Sylvester (Gifted)

Councillor Currie (Gifted)

Councillor Bower
Councillor Elliott
Councillor Ryalls

Co-optees

Lauren Hickey
Mike Hemmingway
James Newman

Improving Places Select Commission – 10L, 4C, 1LD, 3N-A

Councillor McKiernan (Chair)
Councillor Tinsley (Vice Chair)

Councillor Adair
Councillor Cowen
Councillor Garnett
Councillor Jackson
Councillor Lelliott
Councillor Mault
Councillor Rashid
Councillor Taylor
1 x Labour Vacancy

Councillor Castledine-Dack
Councillor Stables
Councillor Thorp

Councillor C. Carter

Councillor Beck
Councillor Jones
Councillor Bennett-Sylvester

Introductory Tenancy Review Panel – 2L, 1C, 1N-A

Chair and Vice-Chair to be drawn from Members of the Improving Lives Scrutiny Commission or Improving Places Scrutiny Commission

Councillor Sutton (Chair)
Councillor Jackson (Vice Chair)

Councillor Tinsley

Councillor Ryalls

Joint Consultative Committee – 3L, 1C, 1N-A

Councillor Alam (Chair)
Councillor Cusworth (Vice Chair)

Councillor Steele

Councillor Z. Collingham

Councillor Elliott

Health and Wellbeing Board – 2L

Councillor Baker Rogers (Chair)
Councillor Cusworth

Councillor Ismail (Observer)

JOINT AND COMBINED AUTHORITIES

South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority Board 1L

Councillor Read
Councillor Williams - Substitute

South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority Rotational Member 1L

Councillor Cusworth

South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority Audit, Standards and Risk Committee 1L

Councillor Baggaley
Councillor Lelliott - Substitute

South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee 1L, 1C

Councillor Steele
Councillor McKiernan - Substitute

Councillor Bacon
Councillor Baum-Dixon - Substitute

South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority Employment Panel 1L, 1 C

Councillor Steele
Councillor Bacon

South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority 1L, 1C

Councillor Taylor
Councillor Ball

South Yorkshire Pension Authority – RMBC Chair for 26/27 1L, 1C

Councillor Sutton (S41 responsibilities)
Councillor Fisher

South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel 1L, 1C

Councillor Ismail
Councillor Baum-Dixon

Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation Joint Committee 1L

Councillor McKiernan
Vacant - Substitute

Mover: Councillor Read

Seconded: Councillor Cusworth

18. CORPORATE PARENTING PARTNERSHIP BOARD - ANNUAL REPORT

Consideration was given to the report which showcased the work completed by the Corporate Parenting Partnership Board to deliver the Council's duty as a Corporate Parent. The purpose was to set out how the Council delivered consistent high-quality care and how the Council, with partners, supported opportunities for Children in Care, Care Leavers, and supported them with progressing key priority areas including placement sufficiency and youth participation. This Annual Report also summarised progress by the Corporate Parenting Partnership Board against the Corporate Parenting Strategy and set out priorities for 2026.

During 2025 there was a redesign of the Corporate Parenting Partnership Board. The motivation for this refresh was to enhance corporate ownership and give the Board an improved presence. The revised model also ensured a dynamic approach to progressing the action plan and in turn outcomes for children and young people. Throughout 2025 there had been a consistent commitment from senior officers and Members who had met regularly.

Areas of specific focus for 2026 included:

- Improve Pathway Plans for Care Leavers
- Ensure Care Leavers have access to Health Passports
- Continue to improve local sufficiency for Children in Care

In moving and seconding the report, Councillor Cusworth and Councillor Fisher both thanked the young people who had attended the Board and shared their voice and experiences.

Resolved:

1. That Council note the progress made by the Corporate Parenting Partnership Board in 2025.
2. That Council note the areas of focus for 2026.

Mover: Councillor Cusworth

Seconded: Councillor Fisher

19. MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEETING

Consideration was given to the reports, recommendations and minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held 13th April 2026.

Resolved:

That the reports, recommendations and minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 13th April 2026 be received.

Mover: Councillor Read

Seconded: Councillor Cusworth

20. MINUTES OF THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

In moving the minutes of the Health and Wellbeing Board, Councillor Baker-Rogers provided an update on the work undertaken. This included updates on the Combating Drugs Partnership, the Loneliness Action Plan Refresh, the Health and Wellbeing Strategy and on Ethnicity and Unequal Ageing: Experiences in Rotherham and Sheffield.

In seconding the minutes, Councillor Cusworth praised the work on the Loneliness Action Plan refresh, in particular the impact it would have on children and young people.

Resolved:

That the reports, recommendations and minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board be noted.

Mover: Councillor Baker-Rogers

Seconded: Councillor Cusworth

21. PLANNING BOARD

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

Mover: Councillor Mault

Seconded: Councillor Jackson

22. LICENSING BOARD SUB-COMMITTEE AND LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE

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

Seconded: Councillor Garnett

23. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS TO DESIGNATED SPOKESPERSONS

There were no questions to consider.

24. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS TO CABINET MEMBERS AND CHAIRPERSONS

There were 27 questions:

1. Councillor Thorp: Do schools within the RMBC area, have to supply alternatives to the standard meal if meat products are served in that meal i.e. a Halal or Vegetarian alternative, or can any school serve meals for just the majority of pupils attending that school?

Councillor Cusworth, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, explained that there was no specific national requirement that schools had to provide particular alternatives such as halal meals in every case. However, schools were expected to act reasonably in meeting the needs of their pupils and whether the Council provided catering, the service specification supported dietary needs.

In his supplementary, Councillor Thorp stated that he was specifically referencing one school who only served vegetarian food or halal meat. He asked if this was allowed.

Councillor Cusworth stated that she was not aware of that school, but she was happy to meet with Councillor Thorp to discuss this further and she would raise the matter with officers.

2. Councillor Thorp: Following on from question 1, if the school delivers meals just for the majority do they have to show this within their literature?

Councillor Cusworth, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, explained that there was no specific requirement for a school to formally state in its literature that it provided meals in the way described. However, schools and catering providers were expected to be clear and transparent about their menu offer. This expectation came from a combination of National School Food Standards, wider legal responsibilities and, where applicable, local service specifics.

In his supplementary, Councillor Thorp stated that Oakwood Academy was only providing halal meat or vegetarian food; it did not provide non-halal meat, but this was not communicated. He stated that this was a problem.

Councillor Cusworth stated that Oakwood Academy was part of an Academy Trust and, therefore, outside the control of the Council. She did confirm she would discuss the matter further with Councillor Thorp.

3. Councillor Reynolds: As it nears completion, can we be told how much solar power the new Market scheme will generate. In simple terms will it power half the Market, all the Market, or all the Market and still export some power to the Grid?

Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy explained that there were 2 systems installed on the new Library and Outdoor Covered Market to maximum spatial capacity, generating 195kW peak output and it was expected that jointly they would generate 12.5% of both sites' annual predicted consumption. This was based on the new supply capacity, so it was likely that the real use of solar would be greater than 12.5%. This was due to day-by-day usage and consumption variance. Generation would also vary depending on season and operational activities, and there would also be a small amount of spill to the grid during closed hours of daylight or low use.

In his supplementary, Councillor Reynolds sought clarity around the 12% figure.

Councillor Williams confirmed that the solar installation was expected to power around 12% of the Market and Library overall power requirement.

4. Councillor Reynolds: What has been the total cost of the Solar installation for the Market?

Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy stated that the total cost was £298,000.

5. Councillor Ryalls: Would the recent successful prosecution of the rogue landlord on Foljambe Drive Dalton have been made easier if it had been in a Selective Licensing area, and if so, how?

Councillor Beresford, Cabinet Member for Housing firstly thanked Councillor Ryalls for her hard work on behalf of the impacted resident. It had been noted and was appreciated. In response to the question, Councillor Beresford stated that this case demonstrated that the Council would take robust enforcement action where serious hazards were identified. In this instance, officers had used existing Housing Act powers to investigate, serve a legal notice, and successfully prosecute when the landlord failed to comply. It was worth noting that this action followed a complaint, meaning the response was reactive in nature.

Selective Licensing could have made the process easier by providing additional tools. It introduced clearer and more straightforward offences through licence breaches, and supported a more proactive approach, with earlier identification of issues through licensing and inspection activity. In areas subject to Selective Licensing, issues were also less reliant on tenant complaints being made; sometimes tenants

were reluctant to make those complaints themselves. However, it was important to note that the absence of licensing did not prevent a successful prosecution in this case.

In her supplementary, Councillor Ryalls asked if the Dalton area could continue to be monitored and if it would be considered in the next round of Selective Licensing.

Councillor Beresford stated that the introduction of the Renters Rights Act would hopefully improve matters. Tenant engagement officers were also available to speak to tenants and provide advice. In relation to Selective Licensing, Councillor Beresford confirmed that Dalton had not been selected in the previous round as it had not met the required criteria. This was because it did not have the density of private rented properties required. However it would be assessed again for the next round.

6. Councillor Thorp: Can you give me a ball park figure of how much the total cost of the consultation to date including the design and costing format used to conduct the Ward Councillors' survey for the proposed new cycle lane from the Brecks, extending to join the Broom road cycle lane, and the surrounding roads included within this Active Travel funding?

Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy explained that he could not give a specific figure just relating to what the consultation was in order to get to the point of consultation, work had to be undertaken on design and feasibility. The total cost for the project referred to date, for all activities done so far, was just over £732,000 and this was funded from the Department of Transport's City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement.

In his supplementary, Councillor Thorp asked if Rotherham Council would be required to pay that amount if the final scheme did not go ahead.

Councillor Williams confirmed a written response would be provided.

7. Councillor Thorp: Why when the proposed new cycle lane project is announced from the Brecks to Broom Road, and an online consultation has been completed, then several in-person consultations at selected locations. Then a focus group is formed, but no RMBC Councillor is allowed to be present because we may have too much influence, why?

Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy stated that the focus groups referred to were held in early 2025 and were just one way of collating local views. They were designed as a place to capture independent, honest views from local residents. To ensure the feedback was non-political, Elected Members

were not invited to these sessions. This was not uncommon for a resident focus group process. Similarly, Elected Members were briefed and given the opportunity to comment on proposals in separate meetings with officers.

Councillor Williams also confirmed that, on the back of concerns shared by Councillor Thorp outside of the meeting, a number of actions were now underway.

In his supplementary, Councillor Thorp stated that he had been told that a member from a cycling group from London had been at one of the meetings to try and push for cycle lanes. He asked Councillor Williams if that was correct.

Councillor Williams confirmed that a written response would be provided.

8. Councillor Thorp: Why after online consultations, then in person consultations, then a series of focus groups, followed by a very thorough road-by-road and even junctions questionnaire giving 3-4 options and costings for each area, road, and junctions completed by all 6 Ward Councillors, do Highways believe they know better and submit a never before suggested road layout for Broom Lane?

Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy stated that the Council had listened to views from residents throughout the process of looking at active travel measures along Broom Lane and of course it was the role of Transportation officers to validate and bring forward proposals for consideration, which was what they had done. Given the focus of the funding made available by the last Conservative Government, officers had developed a design that incorporated Active Travel elements on Wickersley Road and Broom Lane and the associated surrounding neighbourhood. To meet the outcomes of the funding the Council had been given for the transport improvements on Broom Lane, the design had to create a balance of opportunity to access to cycle routes and safe pedestrian spaces.

As a result of the feedback the Council had received, new plans included options to reduce the impact on trees along the route, improved paving and more tactile crossings to assist pedestrians, signalised crossings at the Stag roundabout, plus a new controlled crossing and raised crossing close to Sitwell Academy on Broom Lane.

It was now the community's opportunity to inform the Council whether these interventions were happening in the right place at the right time or whether changes should be made. The Council was now inviting views and representations from everyone as part of the final

consultation stage, and only then would it be in a position to make a decision as to whether the scheme went ahead.

9. Councillor Thorp: Has any data been collected regarding the use of the new cycle lane infrastructure regarding any increase in use these schemes have created and if not why?

In accordance with Procedure Rule 11(8), question 6 would be responded to in writing.

10. Councillor Thorp: When new cycle lanes are suggested it talks of cycling, wheeling and walking; what data have you collected to show that only by introducing designated cycle lanes you can reduce the danger to pedestrians?

In accordance with Procedure Rule 11(8), question 7 would be responded to in writing.

11. Councillor T. Collingham: Following the motion agreed at Full Council on 22nd April 2026 to review barriers affecting the use of lighting columns, what immediate short-term support has been put in place for Parish Councils and community groups, including any interim financial assistance, guidance, or relaxation of requirements while the full policy review is undertaken?

Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Communities firstly apologised for the lack of timely communication on this matter with Parish Councils and other groups, stating that it was regrettable that the Council had not got this right. In relation to the interim assistance, Councillor Allen confirmed that the Council had agreed to:

- Pay 75% of the costs of the inspections of the lighting columns.
- Allow Parish Councils to raise their 25% contribution either this year or next year.
- Pay 50% of the costs for when re-inspections were required (which would be in 3 years)
- Allow Parish Councils to commission their own inspectors to speed up the process. The Council would also offer advice on suitable contractors.

Councillor Allen also confirmed that, as Parish Council Liaison was now under her portfolio, she would be taking this forward as a key learning point.

In his supplementary, Councillor Collingham asked how this proposal had been received by Parish Councils.

Councillor Allen confirmed that she would write to them and ask.

12. Councillor Bower: How can local residents have any faith in the consultation process for the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement when their views have been ignored throughout the process so far?

Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy did not accept the premise of the question. In any consultation the Council received a very wide range of views. Some would be actionable and some would not. However, when a public consultation ran, where there were responses along a theme that could confidently be addressed within the bounds of the funding and scheme, the Council was able to make those changes.

Councillor Williams stated that he set out in response to an earlier question change that had been proposed in relation to the Broom Lane scheme but, for example, on the Fitzwilliam Road scheme, the Council had not now taken forward proposals to close some of the side roads from Fitzwilliam Road – because of the feedback received in the first round of consultation. Possible radical changes to St Anne's Roundabout that would have restricted access to the south were also no longer being considered.

Councillor Williams encouraged those concerned to take part in the consultation, as that would be the basis for a final decision on the scheme.

In his supplementary, Councillor Bower expressed the strong feelings of residents on this scheme. He asked if the strict way in which the funding had been laid meant that there would be no funding if there were no cycle lanes. He asked if residents were just being consulted on so they could be blamed if the funding was not provided.

Councillor Williams offered his reassurances and the reassurances from the Head of Transportation Infrastructure Service that the consultation had to be meaningful.

Councillor Williams did question why Councillor Bower, a Green Party representative, was against cycle lanes.

13. Councillor Bennett-Sylvester: Following the success of the MiCard Barnsley reported at last week's Transportation Advisory Board is there and, if so, what is the plan to introduce the scheme in Rotherham?

Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy explained that at a South Yorkshire level, learning was being taken from MiCard in Barnsley to determine the viability of similar schemes elsewhere in South Yorkshire in the future. It would come at significant cost, but the Council continued to liaise with SYMCA and

will receive briefings on the evaluation of the MiCard scheme as appropriate which could inform future discussions.

In his supplementary, Councillor Bennett-Sylvester asked if Councillor Williams would be happy to discuss the options with Cabinet, particularly in terms of looking at how Barnsley provided actual benefits in terms of uptake of usage, savings and better school attendance. There were massive benefits to be had, even though there would be a massive cost.

Councillor Williams was happy to have discussions with Cabinet and keep evaluating and monitoring the scheme in Barnsley.

14. Councillor Ball: There were 49 vehicle-related ASB cases on RMBC estates last year but only 3 parking-related refusals. What is your time-bound plan to fix verge damage and parking shortages?

As Councillor Ball was unable to attend the meeting, a written response would be provided.

15. Councillor Bennett-Sylvester: When resurfacing footpaths in a street is it still our practice to offer discounted drop kerbs to residents?

Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy explained that, during planned footway resurfacing schemes, it remained the Council's practice to offer residents the opportunity to install dropped kerbs, for vehicle access, at a discounted rate, where it was operationally and economically viable to do so.

This arrangement applied only where full resurfacing works were being carried out and did not apply to micro asphalt or surface treatment schemes, as these did not involve using construction plant or resources required to accommodate new crossings. There were specific requirements that had to be met in order for any dropped kerbs to be included in a resurfacing scheme.

The Council sent all residents a letter, prior to the delivery of a footway resurfacing scheme, that offered residents who were considering having a vehicle access crossing the opportunity to have it installed at a reduced rate of £1,500 whilst these footway repairs were taking place.

In his supplementary, Councillor Bennett-Sylvester asked if this could be reviewed in light of the issues relating to parking on grass verges and pavements. He asked if Scrutiny could review the matter to see if there was a cost benefit to an alternative approach.

Councillor Williams said he was happy to look into the matter and see if there was any further flexibility or options available. He confirmed that it was up to Councillor Steele and Scrutiny Members to set their own work programme.

16. Councillor Bennett-Sylvester: Can you please give an update on the timescale to re-instate some showering facilities to Thrybergh Country Park and how this is being communicated to users such as Rotherham Sea Cadets?

Councillor Marshall, Cabinet Member for Waste Services, Leisure and Green Spaces explained that, unfortunately, it was going to take a long period of time to get the facilities in the building working. This was because the oil-filled boiler needed to be replaced which required extensive electrical and plumbing work. As the project also required additional power, the utilities provider had notified the Council that there would be an 18 week lead-in time, which along with time for design and tendering, meant the project would take an estimated 26 weeks to complete.

Councillor Marshall stated that she knew this was frustrating. Officers had been in touch with the Sea Cadets and were working on a number of temporary options.

In his supplementary, Councillor Bennett-Sylvester stated that this had been going on since October 2025. He asked if a welfare unit could be set up in order to offer warm showers as the lack of warm showers impacted health and safety.

Councillor Marshall confirmed that she would raise this with officers. She also confirmed that the planned temporary arrangements would be in place by the end of May and that the Sea Cadets had been offered alternative arrangements at Rother Valley Country Park.

17. Councillor Tinsley: With the Government reviewing the legality of plug-in solar systems, which cost up to £500 and can save roughly £150 a year on electricity, is the Council reviewing the possibilities for council housing?

Councillor Beresford, Cabinet Member for Housing explained that, where the Council was currently installing solar PV as part of the Warm Homes and wider retrofit schemes, all systems were hard-wired. Plug-in solar panels were currently not legal to install in a UK home, although the Government's announcement suggested that regulations would be relaxed to allow for their use. If and when that happened, Council tenants would have the same rights as everyone else. However, there were a number of health and safety considerations that the Council needed to consider in terms of the possibilities for its Council housing as it must ensure that its approach prioritised safety and responsibility every step of the way.

Firstly, any potential installation would require checks on the wiring system to ensure that it would be able to handle the additional power flow safely. Beyond electrical considerations, the Council would need to consider the safety of balcony installations from both a fixings and weighting perspective to ensure that the structural integrity of its properties was not compromised. The Council also needed to be clear on achieving value for money alongside accountability and tenant responsibilities.

Whilst the market was constantly developing new technology to improve the energy efficiency of homes, the Council's retrofit strategy had to promote a fabric first approach to retrofit; ensuring that properties were as thermally efficient as they could be in the first instance in order to maximise the additional efficiency and effectiveness of new technology.

In his supplementary, Councillor Tinsley asked if the Council were looking at preparing guidance for residents on the matter.

Councillor Beresford confirmed that guidance would be produced when the Government had provided more details on the proposals.

18. Councillor Tinsley: Is the Council keeping check on the progress of the Little London Maltby Development and its lack of progress?

Councillor Mault, Chair of Planning Board, explained that outline planning permission for the site known locally as The Derelicts was granted on 3rd November 2025. This included the demolition of the existing buildings and the construction of 15 new dwellings. As part of that permission a condition was imposed that an application for approval of reserved matters be submitted within one year. At the moment the applicant was still within this timeframe, and Council officers would ensure that the developer was aware of their requirements.

In his supplementary, Councillor Tinsley asked for confirmation that conversations were being held on this matter as this had been an issue for many years.

Councillor Mault confirmed that it was on the radar but the Council were limited in terms of what could be done as the developer was still within the agreed timeframe.

19. Councillor Bennett-Sylvester: Dalton Parish Council have been chasing information on £60,000 of s106 monies from the Gleasons Myers Avenue development for several months when can they expect an answer?

Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy explained that the S106 monies referred to have been received, and the Council's Green Spaces Team were aware of the request from Dalton Parish Council to use the monies to match fund a bid to develop a pump track. A Strategic Outline Case was currently being prepared, in line with the Council's Capital Programme Management procedures, to enable this to happen.

Subject to necessary approvals, this would progress through the stages, with key decisions and funding arrangements expected over the Summer, followed by delivery phases thereafter.

In his supplementary, Councillor Bennett-Sylvester stated that it had been an incredibly frustrating process. He stated that his major concern was whether the Council was keeping a full and proper record of s106 monies when they were allocated to future developments, especially for Parish Councils. He asked if the back history could be reviewed to make sure that a proper register was being kept.

Councillor Williams confirmed that he had not had any other concerns raised to him so far during his tenure as Cabinet Member for this area but he was more than happy to pick up the conversation outside of the meeting and try and get Councillor Bennett-Sylvester that reassurance.

20. Councillor Bennett-Sylvester: Regards congestion on the A630 in Dalton and Thrybergh we have had 2 potential schemes in the last 5 years to tackle congestion fail to cross the line, suggestions from residents around lights, box junctions, removing bus lanes rejected, when can we expect a scheme to tackle this issue?

Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy explained that it had not yet been possible to find a viable solution to creating additional capacity to improve congestion, owing to site constraints and restrictions on Government funding. The South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority was presently developing a scheme for improved bus priority on the A630 in Dalton, on which they consulted over the winter. Councillor Williams stated that this should help mitigate the impacts of congestion for buses along the corridor.

In his supplementary, Councillor Bennett-Sylvester asked if more could be done to look at delays further along the system on Herringthorpe Valley Road in order to improve the traffic flow through this particular area.

Councillor Williams confirmed that he would raise this matter with officers and would try and facilitate officer attendance at CAP meetings. He also encouraged Councillor Bennett-Sylvester to include this matter in the Road Safety Plan.

21. Councillor Tinsley: Can new built housing with outstanding planning conditions be sold and moved into before being resolved?

Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Transport, Jobs and the Local Economy explained that yes, in some circumstances not all conditions related to planning permissions needed to be discharged before occupation. If conditions that were required to be completed before occupation were not discharged, occupying the properties would be in breach of those conditions.

In his supplementary, Councillor Tinsley stated that it had been reported that residents had moved into the new development on Highfield Park despite there being an outstanding condition relating to contamination. He asked if this could be looked into urgently.

Councillor Williams confirmed that officers were fully aware of the situation. A preoccupation condition requiring validation evidence for the land remediation was part of the Planning Commission and unfortunately had not been addressed. Officers were engaging with the developer alongside contaminated land colleagues to seek an acceptable resolution. However, if the matter could not be resolved promptly, then the Planning Service could consider any enforcement action that might be necessary and needed. The Planning Service were also taking legal advice to ensure the most appropriate course of action.

22. Councillor Tinsley: There has been little investment from the Council in Coronation Park Maltby with the exception of Ward Capital and Section 106 Money. With the Park still needing investment to make play areas safe, when will the Council be allocating money for Coronation Park?

Councillor Marshall, Cabinet Member for Waste Services, Leisure and Green Spaces explained that the Council had made funds available via Ward Capital budgets which were in the control of local Members to spend on priorities within their Ward – such as investment in local parks. This and Section 106 funding had delivered a £75k in investment in the last 2 years. The Green Spaces Team carried out monthly inspections of play equipment across the Borough to ensure that it was safe. From the most recent inspection of the play area on 11th May, only low risk or very low risk issues were noted: paint chips, wear on chains, worn surfacing under the swings and minor damage to seats. The good news was that Coronation Park was safe to use. The next inspection was due in mid-June and if additional issues had arisen during this time, works could be ordered at that point.

In his supplementary, Councillor Tinsley stated that Ward Members had had to scrimp and save to keep the Park open and the money could have been spent elsewhere. He did not think the Park was safe. Councillor Tinsley stated that the tennis courts had been shut for

nearly 3 years and was not included in the Playing Pitch Strategy. He invited Councillor Marshall for a walk around the Park so she could assess the safety herself.

Councillor Marshall accepted the invitation. She also encouraged Councillor Tinsley to consider applying for Pride in Place funding for the Park when that process was open.

23. Councillor Ball: The Rotherham Markets and Library scheme has now reached £46.84 million after a further £6 million overspend. When will the Chief Executive's investigation findings be published?

As Councillor Ball was unable to attend the meeting, a written response would be provided.

24. Councillor Ball: Despite overwhelming opposition to the Eastwood Lane cycle scheme, what exact opposition threshold would make you abandon or change it?

As Councillor Ball was unable to attend the meeting, a written response would be provided.

25. Councillor Ball: RMBC is still the landlord with the most tenant complaints over delays. What are current average response times, and when will the new standards show real improvements?

As Councillor Ball was unable to attend the meeting, a written response would be provided.

26. Councillor Tinsley: How much in revenue is the Council set to lose from lower collection number in cans and plastic due to the incoming deposit return scheme?

Councillor Marshall, Cabinet Member for Waste Services, Leisure and Green Spaces explained that, at present, there was no confirmed figure for how much income the Council could lose as a result of the Deposit Return Scheme. This was because the scheme was still being finalised nationally, and key details, such as payment arrangements and operational design, were not yet agreed.

In his supplementary, Councillor Tinsley asked for confirmation that conversations were being held regarding this matter as it was due to be introduced in 2027.

Councillor Marshall confirmed it was being looked in to. She also stated that she very much welcomed the proposals due to the amount of litter collected by the verge cleansing teams.

27. Councillor Tinsley: When fitting new heating systems such as air source heat pumps, do the Council review associated electric tariff prices to run these, in comparison to using traditional gas heating Systems?

In accordance with Procedure Rule 11(8), question 6 would be responded to in writing.

25. URGENT ITEMS

There were no urgent items to consider.