



**Friends of
the Earth
Manchester**

Green Fish Resource Centre
46 – 50 Oldham Street
Manchester
M4 1LE

0161 234 2974 (office)
07940 835847 (mobile)

jonathan@manchesterfoe.org.uk
www.manchesterfoe.org.uk

Regional Centre Transport Strategy Consultation
Transport Policy Unit
Manchester City Council

31st January 2008

Dear Sirs,

I am writing in response to your consultation on the Regional Centre Transport Strategy published in November 2007. This is a group response on behalf of Manchester Friends of the Earth compiled by its Transport Sub-Group.

Manchester Friends of the Earth is a campaigning organisation run by volunteers whose emphasis is on reducing the impact of our actions on the environment, locally where we live in Manchester, nationally and globally. In recent years our primary focus has been on Climate Change, and promoting ways in which we can change our behaviour as individuals and changing policy within local and national government in order to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

In 2008 it is no longer necessary to argue the case for man-made Climate Change, nor the urgency of taking action to avert disaster. It is our opinion that Climate Change is the biggest challenge facing us, and resolving it is our first priority. The next few decades will see many changes imposed upon us in order to meet national targets for reductions in greenhouse gases. The transport sector is one of the largest contributors to greenhouse gas emissions, and transport policy has the potential to encourage reductions in greenhouse gases, by making vehicles more efficient and vehicle emissions cleaner; by reducing the congestion which causes vehicles to travel at inefficient speeds; and most importantly, by encouraging travellers to switch to less damaging forms of transport. Urban transport policy also has the potential, and therefore responsibility, to improve the quality of the local environment, particularly in terms of air pollutants; facilitate active, health-promoting lifestyles; and to make all essential services accessible to all. Manchester Friends of the Earth therefore welcomes the opportunity to comment on this document.

Manchester Friends of the Earth is made up of members who live within the city of Manchester, and our members are users of all modes of transport in the area, including the car. However, many of our volunteers have taken the decision not to own a car or travel by private motor vehicle, as this is one of the most significant things we can do as individuals to reduce our carbon footprint. So we are especially well-placed to comment on the public transport, cycling and pedestrian elements of the strategy, since these are the ways that we travel every day. In our awarding-winning Longsight Transport Project (more at www.onthemovefm.org) we worked with residents in the Longsight area to learn about their experiences with transport in the widest sense and involve them in campaigns to address the issues identified in our report 'Better Buses and Safer Streets for Longsight'. Social inclusion has continued to be a vital dimension to our work on transport issues.

Finally, over the last two years, Manchester Friends of the Earth has been working on a project called Love

Manchester Friends of the Earth 31st January 2008

Your Bike (www.loveyourbike.org), with the objective of promoting cycling in Manchester, with funding through the Local Strategic Partnership. During this time we have gathered and analysed a lot of information from cyclists and would-be cyclists about the problems and barriers that they face. In March 2007 we published a report "Stepping up a gear" (available on the website) summarising our findings, and laying down the challenges that Manchester faces as it aims to encourage cycling. We have drawn on this research during the preparation of our response to this document.

Our response is enclosed.

Yours faithfully,

Jonathan Whitehead
Transport Campaigner
charManchester Friends of the Earth

Summary

As a group we broadly welcome the direction being adopted by the strategy. In particular we welcome:

- provision of new train carriages;
- station enhancements and improved interchanges;
- second Metrolink city crossing and completion of Phase 3;
- elevated status of key bus routes;
- cross city bus routes;
- off bus ticketing, clock face services;
- removal/reduction of through traffic on key city centre roads;
- the aspiration to introduce short-term cycle hire facilities.

We have identified a list of areas where we feel the strategy is lacking:

- The strategy should define a target for the reduction of CO₂ emissions caused by transport in the Regional Centre. An annual reduction of 3% per year has been proposed for the UK as a whole and forms a good starting point for Manchester's position. However the greenest city, which Manchester aims to be, should aspire to exceed the national average for the reduction of emissions.
- The car parking strategy is too car-friendly, as it proposes that car parking provision should grow with demand (p4).
- The strategy fails to emphasise the importance of bicycle priority in the city centre - in particular it fails to say that bicycles will still be able to use the roads which will be closed to general traffic, or non-bus traffic.
- The strategy fails to recognise the need for cycle-to-rail interchange and cycles on trams (p7).
- The strategy lacks detail on the practicalities of integration, interchange, and multi-modal journeys, leaving the potential for holes especially when entering the city centre by bus and needing to continue beyond the bus terminus.
- The strategy does not lay down any principles about the ticket price of journeys which involve changing from one public transport vehicle to another. In particular, it gives no guidance about the cost of continuing a journey across the Regional Centre when a bus or tram stops short of a passenger's final destination. We believe that transferring to another bus or tram in such circumstances should be free of charge.
- There is little reference to Real time transport information (RTTI) for buses or Metrolink in the strategy. Good RTTI systems improve the quality of a transport system, and improve the public's

perception.

- The strategy does not set any standards for the quality of public transport information (maps, timetables, leaflets, integration) and how this will be made available. Greater Manchester's transport information can be greatly improved, for example by taking inspiration from London's spider bus maps centring on district centres throughout the conurbation.
- The strategy needs to do more to explicitly address the amount of pollutants, particularly greenhouse gases, emitted by vehicles. Whilst modal shift away from single-occupancy car use in itself aids greenhouse gas reduction, additional measures should include making parking fees and the congestion charge relatively more expensive for more polluting vehicles, introducing tough standards on bus engine efficiency and introducing enforcement measures to stop vehicle engines, particularly those of buses, being left running whilst idle.

We divide our comments into three sections: Integrated Public Transport, Cycling and Miscellaneous

A - Integrated Public Transport

3.3 Bus strategy

Page 10: Bus strategy fails to set standards for the pricing of multi-modal ticketing and multi-operator bus ticketing. Continuing your journey in the city centre on another bus or a tram should be free. We believe that the current price of System 1 multi-modal tickets is prohibitively expensive.

Page 11: Bus priority measures are good in principle, but we are concerned that bus priority measures implemented to date have not been as effective as expected, e.g. the Bus Gateway on Oxford Road at the entrance to Rusholme from the north, and the Fallowfield/Owens Park developments in 2007. For bus lanes to be effective they must be consistently enforced; equally, good clear signage and awareness-raising among other types of road user is important. Bus priority measures such as bus gates and detection of buses at traffic signals must be monitored and improved to ensure their effectiveness.

There is no mention of Real Time Transport Information in the package of measures delivered by the partnership with bus operators.

3.3.2 Bus Transit Provision

Page 11: We are concerned about how easy and economical it will be for bus passengers from Leigh and Wigan to continue their journey towards Piccadilly and Victoria.

Page 12: It is not clear whether Oxford Street and Princess Street will admit 2-way bus traffic to support the new network of bus routes. In any case, the pattern of bus routes through one-way streets should be simple and predictable, and should be legible on schematic maps of key bus routes.

The section on standard of service on bus transit routes fails to mention ease and speed of boarding and disembarking. Buses with 2, 3 or 4 doors, common practice across Europe (Paris and Madrid for example), admit much faster boarding and disembarking, therefore facilitating smooth running of the services.

3.3.4 Nearside Terminating Local Services

We are concerned with moving too many bus terminations away from Piccadilly gardens particularly at weekends for shoppers. If shoppers have to walk too far across town with shopping bags, the city centre may lose some of these shoppers as they will find it easier to travel to shopping centres elsewhere such as the Trafford Centre.

(Page 13) Bus passengers on services which terminate at Shudehill need a better and cheaper means of continuing their journey into the city centre. At present they can choose between Metrolink and Metroshuttle. With regard to Metrolink, a surcharge of 70p (current price) for a single Metrolink ticket within the city centre is not acceptable. The Metroshuttle service is generally too slow to form part of a credible integrated service. Continuing into the city centre zone by Metrolink or by bus should be free, and should be covered by a single ticket purchased at the start of the journey or previously.

We do believe that the Metroshuttle provides a vital service and should be continued and expanded. Metroshuttle routes must be regularly reviewed to ensure that they provide a convenient and faster alternative to walking.

Salford Central has no nearby Metrolink station, so bus passengers here especially need a convenient, fast, frequent and economical service for continuing their journey

3.3.5 Interchange, accessibility and connectivity

(page 13) Metroshuttle has suffered from circuitous routes, very slow speeds due to congestion, and irregular service times, to such an extent that walking is frequently quicker than taking the Metroshuttle (especially the old route of service number 2). Routing has improved a little, but congestion still poses a real problem for the viability of Metroshuttle as a component of a credible integrated transport system. Metroshuttle has done little to facilitate cross-city journeys by bus e.g. bus passengers terminating at Shudehill who wish to travel to Manchester Royal Infirmary.

So in the future it is highly unlikely that Metroshuttle alone will be sufficient to meet the demand for transit from one city centre interchange to another. We believe that provision should be made for bus passengers to transfer to Metrolink and Cross City buses free of charge within the central zone.

Regarding free Metrolink transfer for rail users, we believe that this has been poorly communicated and confusion still exists. Posters at rail stations give the impression that free Metrolink transfer is the exception rather than the rule. Rather than saying "Only the following tickets are valid on Metrolink", it would be much more positive to say: "Did you know that you can travel on the Metrolink for free if ..."

4.1.2 Albert Square and St Peter's Square

We can sympathise with the reasons for removing buses from St Peter's Square, but are concerned that this would result in the loss of a potentially very useful facility allowing buses from the Oxford Road Corridor to turn around (Oxford Street - Mosley Street - Princess Street) without the need to penetrate further into the city centre, yet still allowing excellent interchange with Metrolink at St Peter's Square and heavy rail at Oxford Street station. It should be apparent that a significant proportion of bus passengers on the Oxford

Road Corridor from the south have destinations within the Higher Education Precinct and do not need to enter the city centre at all. With this in mind we feel that a proportion of buses on the Oxford Road corridor can be "terminated early" and St Peter's Square is an excellent opportunity to do so.

The re-design of St Peter's Square must get right the interchange between tram and Bus Transit and Cross City Bus Services, enabling bus passengers arriving at St Peter's Square to transfer to a tram for ongoing travel to Piccadilly Gardens, Piccadilly Station, Market Street, Shudehill and Victoria. We feel that passengers should not have to pay more to do this.

One thing that St Peter's Square has lacked is a convenient interchange from tram to southbound buses onto Oxford Road. It is not clear from the strategy whether south-bound Transit and Cross City Buses will use Princess Street as at present, or if Oxford Street will permit two-way bus traffic. In any case, the interchange must be well-designed to provide convenience for passengers.

4.4 Piccadilly Station and Eastern Gateway

Rail/bus interchange possibilities have improved, but there is still room for improvement, in terms of increasing the number of bus destinations with services to Piccadilly station.

B - Cycling

3.7 Cycling

We are very concerned by the words "reducing the need for highway space to be dedicated to cyclists, particularly in sensitive areas where there is an aspiration for a high quality of public realm". It is our belief that dedicating highway space to cyclists is one of the better ways of improving the experience of those visiting the centre. Pedestrians flows are much less inconvenienced when highway space is dedicated to cyclists than to motor traffic . A modal shift to cycling also clearly contributes to better air quality and reduced climate change impacts.

The priorities should be:

- to design cycle facilities so that they are not only effective and convenient for cyclists, but also so that they enhance the public realm, rather than eliminating facilities for cyclists in the belief that this will improve the public realm;
- to reduce the need for highway space to be dedicated to through traffic by private motor vehicles, rather than to bicycles

The aspiration to install facilities for cyclists in the city centre should take inspiration from Camden in London, where the first of a network of bicycle stations is due to open in March 2008. This will be a members-only facility located in a basement, with secure bike parking and shower and changing facilities, clothes lockers, tools and a receptionist.

The strategy should recognise the importance of keeping the surface of cycle lanes well maintained and cleaned, which has been highlighted by our research for Love Your Bike.

No mention is made of allowing cycles to be transported on trams. This strategy document should formalise the promise made by GMPTA/E on previous occasions to allow cycles on Phase 3 trams, as well as to extend this to existing trams. Cycle-tram multi-modal journeys are an excellent way of removing car journeys off the road which would not be attractive by tram or bicycle alone. The delivery of new rolling-stock presents the opportunity to address the current lack of multi-modal integration in this respect, and this is an opportunity that must be taken.

On many occasions the strategy expresses the desire to reduce through traffic, which is very welcome. However, nowhere is it suggested that through traffic by bicycle will continue to be supported or indeed encouraged. The following are key areas and routes where convenient, fast and safe cycle transit must be preserved:

- St Peter's Square to Mosley Street (to be closed to general traffic) and onwards to Piccadilly Gardens
- Portland Street to Piccadilly Gardens (through traffic to be discouraged) and onwards to Piccadilly and the Northern Quarter
- Victoria Street (to be closed to general traffic)
- Cathedral to Piccadilly and Oxford Road

4 Proposals by Area

4.1 Pedestrian Priority Core

"Access [to Pedestrian Priority Core will be] discouraged except for those vehicles which need to enter. These would include servicing vehicles, cars accessing private car parks and limited on-street car parking". We are concerned that the Strategy does not explicitly preserve access for bicycles to the pedestrian core. We strongly believe that this priority for cyclists must be asserted in the Strategy, because a modal shift to bicycles has great potential for reducing congestion, pollution and climate change emissions, and improving the health of the residents of Greater Manchester. Our research as part of the Love Your Bike project (www.loveyourbike.org) clearly showed that the top two reasons why more people don't cycle to work are the high levels of traffic and the absence of safe cycle routes. Our results also show that the city centre poses many problems for cyclists. Safe routes for cyclists through the Pedestrian Core will address both of these disincentives to travel by bicycle. We believe that the Pedestrian Priority Core has enough space to be shared between pedestrians and cyclists. The council should investigate best practice in accommodating pedestrians and cyclists in shared spaces.

4.1.1 Piccadilly Gardens

It is noticeable to cyclists trying to travel through Piccadilly Gardens that they have been given a lower priority than cars, buses and trams based on the allocation of road space. It is actually impossible for a bicycle to legally approach Piccadilly Gardens from the north (Market Street) or west (Mosley Street). The nearby cycle lane on Fountain Street is of some help but it is only one way, and there is no obvious

route for travelling in the opposite direction except a very circuitous route shared with buses and cars via the Printworks and the back of the Town Hall. The route from Portland Street/Aytoun Street to Lever Street is possible but it is very uncomfortable to circumnavigate the bus priority areas, and again the reverse journey is not possible. We propose that cycleways should be introduced in Piccadilly Gardens to permit north-south and east-west travel in both directions.

4.1.2 Albert Square and St Peter's Square

If cycling in the city centre is to be encouraged, a facility for cyclists to travel south-west from Cross Street to Albert Square and Mount Street is essential.

There must also be a usable route for cyclists between St Peter's Square and Piccadilly Gardens in both directions.

We must also see assurances that if St Peter's Square is closed to all traffic except trams, that bicycles will still be able to pass through conveniently in all directions. We note that the current cycle lane passing the front of the Central Library and the back of the Town Hall is far from ideal and puts both pedestrians and cyclists at risk, and the remodelling of St Peter's Square provides an excellent opportunity to rectify this.

4.1.3 Retail core

The proposal to pedestrianise the southern section of High Street is welcome, but cyclists must still be catered for in this area, as this is one of only two practical routes for approaching the Northern Quarter from the south or west.

4.2 Deansgate

We welcome the proposal to widen footways on Deansgate, and see this as an opportunity to allocate more space to cyclists.

4.6 Oxford Road Corridor

We welcome:

- diversion of general traffic between Hathersage Road and Grosvenor Street
- wider cycle lanes
- limited traffic on Oxford Street

It is crucial that the new cycling facilities on Oxford Road are of the highest possible standard, and they should be designed after consultation with the cyclists who use this corridor.

4.9 Victoria

If Victoria Street is closed, provision must be made for a good cycle route to Deansgate and into the city centre for cyclists entering from Bury New Road. Indeed, cyclists need a cycleway through the centre from the north to both Piccadilly/Ardwick and the Higher Education Precinct. So within the city centre there should

be key routes linking Victoria, Piccadilly and St Peter's Square.

Fennel Street could provide a useful link for cyclists to access the city centre from the north, but at present cyclists are explicitly prohibited. The council should investigate ways of admitting cyclists at the same time as accommodating the pedestrian users of the space between the Triangle and Urbis.

One of the aspects of Manchester that discourages cycling is the relatively high level of bike crime particularly theft and damage during attempted theft in the city centre. Accordingly we would urge that the strategy specifically address this issue and ensures that:-

- Safe (lockable, with video camera supervision) cycle parking facilities are installed at the key rail, bus and Metro interchanges in the city centre.
- Cycle parking is available in the City Centre that is under video surveillance. (As of autumn 2007 according to a statement quoted in the Manchester Evening News , there was none). Video surveillance does not necessarily have to be newly installed: passive parking racks could be installed or relocated to areas already under existing video surveillance.
- Passive cycle racks are of a state of the art design that makes it hard for the criminal to damage or remove security devices in order to effect a theft. See for example the study done by the Design Against Crime research centre with The Metropolitan Police in London.
- As are now being trialled by Camden Council and Holborn Business Partnership in London, the provision of "executive cycle parking" facilities (with indoor secure cycle parking, video surveillance/ parking attendant supervision and shower/changing facilities in return for a small charge) is piloted in the City, either by MCC or PTE or through support for such an initiative from the private sector.

5 Next Steps

We suggest that as an essential continuation of this consultation, a more detailed consultation with cycling organisations with regard to cycle routes and facilities through the city centre.

In addition we would refer you to the Love Your Bike One Year On report "Stepping Up a Gear" (http://www.manchesterfoe.org.uk/lyb/anniversary_report.php) submitted to Manchester City Council in March 2007, for detailed research on the aspects of Manchester that are both conducive and challenging to cycling and would urge you to take account of all of its findings in formulating the Strategy. Additionally, the www.loveyourbike.org website contains a 'highlights/blackspots' section, in which cyclists draw on an interactive map to indicate which parts of Manchester they consider to be good or bad for cycling, making a useful resource for cyclists and planners alike.

C - Miscellaneous

3.1 Heavy Rail

Page 7: the minimum standard for busy rail stations should include "convenient cycle access and convenient secure cycle parking". Cycle parking provision should exceed the current expected usage in order to allow for growth in cycle use.

3.2 Metrolink

Page 10: In considering the pros and cons of the two Metrolink city crossing options, the strategy fails to recognise that the Deansgate option for the second Metrolink city crossing is superior as it covers a wider catchment area providing a convenient service to more people, because it is further away from the original line and longer than the Cross Street option, and its route better serves key locations such as Spinnigfields.

The branding of Metrolink has not been considered (p10, 12). Public perception of Metrolink as a quality mode of transport would benefit from a re-branding as its visual appearance gives the impression of being old.

3.3 Bus strategy

3.3.2 Bus Transit Provision

Branding of Bus Transit has not been considered. A shared branding which associates it with Metrolink and rail would communicate the message of rapid transport.

3.3.3 Cross City Bus Services

Deansgate is one of the key corridors for Cross City Bus Services, however it will be closed at Victoria Street according to the Greengate development plans. We are concerned that these two measures are incompatible, and cross city buses will be delayed by measures aimed at deterring through traffic for private vehicles.

3.3.4 Nearside Terminating Local Services

3.3.5 Interchange, accessibility and connectivity

3.3 General

There is little reference to RTTI in the strategy. Real time transport information (RTTI) has a major impact on public perception of transport systems, as well as giving a higher quality of service to passengers.

Despite the fact that money has already been spent on the beginnings of a system and that RTTI signs are already in place along some routes, we have grave concerns about the accuracy of the systems deployed. RTTI systems which do not function accurately have a massive negative impact on public perception. Confidence in these systems is extremely low based on experiences on the 135 and 192 bus routes, and the Metrolink RTTI also suffers persistently from inaccuracies. We feel that GMPTE has been extremely

unprofessional in permitting bus and tram RTTI systems to display information which is inaccurate, misleading and just plain wrong, over a period of at least 5 years, a situation which persists to this day. We feel that RTTI which is frequently inaccurate or wrong is worse than no RTTI at all, and should be removed. We need assurances that GMPTE will take RTTI seriously, monitoring carefully the accuracy of the information, and withdrawing any systems which give inaccurate information. This said, we feel that RTTI should be extended widely throughout the regional centre at bus and tram stops.

No mention is made of the level of information about public transport routes. We believe that Transport for London's series of "spider" bus route maps which are centred on district centres throughout the conurbation provide an excellent model of what can be achieved. The aim should be to provide a quality of information for all modes of public transport, matching the London underground map in terms of simplicity, comprehensiveness, consistency and availability.

The strategy for communication of information about public transport should be very carefully thought out and accommodate all users, in particular people who find mainstream communications difficult, including blind, deaf and people with limited English. Studies such as the one recently completed by South Manchester Regeneration Team on BME's on transport and our report 'Better Buses and Safer Streets for Longsight' (2003) should inform an inclusive communications strategy.

More use should also be made of proactive communication such as personalised journey planning and marketing targeted at particular businesses. An example of this is the TravelSmart project from Sustrans, which works with households offering tailor-made transport information leading to relative reductions in car trips of between 9 and 14% for a modest cost

3.5 General traffic

(page 14) We welcome the desire to eliminate through traffic in the pedestrian priority zone and on key bus routes, diverting it instead onto the Inner Ring Road. However we have reservations about how this will work in practice. We would hope that the congestion charge will cause a decrease in the volume of traffic during the morning and evening peak. But between the two congestion charging periods, there will be no incentive to decrease traffic volumes other than the congestion itself, so we have doubts as to whether the IRR will be able to cope. If the IRR remains permanently congested during the day, traffic will still attempt to use cross-city routes if these have been left navigable for the sake of service traffic. Our concern is that the new bus services, however excellent they might otherwise be, will end up in gridlock just as they are at present. We draw two conclusions from this:

- (1) measures should be taken to eliminate through traffic rather than reducing it, i.e. through journeys should be made impossible, rather than more difficult and
- (2) if after the introduction of congestion charging, congestion on the IRR can be shown to be impacting negatively on public transport outside the hours of charging, then consideration be given to extending the hours of charging to address this.

We note that the physical barriers installed on Cross Street have succeeded in eliminating through traffic during the hours of operation, and also reducing it in the morning peak prior to the operational hours of the

barriers. We believe that measures such as these are the only effective way of deterring through traffic. We note that the physical barriers installed on Cross Street have succeeded in eliminating through traffic during the hours of operation, and also reducing it in the morning peak prior to the operational hours of the barriers. We believe that measures such as these are the only effective way of deterring through traffic.

Manchester should consider imposing a default speed limit of 20 mph throughout the Regional Centre, as is currently being planned throughout Greater London. This would reduce the number of deaths on our roads, and would also encourage walking and cycling.

The junction of Cambridge Street with the Mancunian Way is singled out in the Strategy as an opportunity to “free up land for redevelopment”. We feel there are much more important priorities for land use at this junction. The current layout is responsible for isolating Hulme from the city centre. Not surprisingly for what is essentially a motorway junction, it presents severe difficulties for cyclists and pedestrians, faced with the choice of an insecure and unattractive subway (prohibited to cyclists), crossing the roads or circumnavigating the roundabout which other road users take at high speed. So plans to redesign Cambridge Street should focus on improving the experience for pedestrians and cyclists rather than making land available for redevelopment as stated in the Strategy. If this is done, Hulme can become a living and genuinely connected city centre residential zone.

3.6 Coaches

Not all long distance coaches which serve Manchester need to enter the regional centre. Most coach passengers will continue their journey by public transport anyway. So for example, a coach service connecting Leeds with Liverpool via Manchester would be faster and potentially more useful if it connected with public transport interchanges in Rochdale and Whitefield en route on the M60 rather than leaving the motorway to enter Manchester city centre. Manchester City Council and GMPTA/E should review coach routes through the Regional Centre in partnership with National Express.

3.9 Parking

In the light of our concerns that the IRR will not cope with all diverted through traffic during and between the two peak charging periods, and that traffic will still overflow onto the strategic bus routes causing congestion, we do not believe that parking provision should grow in line with the growth of the Regional Centre. If congestion is to be kept under control for the benefit of bus users, then the proportion of journeys made by car must get smaller as the Regional Centre grows. Allowing car park provision to grow sends entirely the wrong message to visitors to the city, that it is OK if everyone continues to drive into the city centre. Facilitating the continuing growth of car traffic is not compatible with Manchester's target of becoming the greenest city.

Also we believe that on-street parking should be reduced year on year, as parked cars represent wasted space in an already crowded city, and diminish the quality of the experience of pedestrians and cyclists. Moreover, car drivers seeking on-street car parking are themselves an additional cause of congestion, as they drive down many streets searching for somewhere to park, and then bring traffic to a stand-still while they turn into and out of a parking space.

Even if the Strategy succeeds in eliminating through traffic from the Centre, we may find that buses are still caught in the gridlock caused by the traffic generated by car parks.

Where parking is provided it should be integrated with other modes of transport, like buses, trains, metrolink, coach, and bike hire.

The opportunity to link parking fees with vehicles emissions, with the aims of encouraging the use of lower-emission vehicles, should be encouraged.

4 Proposals by Area

4.1 Pedestrian Priority Core

4.1.1 Piccadilly Gardens

We welcome the extended pedestrianisation of Piccadilly Gardens, and note the planned reduction in the size of the bus station. We recall that Piccadilly Gardens has been shrunk once before, when it was reduced from 3 rows of bus bays to 2, and also note the failure of the reduced station to cope with the volumes of terminating bus traffic which it attempted to service in the following years. Our experience leaves us wary of promises that the new smaller bus station will cope with the level of bus traffic programmed for the station.

4.1.2 Albert Square and St Peter's Square

4.1.4 Chinatown

We would like to point out that Chinatown is in the heart of the pedestrian core, and Chinatown would benefit from measures to deter through traffic and prioritise pedestrians as it is commonly used as a short cut by knowledgeable drivers avoiding other congested roads.

4.1.5 Central Business District

We welcome the proposal to remove through traffic from Princess Street and Portland Street, but are worried that the measures to do so would not be effective. Physical barriers such as those on Cross Street are the only effective way to deter through traffic.

We propose that the surface car park on Tib Street should be converted into a quality public space, providing an attractive link for pedestrians between Market Street and the Northern Quarter, and offering facilities for cyclists.

4.6 Oxford Road Corridor

We welcome plans for off-bus ticketing on this corridor to reduce dwell times. Dwell times can be further reduced by employing buses with 3 or 4 doors.

4.8 Chapel Street including Greengate

As well as new pedestrian and cycle routes across the Irwell, new routes for pedestrians and cyclists along

the length of the river, as proposed in the Irwell City Park plans, will provide a pleasant additional facility and will open up new journey possibilities.

4.13 The Village

We suggest that the surface car park lying between Minshull Street and Aytoun Street has excellent potential as a public square, creating a pedestrian link from Piccadilly Station to the Village and the bus stations at Parker Street and Chorlton Street. Once the car park is removed, the square which remains becomes a very attractive space, with striking architecture, trees and an absence of traffic.