

**TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY GROUP  
19th November, 2025**

Present:- Councillor Williams (in the Chair); Councillors Allen, Baggaley, Bennett-Sylvester, Bower, Clarke, Currie, Fisher, Harper, Rashid, Sutton, Taylor and Thorp and Sharron Bigum (Maltby Parish Council) .

Also in attendance were Sam Millington (SYMCA) and John Young (Stagecoach).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Baker-Rogers, Z. Collingham, Cusworth, Garnett, Hall, Lelliott and Pitchley, Brian Edwards (SYMCA) AND Parish Councillors Bob Croxton (Treeton) and Fiona Radford (Harthill with Woodall).

**41. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 17TH SEPTEMBER, 2025**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting held on 17th September, 2025.

**Agreed:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 17th September, 2025, be approved as a correct record of proceedings.

**42. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MINUTES (NOT COVERED BY THE AGENDA ITEMS)**

There were no matters arising.

**43. QUESTIONS ON TRANSPORT ISSUES**

In relation to Question 1 (page 9 of the agenda pack), Councillor Baggaley stated that he did not have a supplementary question but would continue to monitor the situation in relation to the bus service from Waverley to Brinsworth Academy.

In relation to Question 2 from Councillor Hussain (page 10 of the agenda pack), it was noted that works had been due to start on overhanging tree branches on 17 November but this had not yet happened. Nat Porter explained that the delay was due to the late leaf fall and works were now scheduled for the week commencing 1 December.

An additional two questions were submitted after the agenda had been published. These are detailed below:

**Question 3 – From Councillor Clarke on behalf of a resident**

A resident had recently experienced problems in getting home from Maltby to Dinnington using the X5 bus service.

The 17.25, X5 Maltby to Dinnington the last bus of the day between both villages, drove straight by them with “not in service” displayed. They had called the Travel Line who confirmed that they had not been informed that this service was not running at that time and First Bus had not updated any systems to suggest this either.

The resident logged a complaint with Travel Line for them to forward on to First.

On 6<sup>th</sup> November, 2025, the resident had had to rely on that bus service again so had contacted First directly to ask if there were any plans to take the service off explaining what had happened previously to the customer service advisor. When they looked they could see that the driver had not followed the correct route back to Dinnington. After the resident told the customer service advisor that there had been many instances with this service not running correctly since it had started, they had been encouraged to make a complaint with him so that they could look into it.

The customer service advisor checked that there were no plans to take the 17.25 X5 off service that day, however, it did again displaying “not in service”.

The resident had again called Travel Line, the customer service advisor apologised and another complaint submitted. The resident was told that there were many negative complaints going in about the running of the X5, or lack of it.

People relied on this service for work, care responsibilities and vulnerable people were being left stranded.

#### **Response from First Bus**

The X5 driving past a customer with “not in service” on the front was incorrect. The bus allocated to this journey (37522) developed a mechanical fault at Laughton Common on the outbound journey at 16.44. The bus was not moved until 18.32, so could not have driven past anyone in Maltby. On checking the wider bus graph there were no other buses operating out of service.

The engineer heading to the defective bus took another bus out to allow the driver to recover as much of the service as possible but, as the bus was already 90 minutes late on the outbound journey and 25 minutes late on the inbound the journey, the bus ran direct to Fence to regain service.

#### **Question 4 – From Councillor Clarke on behalf of a resident**

I am new to the area having recently moved to the new Thornberry Gardens estate with my partner.

I rely on public transport a lot of the time as I do not drive. I work for Sheffield City Council so often commute to Sheffield.

Are you aware of any plans for the 19/19a bus route to be extended to serve Thornberry Gardens? This would be beneficial to residents who, like me, struggle with mobility or have young children, care for elderly folk etc.

**Response from Stagecoach East Midlands**

We work closely with our local authority partners to monitor opportunities for the expansion of local bus services to serve new residential areas across our operating region. We have been particularly successful with this work within the Nottinghamshire Enhanced Bus Partnership where we have introduced several new routes and timetables with Section 106 developer funding secured by Local Authority Transport Officers; the latest was an extension of Services 21 and 25 to serve a new residential estate at Harworth near to the South Yorkshire border.

Over the years, traffic congestion along the Service 19/19a routes had increased, especially during the peak hours. Consequently, there was no slack in the current schedule to enable a route extension to serve Thornberry Gardens, so additional bus and driver resources would be needed to expand the coverage. It was not sure if there was any Section 106 funding linked to the development for a new bus service. Also, the location and layout of the estate presented some challenges in devising a suitable bus service format.

For the above reasons, there were no plans at the present time to include Thornberry Gardens in Service 19/19a but would explore any options with SYMCA transport officers.

**44. SOUTH YORKSHIRE MAYORAL COMBINED AUTHORITY  
TRANSPORT - UPDATE**

Sam Millington, SYMCA, gave the following updates:

- There was a new 21S school day only service that ran between Aston and Rotherham for Thomas Rotherham College. This had resulted from concerns raised by the Council and the public regarding overcrowding on the existing Stagecoach 21. The service was implemented on 3rd November and ran twice a day on school days.
- A change had been made to the 26 and 26A bus in Aston following local feedback. A slight reroute had been made to serve Worksop Road and Lodge Lane rather than directly down Mansfield Road.
- Following consultation with Stagecoach, the 114 was to be rerouted passed Badsley Moor Lane Hospital at the request of Rotherham Teaching Hospital.

Members were invited to attend an engagement session taking place on the afternoon of the meeting (19th November) at Rotherham Interchange regarding bus franchising. On Saturday, 22nd November, a demonstration

vehicle would be displayed so members of the public could see what a future electric double decker bus would look like.

There were no updates to provide in relation to tram or rail from a SYMCA perspective.

The Chair asked that feedback on the engagement sessions be provided to the next meeting and Mr. Millington agreed.

In relation to questions on the Magna Tram Stop, it was confirmed that the works were on schedule, and it was expected that the Saturday evening suspension of the tram service would continue until completion of the stop. However, Mr Millington. agreed to confirm this with tram colleagues.

*(After the meeting the following information was received:-*

*There was no current open date to advise other than early 2026. The programme was still on track and SYMCA was working with the operator towards becoming operationally ready. Testing and commission could not take place until construction was completed.*

*Saturday evening services were planned to be reinstated as from 6<sup>th</sup> December. SYMCA would be releasing public communications from 24<sup>th</sup> November confirming that the final Saturday evening disruption would be on 29<sup>th</sup> November. Construction would continue after this time but would not require any further line closures.)*

Councillor Bennett-Sylvester referenced the Bus Lane Review Project consultation that was due to commence from 10th November and asked why it had not yet started. Nat Porter explained that key stakeholders and Ward Members had not yet been briefed so the consultation had been delayed to allow those briefings to take place.

Councillor Currie asked about the ongoing issues impacting school transport for children with SEND, specifically how budget changes and pressures would affect travel plans. Mr. Millington agreed to take the question away. This matter was also discussed under Minute No. 47 (RMBC Transportation Unit Update) and it was agreed that a SEND School Transport update be included on the agenda for the next meeting and relevant officers be invited to attend.

*(After the meeting the following information was received:-*

*Home to School transport, including SEND transport, remained a function and responsibility for the Local Authority. Franchising did not change this and SYMCA continued to support Local Authority partners with mainstream home to school transport. Mainstream school buses continued to be procured by SYMCA and this continued with franchising but, as with the current situation, SEND transport remained solely with the Local Authority.*

*Wider local bus and mainstream bus decisions that affected those travelling with additional accessibility needs would continue to be made by SYMCA and the MCA Board)*

**Agreed:-** (1) That the update be noted.

(2) That SYMCA provide updates at the next meeting in relation to the engagement sessions and Saturday evening tram suspension.

(3) That a SEND School Transport Update be included on the agenda for the next meeting and relevant officers invited to attend.

#### 45. **BUS OPERATORS - UPDATE**

**First Group:-** No representative was present at the meeting.

**Stagecoach:-** John Young reported that Stagecoach continued to enjoy high performance figures – 99.54% of all mileage from its Rawmarsh depot operated in Period 7. Service punctuality was at around 89% of all journeys at all timing points on time (running on time was no more than 5 minutes late).

There had been a number of highway incidents across Rotherham and South Yorkshire on 13th November which had caused disruption to the bus network.

The network was stable other than the minor change to the 114 which was referenced in the SYMCA update.

Councillor Thorp asked if a reroute could be considered for the bus that went from Harthill to Rotherham via Whiston as a large portion of Whiston was being missed.

Mr. Young stated that there were no plans for significant changes to the network before franchising started to take place. He confirmed that the particular bus referenced by Councillor Thorp was run by Stagecoach East Midlands which was a different part of the company but he could pass on the query to his colleagues. The 21 bus was funded by SYMCA so it would be for them to review. However, there was no slack in the timetable so any additional stops would present a significant cost as it would require an extra vehicle. Mr. Young agreed to pick this up with Mr. Millington and a written response would be provided to Councillor Thorp.

**Rotherham Community Transport:-** No representative was present at the meeting.

The Chair raised concerns at the lack of representatives present for the Bus Operators update. Mr. Porter agreed to pick this up with the operators outside of the meeting.

**Agreed:-** (1) That the update be noted.

(2) That a written response be provided to Councillor Thorp re bus provision in Whiston by Stagecoach and SYMCA.

(3) That Nat Porter contact First Bus and Rotherham Community Transport regarding attendance at meetings.

**46. RAILWAY OPERATORS - UPDATE**

No representative was present at the meeting.

**47. RMBC TRANSPORTATION UNIT - UPDATES**

Nat Porter, Interim Head of Transportation Infrastructure at RMBC, gave the following update:

- All Local Neighbourhood and Road Safety Fund Schemes were now on site. There had been a delay at the Woodsetts village traffic light scheme, but some initial work had started. The second tranche of schemes were in the design stage. It was hoped that consultation on those schemes would commence in the first half of 2026.
- Updates continued to be provided to Ward Members on the Sheffield City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement. There had been some changes due to cost pressures on the schemes and work was underway to understand how the schemes could be brought back in budget. As a consequence, consultation was now due to commence in 2026.
- RMBC officers continued to attend Ward briefings to update on the minor schemes process.
- Early discussions continued with SYMCA regarding the Transport for City Regions Funding which covered 2027-2032. It was hoped that more detail on what monies were available and the themes would be available in the coming weeks and months.

Councillor Currie raised the matter of the ongoing issues impacting school transport for children with SEND, specifically how budget changes and pressures would affect travel plans. As stated in Minute No. 44, an update would be provided at the next meeting.

Councillor Thorp asked for an update on the Broom Road School crossing. Nat Porter agreed to provide an update to Sitwell Ward Members at their next Ward briefing.

Councillor Thorp also asked if the funding from SYMCA could be used for road safety outside of schools and whether discussions had taken place on this. Mr. Porter stated that the discussions were still at a very high level, focussing on themes such as active travel, casualty reduction, highway maintenance etc. The next stage would consider what sort of schemes would be put forward. The Service was aware of the ongoing review by the Improving Places Select Commission into road safety at schools so it was definitely on the radar but it was too early at this stage to confirm what the funding could be used for.

**Agreed:** (1) That the update be noted.

(2) That an update be provided to Sitwell Members at their next Ward briefing on the Broom Road School Crossing.

**48. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business to consider.