

Valley Gardens update: compiled by Peter Elvidge (Secretary and executive member)

Executive summary

Valley Gardens is Brighton & Hove City council's proposal to create a linear park between St. Peters' Church and Edward Street. The Bus User group is concerned that this risks substantially undermining the city's currently positive bus services. The council having only addressed one of the group's numerous concerns.

The loss of the existing bus lanes through the corridor is likely to cause problems, but a major issue has been identified which means their 'replacement' could well be unenforceable, causing damaging additional delays to bus services.

The bus user group has created an alternative which maintains most positives from the current design (including greatly enhanced cycling and pedestrian facilities), yet answers our concerns, and should even help buses. Obviously the council has tried to rubbish our proposal, which we comprehensively refute in this paper.

This paper briefly mentions many of our issues, together with problems with traffic models in general, and the city's traffic model in particular. Including why the council is technically wrong to not model Saturdays, when traffic is heavier. It also covers why the 'technological' solution is expected to fail.

Bus services are too important to our city (and its economy), for bus user concerns to be ignored. There is an alternative.

In detail:

As you may be aware, while Brighton Area Buswatch is generally supportive of the environmental enhancements for Valley Gardens (as can be seen from our alternative). However the Bus User group remains deeply concerned over the current detailed design, and the substantial damaging affect this is likely to have on local bus services.

We are pleased the council has (at last) responded to our concerns, unfortunately with one notable exception it has failed to address any of these issues, and in one case has accentuated them.

A brief overview of the proposed scheme: The concept behind this, is to create a linear park-between Edward Street and St. Peter's Church, with particularly easy access from the west. Strengthened by greatly enhanced cycling and pedestrian facilities.

The plan will make major changes to the current traffic arrangements. Traffic from both directions on arguably the most important artery into the city, will be squeezed into the existing southbound carriageway, on the east side of the valley. This means all the traffic on the A23, Lewes Road and Ditchling Road combined will be shoe horned into a single lane.

According to Tom Tom, the satnav people- **Brighton is already the fifth most congested city in Britain (and now is amongst the top 100 in the world), so it appears strange the council is dramatically reducing capacity on arguably its most important artery, into the city.**

There would also be a second two-way 'low usage' or 'bus' road, on the west side of the valley. Ostensibly to carry local access traffic and buses, but we have many concerns over this (see later). The current bus lanes which work so well, will be abolished.

It is disappointing that the final design (and report) has only been available for a few days, and so only limited changes have been made to the text.

However, under 'Sustainability Implications', it is suggested Sustainable transport modes would gain from the scheme. If buses are included as part of 'Sustainable transport', this is clearly wrong. This section should clearly state that buses will be disadvantaged by the proposals.

A positive: We would like to start with the one positive- the council plans to ban right turns into Kingswood Street. This will greatly reduce delays to northbound traffic, which risked delaying buses south of the 'low usage' corridor. However the lack of a no-right-turn sign, at this location, on the diagram showing signage, is a concern. Assuming the positive, with the no right-turn implemented, there are still likely to be lesser delays, further north.

Now onto the negative points: The numbers in the following sections refer to the bus user group's official one page deputation to the council's Sustainability, Transport and Environmental Committee. This is a much expanded (and partly updated) version of the original **Supplementary Information**, which the council chose not to accept. To improve readability, these are shown in a different order.

Valley Gardens Area

1. The existing bus lanes between St. Peter's Church and Edward Street work well. Their total loss was a shock, and potentially a huge blow to bus services, as they are so useful in keeping bus services running with acceptable reliability.

Since our submission, the final design has become a lot clearer, with major very recent change to the North Road/'Bus corridor' making it possible for the council to install a northbound enforcement camera, at the North Road junction (this was not possible before).

However this will still allow northbound general traffic to run freely on the west side of the valley, between Edward Street and North Road. As has previously been highlighted, with traffic on east side of the valley likely to be almost stationary, under busy traffic conditions; the apparently free flowing road on the west side of the valley would appear an attractive alternative. Especially as existing traffic currently uses this route.

While this enforcement should be great in preventing through traffic heading further north. However there is a lesser problem with this enforcement, as it would force northbound traffic to turn right at the North Road crossover. On hitting near stationary traffic on the east side, this traffic would quickly cause a significant tailback- blocking the northbound bus lane (and potentially causing significant delays to buses).

Under the proposal, general traffic is also free to turn left out of North Road, towards St. Peter's Church. Seeing stationary traffic on the east side of the valley (and the queues straight ahead), so using the 'bus corridor' on the west side of the valley- would become an attractive alternative route, for the substantial traffic using North Road.

It is suggested that enforcement cameras would be located each side of Trafalgar Street. While this is good. However a question needs to be asked whether narrow Trafalgar Street, (with its narrow pavements), is a suitable road to carry quite heavy traffic loads, especially as both southbound and northbound general traffic would be diverted up this road (the only way general traffic can avoid being caught by the enforcement cameras). And such is the road's narrowness, it could be blocked by an unloading vehicle.

If it was deemed unacceptable to divert all this traffic up Trafalgar Street, buses will face two serious problems.

First, it means all this northbound traffic will be forced up past St. Peter's Church, towards the London Road shopping area. Without a bus lane, northbound buses will suffer serious delays.

Second, southbound could prove equally damaging, without an enforcement camera forcing southbound general traffic to turn up Trafalgar Street, it would be free to travel the full length of the former bus lane, potentially causing substantial delays to buses, at the southern end of the 'bus lane' (near the Edward Street junction).

In short, diverting traffic (especially large Lorries) up Trafalgar Street is a high risk strategy. Without it, the proposal would be very damaging to bus services. In short, it remains difficult to justify the current plans, especially with the risk the traffic orders, and/or enforcement cameras could be challenged. I could point to a former traffic restriction half way up St. James Street, which has never been enforceable. There is an Alternative.

4. As the explanation for '4' follows on well from '1', this is covered next.

The London Road/St. Peter's Place junction is already a congestion hotspot, which we expect to continue. While the council claims the junction will be simplified, in terms of actual traffic flow, the junction would see little change. The minor time savings (5 seconds?), from the removal of one inter-green phase, is likely to be offset by extra pressure on the junction, as Lewes/University buses (mostly long bendy-buses) are forced to turn right at this junction.

The council model projects the junction will be freeflowing, however if it was to use the same data on the existing junction, then this is likely to show a similar result- which is obviously not the case. The problem is northbound traffic from the London Road/Oxford Street junction is queuing *through* the London Road/Cheapside junction, artificially reducing the traffic count, and so creating a false result.

This is a major reason why an effective northbound bus lane past St. Peter's Church must be retained, towards the London Road shopping area. Currently, it prevents buses suffering from substantial delays.

Continuing on: even if very modest general traffic flow uses the former bus lane, then the route's very low capacity, will cause buses substantial problems, and potential significant disruption to bus services.

The area has other problems: The council has not attempted to address our concerns at the St. Peters bus stops, presumably because does not want to emphasise the current design is likely to cause bus services considerable problems.

Ironically, traffic turning right (and left) into Trafalgar Street, is likely to compound the problems bus services running in both directions, will face at the St. Peter's bus stops.

Even without this, northbound bus services to the University and Lewes, would face significant extra journey time (at any time of day) because the council has forced bus services, to run north of St. Peters Church. In fact, especially given the likely problems at the St. Peter's bus stops, it may be worthwhile for University services to ignore the 'bus route', in all but the most congested traffic conditions, and join general traffic on the east side.

Despite the new short bus lane, similar services running in the southbound direction are likely to face unnecessary delays in St. Peter's Place, under busy traffic conditions. Obviously like all our issues, the Alternative would solve these problems, probably saving (at least two) extra buses, which would otherwise be required by the current design.

2. Going back to item 2: The council is predicting average bus journey time would be 21 second longer than at present. Assuming this extra journey time is extended throughout the day, this would cumulatively cause bus passengers to be delayed by about 50,000 hours a year. At about 42 seconds per return journey, even this will make it more likely extra buses will be needed, or cutbacks made. However this extra journey time pails into insignificance compared with the other likely negative aspects of the scheme.

There are a number of other potentially serious problems, in addition to delays caused by the St. Peter's bus stops, and potential/likely problems caused by the withdrawal of the existing bus lanes south of St. Peter's Church (particularly northbound towards the London Road shopping area).

None of these delays have been factored into the projected increase in bus journey times. Nor the large number of extra buses needed, or passenger loss from the chronic increase in unreliability.

It is almost churlish to mention that that the council's projected journey time increase for buses, is ten times that for cars. This will do nothing to encourage bus usage.

3. *Will be covered in a minute.*
4. *Has already been covered.*
5. We believe we have identified a further damaging problem with the traffic model. The design shows two southbound traffic lanes in Grand Parade, at the junction of Church Street. Unfortunately a significant amount of traffic turns right towards Church Street, so even if the offside lane was not a dedicated right-turn lane, it would soon be blocked by right-turn traffic. Effectively there would only be one ahead lane- so halving southbound traffic flow.

This assumption was confirmed in a traffic count during the summer, which showed the junction to be at maximum capacity, with *both* lanes open. The reference to less than half traffic flow relates to the fact the proposed design has extra signal phases for important items such as Pedestrian crossings, the new bus lane exit etc.

The council has effectively admitted, there *could* be a problem, as it has offered some potential 'solutions', which are far from ideal.

This is likely to prove a year around problems, and approximately halving capacity will cause massive traffic queues. Potentially badly affecting buses and greatly adding to pressure on the so called 'bus corridor'.

The last minute change, which would see a very short right-turn lane, is only likely to make a minor difference, as the outside lane would soon become blocked, especially at the weekend- when right-turn traffic is much heavier.

6. & 7: **The council has agreed that the current design is only designed to cope with quieter traffic levels, such as found on a mid-weekday in October.**

Our major concern is that traffic at weekends, summer, and special events is often considerably heavier than on such an October day (perhaps by about 25%). We are after all a major tourist resort and shopping destination. At these busy times buses often already suffer from significant delays and unreliability problems, before capacity reduction is considered.

With the council planning to reduce capacity by perhaps 25% (we would argue more), in what it admits is an already a congested area, this can only cause a massive increase in traffic queues, and disruption to bus services. This will be compounded as motorists seek alternative routes, causing substantial delays to buses on these bus routes as well. Together these will cause buses considerable unreliability problems, increased cost/fares, and/or cause cut-backs in services, accentuated by the loss of bus patronage.

By choosing a quieter time, the council will fail to identify problems with the traffic system, that will only occur under these busier traffic conditions- such as weekends, summer (etc.).

For example- at a quieter time, the model could show traffic to be free flowing on the east side of the valley, so there would be no reason for traffic to want to use the 'bus' corridor. However under much heavier traffic conditions, it is likely the east side will become heavily congested, encouraging motorists to risk using the bus corridor.

The council claims it is 'normal' to complete traffic modelling at this October time, but the city's traffic patterns are not normal (for example August in most cities is the quietest month, whereas it is probably our busiest). Second, Transport for London traffic modelling guidance suggest Saturdays should be considered, if that gives a more realistic traffic flow figure. This has been reinforced locally, at Tesco's (Church Road), Hove; where traffic projections were measured on a Saturday (and found it to be busier than on a weekday peak).

Traffic models measure traffic flow, not simplicity of junctions.

8: We believe the council is placing too much reliance on smart signalling to answer its traffic concerns. Once a junction is at its maximum capacity, technology will not magically create spare capacity out of thin air. **Is the council really suggesting that this smart signalling strategy would be able to cope with a traffic reduction in Valley Gardens, of perhaps between 25% and 50%?.** Has this been tried successfully elsewhere? (Unlikely).

More importantly, it would be impossible for the council to prove this strategy would work, because it has not modelled traffic at busier times such as weekends, summer etc. Without this, it would just be a case of fingers crossed, which is not good enough when the future of the city's bus service and economy, are at stake.

Also the council its past record on introducing signal technology is not good. Third, one suggested strategy is to redirect traffic off the A23, Lewes Road etc., onto roads without bus lanes, causing bus services on these roads to deteriorate sharply- undermining bus usage, and adding further to traffic congestion, as motorists who currently use bus services- revert back to their cars.

Problems with the traffic model: Before going back to item 3, it would be a good idea to look at likely problems with the traffic model (and traffic models in general).

I have mentioned above the most important problem- caused by measuring and modelling traffic, at a quieter time of week/year.

However, there are other issues, including- **no accommodation has been made for an increase in traffic.** It has been suggested that the city's population could increase by 10% over a period. So unless traffic usage (per inhabitant) reduces by a similar amount, this will result in increased traffic, and increased congestion.

Second, historically traffic has generally increased in parallel with increased living standards; and so this increase in traffic has been factored into traffic models. While recent traffic increases have been minimal, this reflects the static changes to living standards over the last decade. It is hoped that living standards will rise in future. With it restricting existing traffic flow, **the council is taking a substantial gamble that increasing traffic will not resume.**

Third, in many areas, traffic is not constant throughout the time period measured. For example the amount of traffic between 5.45pm and 6pm is often much quieter than earlier during the evening peak. This means that significant traffic queues could form during the evening peak, yet the traffic model would show traffic to be freeflowing throughout.

Fourth, the modelling assumes that both traffic efficiency and junction efficiency are both running at 100%. While theoretical capacity is 100%, traffic engineers tend to regard 90% *junction* capacity to be the *practical* limit. With some *junctions* said to be close to 100% of capacity (this would be over the maximum *practical* capacity).

Continuing on with this, the author has completed traffic surveys at a critical junction, and at best- *traffic* efficiency was found to be about 82%. As 100% efficiency is assumed, this on its own would cause substantial delays to traffic.

Fifth, the exceptionally high bus usage figure is a major reason for the relatively low traffic levels found on an October mid-week peak period (and a major reason why traffic levels rise steeply, when external traffic flows become more dominant).

As bus services will be undermined by this proposal, the resulting increase in general traffic should be included in the council's calculations.

It should be noted that the council has twice refused to let the author/bus user group see junction traffic predictions. If it is so confident in its figures, then why the secrecy?

Historically, traffic models have been used to predict how traffic management improvements will improve traffic flow (with any errors blamed on changes to the 'natural'

increase in traffic). It is less well known how well traffic models will predict traffic flows, when traffic reduction is being considered.

With several junctions said to be close to 100% of capacity, any error in modelling will see potentially major traffic problems, with the consequential further negative affect on bus services.

3.. Going back to the third item- The cost to bus services. This paragraph has been included in our submission to council, to show how past deterioration of bus journey time, has required a number extra buses, which has been passed on as higher fares. Figures quoted are from the Brighton & Hove Bus Company. This only included the service '5' routes, yet projected a cost/fare increase of nearly £1 million.

Hopefully the above sections have shown beyond reasonable doubt, that bus will suffer considerably from the current Valley Gardens proposals.

While no accurate prediction can be made to how many extra buses the scheme will required, such is the likely increase in delays to bus service, and unreliability that a significant number of extra buses would be required to reduce the adverse effects of the scheme.

Equally (if not more important), the chronic unreliability problems the scheme will cause, will lead to the loss of a number of bus passengers. This loss has be proven, by recent and past roadworks. The main bus company is about to announce cut-back to some services (from January), caused by passenger loses from recent roadworks. Although halving the service 21 in north Whitehawk could also be mentioned.

While the bus company is likely to add some extra buses to try to offset some of the worse unreliability problems, there is now a greater indication that services (especially more marginal services), are more likely to face cut-backs, or be dropped by the company. After all, extra buses need extra garage space- which is in short supply, and it requires many extra drivers (which from past experience, are likely to prove difficult to recruit).

While cut-backs in services are difficult to quantify in monetary terms, if we were to assume just four extra buses were required, and a 3% loss of patronage; that would **increase bus fares by about £2½ million!** Further discouraging bus usage.

It would be expected that many more buses than this, would be required. While average journey time will hopefully not increase by 10% . However if it did, this would require something in the region of 26 extra buses (or equivalent cut-backs!).

Some other issues not covered so far:

- To suggest that the narrow 6.5 metre 'bus corridor' is acceptable, because it is above the government's absolute minimum- misses the point. It does not need to be this narrow, with buses approaching 3 metres wide (with mirrors), it means buses will be running close to the pavement, with increased likelihood buses will hit pedestrians waiting to cross, or standing too close to the kerb. It also gives little room to manoeuvre, should either pedestrian or bus driver make a mistake. Is it worth taking the increased accident risk?
- Second, by blocking the right-turn from Ditchling Road to St. Peter's Place; the official routing for the major east to west traffic route (A270), would be redirected through the Lewes Road shopping area. This risks increasing traffic and pollution through the shopping area, increasing delays for southbound Lewes Road buses (especially University services), and increase loading on the critical St. Peter's Place/Richmond Terrace (Lewes Road) junction. Given the design, reopening this right turn could also cause problems.
- The council previously stated that one of the scheme's aims- was to reduce pollution. It is difficult to see how increasing congestion will reduce pollution.
- In London, designs that have not properly considered bus services, have been blamed for a 3% overall fall in bus usage, in the capital (with some patronage falls over 10%). It is also

important to note these London schemes only cover small areas, unlike the Brighton scheme which will directly (or indirectly) affect most bus services in the city. **We must learn from the mistakes in London, before it is too late.**

Support from elsewhere?

It may look like we are the only people concerned with the council's proposal. This is not the case. You will not find any bus companies actively praising the scheme. In private the main bus company has told us they to share a number of our concerns, but have taken a decision that the proposal is unstoppable, so instead of objecting to the scheme, have sought alternative solution beyond the 'bus corridor', which could slightly reduce the substantial problems. Even here, the council has not committed to finance these.

In addition, again in private, several of the smaller bus companies (including one you would not expect) have supported our concerns, but as they are heavily reliant on council supported bus services, they have understandably not wanted to voice these concerns publicly. We have also had support from someone with very strong local bus connections, who is revered throughout the bus industry, but we cannot name.

Our concerns have united the executive committee, in an unprecedented way.

Construction: While the council should be praised for attempting to reduce delays to buses during the construction phase. However given the scale of the design, comprehensively affecting almost every road in the area, it will still have a substantial adverse effect on bus service.

More importantly general traffic is expected to be narrowed down to a single lane, at critical junctions, for a prolonged period. So buses will still be severely affected by the mammoth traffic queues and disruption from motorists seeking alternative routes.

On the other hand, the Alternative seeks to absolutely minimise delays by:-

- Only changing the road layout where absolutely necessary.
- This means the most disruptive roadworks could be completed at quieter time of year.
- Thirdly, the finished design retains more traffic lanes, so there is a much greater chance roadworks can be completed, without causing significant disruption to traffic/buses.

This brings us onto section 9.- The Alternative.

Brighton Area Buswatch has created the Alternative, which it believes is far superior to the present proposal. Not only would this retain most of the positive aspects of the current proposal, and answer all our many remaining concerns; but it would actually be beneficial to bus users. If necessary, further changes could be made to the design.

Some of the advantages of the Alternative are:-

- It would retain most of the positive environmental measure of the current scheme.
- Retain the vital bus lanes, through the corridor (while maintaining delivery access).
- Remove the problems at the St. Peter's bus stop.
- Eliminate the right-turn at the London Road/St Peter's junction, benefiting the critical junction considerably.
- Services to/from the University/Lewes would further benefit, from the new/extended bus lanes near St. Peter's Church. Possibly saving buses 5 minutes northbound.
- It would prevent extra congestion/pollution in the Lewes Road shopping area, and problems at the St. Peter Place/Richmond Terrace junction.
- It will be able to cope with Summer/weekend traffic (certainly no worse than at present).
- We would argue that overall it would be at least as good for cyclists, and pedestrians (see next section).
- It would greatly reduce disruption to bus services, during the construction phase.

- **Most important of all, it would turn the proposed scheme from one set to seriously damage bus services, into one which is mildly positive. By continuing to encourage bus usage, this is the best way to genuinely reduce traffic levels, without damaging the city's economy.**

9B. The council has attempted to discredit the alternative, most of which we refute.

The main complaint is that it is not compatible with the principles of the scheme. We argue it is.

The Alternative still creates an attractive the linear park (with particularly easy access from the west). It similarly greatly enhances cycling and pedestrian provision. The current Alternative plan is to retain all existing trees, particularly the mature Elms. So how can the council claim it contravenes the basic principle of the scheme?

It has been suggested that the Alternative will be detrimental to pedestrians and cyclists. This is difficult to justify. The Alternative will retain all the known proposed cycle routes through the corridor. It even proposes enhancements, such as a continuous cycle route across St Peters Place (supported by cycling groups); as well as additional cycle routes/ mixed pedestrian/cycle routes (on on the west side etc.). Additional cycle contraflows in Trafalgar Street and Gloucester Street are already included in the Alternative, and it remains open to other positive changes.

As for pedestrians: the council's response to our design is misleading. We have retained all the pedestrian crossing points, into the gardens. The only reason we have not included the multiple crossing routes within the Gardens area, on our map, is to simplify the diagram.

On the positive side, the alternative proposes a greatly enhanced pedestrian/cycle crossing between the Pavilion Gardens and Valley Gardens (mentioned later), and an optional, yet desirable underpass under North Road, reducing the current barrier half way up the gardens. There would be other positive pedestrian measures. Most other 'Garden' enhancements are likely to be retained.

The council has suggested how the proposal will simplify the existing road network. This too should be questioned. The existing design for general traffic- between Edward Street and St. Peter's Church, is basically a large elongated roundabout, with the North Road extension across the middle. Often with left-turn in, left-turn out. On the other hand, the council's proposed design has a two-way road on each side of the valley, often with multiple right-turns, complicating the design. To suggest the Alternative is over complex, is unhelpful.

It has been suggested that the alternative would reduce park area. Compared to the original 4-lane proposal for Valley Gardens, there is little difference (so it would again be difficult to suggest the alternative incompatible with the principles of the scheme). Second, the expansion would be comparatively small. According to the Argus the road narrowing would only add 7% to the valley parkland area.

Councillors should have a clear choice whether they prefer to cause massive disruption to bus services (and other traffic) for perhaps 50-100 days per year (approaching one third of a year), or whether they would prefer a marginally wider parkland.

While passengers will put up with substantial disruption to bus serves on relatively few days per year, when this becomes a regular occurrence, this significantly discourages bus usage (causing a decline in bus usage); and can make some less frequent services almost unusable.

Back to the main subject: It has also been suggested our proposed single northbound lane road-between North Road and Richmond Parade would damage the important Elm tree roots. It should be pointed out the council originally planned a 2-lane (northbound) road in a similar location, and surely it would not have proposed something that would damage the tree roots. If it did, then innovative construction methodology and/or moving the road further from these important trees should overcome this problem.

There is one possible exception to this clean sheet, which needs further explanation. The design specifically allows a small amount of general traffic in the west side of the valley. Whether this would be more than the current design is an open question.

First, to avoid the severe congestion problems in Grand Parade (junction with Church Street), a fairly small amount of traffic would turn right at the North Road junction, then continue down the west side of the valley to Church Street. Apart from avoiding the congestion problem, it has a second major advantage.

The alternative proposes a greatly enhanced pedestrian/cycle crossing between the Pavilion Gardens and Valley Gardens (creating a huge more unified open space). By rerouting southbound Church Street traffic away from the crossing, this will further reduce any sense of barrier between these two important pedestrian areas. Inferior alternatives are available.

There is a second exception, which could prove more controversial. It is assumed that the single lane northbound carriageway will not be able to cope with peak-time traffic. So the design allows general traffic to use the west side of the valley, at this time.

It should be emphasised that this could be for just an hour a day; and more importantly on the key section of the Gardens, south of North Road, heavy A23 traffic would remain on the east side of the valley, so pedestrian/cycle access to the gardens would remain similarly good, to the present proposal, at all times.

If this remains unacceptable, the bus user group may consider dropping this. While it would have disadvantages, sometimes it is better to compromise than to accept the disastrous current proposal.

It has been suggested that the Enterprise board would not accept another delay. Given the deep concerns over the current scheme, how can the council be sure of this?

The author has taken a personal interest in the council's plans to move the 'Ladyboys of Bangkok' tent, to another location within the valley; observing the difficulty in finding such a location within the current design. At the 'garden design' stage, councillors were told this had been settled, so passed the 'garden' aspects of the scheme. With recent high level lobbying by the Brighton Fringe organisation, it now appears the council has failed to find an acceptable solution. Perhaps we should consider this, when listening to the council officer!

Section 10 and conclusion:

Brighton has the highest bus usage (pro-rata) outside London (figures from the DfT). Our exceptional bus usage, is likely to have reduced car usage; and allowed the economic regeneration over that 15 years to continue, without being drowned out by increasing traffic. Buses have kept the city moving.

As suggested before, encouraging bus usage (and other sustainable modes) is the only realistic way to create genuine traffic reduction, without undermining the city's economy. Both buses and the economy- risk being undermined, if the proposals go ahead in its current form.

There is a viable alternative, which retains most of the positive measure in the current scheme, while maintaining, even enhancing bus services. When councillors vote on Tuesday, do they really want to undermine the city's bus services (and its economy)? There is an alternative.

Peter Elvidge