For Cities

Out of sight, out of mind:

a comparative study of public bus terminals as civic spaces

Lawrence W.C. Lai*, Mark Baker **

Wilson W.S. Lu *, Mark H. Chua *, Daniel C.W. Ho*, Stephen N.G. Davies*

* University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

** University of Manchester, United Kingdom

Contact: Prof. Lawrence W.C. Lai: wclai@hku.hk

28 October 2014

Keywords: Real estate development, bus terminals, civic spaces, sign structures

Abstract

This is a trans-country investigation of the provision of bus terminals as sign structures that may affect their subjectivist recognition and hence design. In relation to real estate and commercial development, they are to be understood as socially significant civic spaces. The incorporation of public bus terminals into private developments can be used as a measure of the pressures occasioned by the commodification of land as ranked in terms of land values. This tends to put bus terminals out of sight and further diminish any public support for their conservation.

Introduction

Imagine if the Statue of Liberty, originally used as a lighthouse, were enclosed as part of a private piece of "starchitecture" **(Freudenheim (2010))**. Would it remain much longer as a New York Harbour icon? At a more nostalgic level, what if Piccadilly Garden Bus Terminal in Manchester were decked over under a podium development? Would the statue of the Duke of Wellington still serve as a landmark?

Bus terminals are among those ordinary, but iconic, civic features whose demise have not attracted due academic research outside the traffic engineering arena (see for instance **Steer (1979) and Adhvaryu (2006)**) or heritage studies, which prefer railway terminals (see for instance **Henderson 2011** and **Erkan 2012**), though **Jutla (2000)** reported that neither tourists nor residents attached much importance to either rail or bus terminals). These seemingly humble facilities are, in fact, very good examples for studying the commodification of land and the encroachment of real estate development on public open spaces from a redevelopment angle within a globalizing context. They are a potential source of brownfield land supply that does not involve the huge costs of assembling land and establishing urban landmarks.

Our hypothesis is that the lack of academic interest in bus terminals is sociological and connected with a hierarchy in modes of transport. Given that ALL transport hubs are potentially important sources of land supply for real estate development, that bus terminals in general are not seen as

'heritage' makes them particularly vulnerable. As the first qualitative comparative study of four metropolises with different degrees of public space marketization, this paper examines how involvement of real estate development, as the formation of a sign structure (**Culler 1981; Lai et al. 2014a**), may affect the subjectivist social recognition of, and hence design of bus terminals as socially significant spaces.

The metropolises examined, from east to west, are Shenzhen, Hong Kong, Manila, and Manchester. They are ideal for comparison not only because bus transport is a significant people mover[1] for all, but also because they share similar institutional or social features. As an ex-British colony, Hong Kong shares a common transport regulatory and highway design tradition with Manchester. Hong Kong and Shenzhen share a common social culture. Manila and Shenzhen are both rapidly developing cities in global terms. In terms of degree of commodification as measured by CBD rents[2], Hong Kong is the strongest, followed by Shenzhen, Manila and Manchester.

---

[1] Public buses in Hong Kong carried 31.9% of all forms of public transport in June 2014; in Shenzhen 60.5% in July same year.(Sources: http://www.td.gov.hk/filemanager/en/content_4666/chart27.pdf;http://www.sztb.gov.cn/xxgk/tjxx/201408/t20140814_43733.htm) In 2005, jeepneys in Manila carried 39.1% of total person trips and 17.9% of vehicular traffic (**Jamila 2005**) Eight out of every 10 public transport trips undertaken by Greater Manchester's 2.4 million residents are by bus (**TfGM, Annual Report, 2011-12**).

[2] Recent CBD rent per m2 per annum in Hong Kong was US$1,493; Manila US$232; Shenzhen US$377; and Manchester US$534.86. (Sources: http://www.ap.jll.com/asia-pacific/en-gb/Research/the-office-index-2q-2014.pdf;

A building or place is sign structure recollecting memories and focusing attention. In the case of a bus terminal, it is also publicized by buses carrying that name on their destination panels, in printed and disseminated timetables, on bus stop notices at the far end of routes (even in neighbouring townships or, in the case of inter-city or wider-ranging services further afield) and, these days, on websites.

Theoretical context: bus terminals as civic places and a typology

The existing literature on civic space has focused mainly on "open space," but has had virtually no interest in bus terminals, leave alone treating them as sign structures. The attention paid is often from an urban design perspective, with the focus on form (**Ginkel 1961**), or from a civic liberty (**Batchis 2011**) angle. In recent years, attention has shifted to the effects of globalization and the conversion of places originally open to the public into private ones, notably shopping malls (**Voyce 2006, 2007**; **Boonchuen 2002**; **Douglass 2002**). One trend is that civic spaces are threatened by real estate development. While most of the research works have been general discussions, few actually addressed the specific forms of civic space to protect. Public streets (**Miao 2003**) and compounds in housing developments (**Daniere and Douglass 2008**) have

---

http://www.joneslanglasalle.com.cn/china/zh-cn/Research/JLL_14Q1_GC_Office_Index-CN.pdf;
http://www.cushmanwakefield.com/~/media/global-reports/OSATW%202014%20Publication%20updated.pdf)

been cited as significant civic spaces. Libraries, considered as nexuses of the information age have been given the most detailed treatment by far (**Peterson 2005; Kranich 2006**).

Interestingly, open air bus terminals have rarely been treated as candidates for preservation. Yet, insofar as these transport terminals are considered essential features in designing "Traditional Neighbourhood Developments" (TNDs) (**Gordon and Tamminga 2002**; **Grammenos et al. 2008**), as indicated in **Aurbach (2005)**, they should not be neglected as significant urban phenomena. As our case studies reveal, their redevelopment can attract public attention, and act as telling examples of the interaction between public concerns for civic space protection and commercial interests.

Any discussion of landmarks as sign structures of social significance inevitably has a subjectivist element. This is the point of **Gould and White's** famous (**1974, 1985**) book *Mental Maps*. From this angle, the question of bus terminals is in the same class of questions about the cult of the grand rail terminus in Victorian times; and the cult of the air terminal and even the cruise terminal of today. Two distinct elements are relevant. The first is what a public terminal is in terms of social interaction/everyday life – for example the symbolic role any terminal may play in a place's identity. This leads to the second; how this role affects the social/political 'value' of the space and whether this is related (and if so how) to whether the space is:

(a) open (q.v. the bus terminal outside Victoria Station in London);

(b) open and in a way visually integrated with and a part of a distinctive/iconic urban space, such as any major city square-cum-terminal (q.v. Euston Square in London);

(c) enclosed and hidden in a utilitarian manner (q.v. United Centre, Hong Kong); or

(d) enclosed in a monumental manner (q.v. Preston Bus Station).

That is, there is a typology here (**Figure 1** shows sketches of 4 the types), which needs to be considered since presumably where any given terminal locates in the typology may (or may not) have an impact on the likelihood of it being seen as potential real estate.

Bus terminals in four cities from East to West: Shenzhen, Hong Kong, Manila, and Manchester

Hong Kong

Public buses in Hong Kong are all private companies operating under franchises from the government. They are all profitable, though adjustment in fares requires permission from the Transport Department. For example bus fares were not allowed to rise from 1946 to 1976, forcing the franchisees to make profits by expanding their scale of operation and through innovations (**Lai and Lorne 2012; Lai et al. 2013**). Since 1976, adjustment in fares has continued to be subject to government approval.

Generally, Hong Kong public bus terminals are built and provided by the government freely for use by franchised public buses (**Lai, Davies, and Cheung 2011**). There are about 324 bus terminals in Hong Kong (**Yung 2012**), falling into types (a), (b) and (c). Type (a) has its historical roots in Hong Kong's crash public housing programme occurring as growing light industry needed workers transported to and from housing estates. The first purpose designed bus terminal to be built as part of a private real estate development is the terminal under the United Centre, an office and commercial building above Admiralty Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Station, part of the former *HMS Tamar* naval base. It is of type (c) **(Figure 2)**. It commenced operations when the Initial Modified Line of the MTR started operation in 1980. This model was quickly duplicated elsewhere for many new bus terminals in new development areas and new towns – mainly to economize on government land and also to control bus noise. This type amounts to as many as 94 (29% of all) terminals. Five are provided below property development: 58 are commercial and 29 are beneath residential blocks, the rest form part of car parks etc.

The standard institutional arrangement for locating bus terminals below new real estate developments was for a developer to construct a bus terminal at the base of a development according to government highway and transport standards modelled after those in the UK, as required under the conditions of the sale of leasehold interests. Then, upon the completion of the development, the developer had to dedicate it to the government. This dedication has the effect of

relieving the developer of legal liability for tort as landlord/occupier and giving the government full control of the terminal. The Discovery Bay Bus Terminal on Lantau Island is an odd exception to the rule. The property belongs to the developer, which has an exclusive right to run private buses that connect this remote and cut-off development to an MTR station. Meanwhile, new open air bus terminals of type (a) with passenger shelters continued to be built in locations where land was less expensive. Granted that Hong Kong is a capitalist "property state" (**Haila 2000**), one may say that these merely serve as land banks awaiting redevelopment when the time is ripe.

Hitherto, there has been no public reaction against this approach and no complaint against integrating bus terminals with housing or office developments. It is too tempting to suppose that because of this or the high degree of commodification of land, people in Hong Kong are all capitalists and have no concern for civic space.

However, a civic space debate arose after planned relocation of the Tsimshatsui Star Ferry Bus Terminal was made known to the public. A type (b), this is the oldest surviving terminal in Hong Kong and dates back to the 1920s. It was an important transport facility designed in tandem with the Kowloon-Canton Railway Terminal and the Star Ferry Kowloon Pier. The post-colonial government proposed to relocate it in defiance of public wishes on heritage grounds. These were that it has been socially defined by members of the public as part of Hong Kong's "collective memory".

This example may be the first in the world of a public campaign to protect an open air bus terminal as a monument.

An interesting hobby group, bus fans, has emerged in Hong Kong. They are mainly young school boys and professional men. They appear sporadically at bus terminals or along good vantage points along highways to take photos of buses and specialize in companies, bus marques, routes, or advertising schemes. Some purchase retired buses and keep them in their yards in the New Territories. When a bus of a certain model is about to retire from service, they may crowd the bus, the terminals, and key points along the entire route to record the end of an era (**Figure 3**). This causes a degree of traffic congestion. Fans sustain a small publishing industry of bus literature, with both imports (mainly from the UK which provides most of Hong Kong buses) and locally-produced works. They were prominently behind the campaign to save the Tsimshatsui Bus Terminal.

There is no type (d) terminal in private development, though the Chek Lap Kok bus terminal is part of the monumental airport terminal building, as in the case of many new airports in the world.

Most developers in Hong Kong treat bus terminals purely functionally but there are two good examples which show signs of paying greater attention to bus terminals as visual assets. One is the half covered and half open bus terminal in Riviera Garden in Tsuen Wan and a covered terminal that has glances of the sea at Island Resort, Siu Sai Wan.

Shenzhen

Shenzhen is a major city in Southern China located on the Pearl River Delta and situated immediately north of Hong Kong. Due to its proximity to Hong Kong, Shenzhen was formally established in 1979 as an experimental "economic zone" directly controlled by Beijing to practice market capitalism in a Socialist society (**Lai et al. 2014b**). It is now one of China's most successful Special Economic Zones (SEZs). As a young city, which in many ways imitated Hong Kong during its first 20 years of existence, Shenzhen has many similarities to, as well as differences from, Hong Kong in terms of public bus terminal development.

The Transport Commission of Shenzhen Municipality (TCSM), as the government's executive arm, oversees the development and operation of public bus services. Unlike Hong Kong, which franchises public bus services to private companies, Shenzhen provides the services through several state-owned enterprises (SOEs) such as the Shenzhen Bus Group Co., Ltd, and Shenzhen Western Bus Co., Ltd. Bus fares are capped and kept low by the government. For example, each journey costs 1 Yuan (about US$0.16) on a self-service ticketing bus in Beijing, but 2 Yuan (about US$0.32) in Shenzhen (**Piaojian.cn, 2014**). Notwithstanding the availability of non-fare revenue from advertisements on buses and bus stops, Shenzhen's bus operators need government subsidies to break even, just like Australia's state transport concerns. This model has become, perhaps unintentionally, a means to fight inflation in China, which is experiencing a rapidly rising consumer price index (CPI) in many of its other

sectors. Based on a socialist ideology that a government should dominate industries of vital importance to the nation's economy and the people's livelihood, this mode will exist for the foreseeable future.

Bus terminal (re)development and operations vary widely in Shenzhen, which has about 300 public bus terminals. The bus terminals are basically types (a) or (c). Unlike Hong Kong, there is no clear type (b) terminal like Star Ferry.

Thirteen of them are covered and combined with commercial elements (e.g. shopping centers) to form part of real estate developments constructed by private developers. Type (c) is the dominant manner. **(Figure 4)** These covered terminals are required, under the conditions of development, to abide by the gross floor area stated for the terminal in the land lease contract signed between the Shenzhen Urban Planning Land and Resources Commission (UPLRC) and the private developer. The design and construction of these terminals are mainly the developers', while the UPLRC supervises the planning control, and increasingly, defines their functionality. This practice, according to Shenzhen transport officials, is modelled on Hong Kong. The lower percentages of covered bus terminals in Shenzhen matches with the fact land values in Shenzhen are generally lower than those in Hong Kong.

As in the case of Hong Kong outside Discovery Bay, all covered public bus terminals built by developers are, upon their completion, vested to the government, which operates them. The other public bus terminals in Shenzhen, mostly

uncovered, were constructed and operated by TCSM. The Commission is fighting for more space for public bus services on the one hand, and is responsible for making better use of existing uncovered terminals (e.g. by redeveloping them into complexes) on the other.

In large covered bus terminals with superstructures fully owned by the state, as in the case of Futian Coach Terminal, one can easily spot government mass education propaganda displays. This terminal is not type (d) though the development above it is definitely monumental because it is a government building, not a private development. Such treatments reinforce the image of bus terminals as state-controlled civic spaces, though in terminals that are located in private developments mass education propaganda are often dwarfed by commercial advertisements. In people's minds it seems that the benefits have been offset by the negative factors. Unlike Hong Kong, no bus fan groups seem to have appeared to tout either buses or terminals existence.

Manila

Unlike Hong Kong or Shenzhen, Manila (or, more accurately, Metro Manila, because it is composed of different contiguous cities) does not have a tradition of the state providing public land for bus terminals. This is a legacy of the laissez faire period of American rule in the Philippines. Privately-operated jeepneys, the main form of public transport, usually park along streets or in privately-owned yards (or temporarily on unused public land), a kind of type (a) terminal.

Although there are other transport means like buses and utility vehicles, none of them—despite their comfort and efficiency—is as iconic as the elaborately decorated and colourful Filipino jeepney. A jeepney is a little bus with its origin from World War II American military jeeps (**Otsuka et al. 1986**). Back then, these military jeeps were refurbished to suit the needs of public transport. In recent times, the body of the jeepney is usually home-made and the surplus or reconditioned/overhauled second-hand engine is usually imported from Japan (**Bacero and Vergel 2009**). The jeepney and the industry behind it, especially after the war, normally symbolize many aspects of the Filipino people like ingenuity, creativity, flexibility and dynamism (**Chiu 2008**) Understandably, this can be extended to its terminals as sign structures. The resourcefulness, despite the existing chaos that helped some of these privately managed terminals last in the same location for more than 30 years, is impressive. However, sentiments are arguably more attached to the vehicle than to the terminals themselves, as can be observed by the scarcity of literature about these terminals.

In economic theory, the jeepney industry is primarily like the taxi industry in the UK, Hong Kong or Shenzhen. It is basically not a company (or Coasian "firm" (**Lai 2000)**) arrangement but individual operators. The operators are normally people who have capital to purchase one or more jeeps to lease out to drivers who pay them a fixed rent **(Otsuka et.al. 1986)**. The rent is loosely called "boundary". However, the Supreme Court has ruled in *National Labor Union vs. Dinglasan (1956),* that the hiring of a jeepney by a driver from

the vehicle owner does not exempt the liability of the owner as an employer rather than a lessor.

In any event the state has not designed or constructed any jeepney terminals and these little vehicles just park along the street or terminate in open yards, often near garages, owned by private merchants. Control over these terminals is carried out through the association of jeepney operators and drivers, who manage the terminal operations. Jeepney operators and drivers on the same route normally comprise an association. These are registered with the government and each has its own set of officers. In recent years, more and more associations are observed to have started improvements of many of these street terminals. These improvements include fare collection counters, more organized routes, and some sheds for passengers to wait under. Metro Manila has around 799 jeepney routes and 99 bus routes within and going to suburban areas surrounding the metropolis (**DOTC 2014**). Many times shorter than bus routes, the jeepneys ply the small roads that big buses cannot reach. With these route figures, one can more or less estimate the extent of these terminals in the metropolis. In the CBD of Metro Manila (Makati) alone, there are about 26 major jeepney terminating places for around 30 jeepney routes (**JICA 2004**).

A recent development is for large, modern shopping centre owners to provide jeepney terminals within their premises, which they manage (**Okamura et al. 2013**). A good example is SM Mega Mall and other big SM Malls, where public transport hubs are a common feature (**SM Prime Holdings 2013**). **(Figure 5)** While the purpose of the business sector

providing such civic spaces is profit, the private sector has created some public spaces that the state does not offer. Indeed, the state encourages this practice. Another variation is the Trinoma Mall, which doubles as a public transport terminal. Its 13-ha area is 49% owned by a private firm, Ayala Land, Inc., and leased by a government agency — the Department of Transportation and Communications (**Ayala Land 2012**). These better designed terminals may be called type (b) though the setting is not civic buildings but shopping centres.

Recently, the government initiated the development of bus terminals or interchanges on the fringes of Metro Manila so that coaches from other parts of Luzon, which did not have their own terminals within the metropolis, would not have to terminate in the highly congested city centre areas. As the state lacked its own suitable land, it leased around 1.4 ha for 2.5 years from a private firm, Uniwide Mall (**MMDA 2010)**, for terminal use.

In a survey done on the business district of Metro Manila, researchers found that the presence of security personnel, comfort rooms, more seats, and trip information signs are thought highly desirable for transport terminals (**Koh et al. 2011**). This was in line with findings elsewhere. Naturally, the public tends to welcome terminals near or connected to malls or other similar establishments with these amenities. These type (b) or even type (c) terminals **(Figure 6)** normally have food stalls and stores nearby making them more convenient for the public. For big terminals, they rechannel and consolidate the jeepneys by imposing stricter traffic discipline within their vicinity.

However, with respect to civic space, private malls in the cities of developing countries like the Philippines' old Harrison Plaza or Robinsons Place or SM Mega Mall are often not seen as an invasion of or a compromise of public space, as perceived in the West. Rather, they constitute a new type of civic space **(Capulong-Reyes 2012)** because operators dedicated space[3] for the celebration of Mass, which is an occasion of great importance to many in this country. And even if new malls may be seen as a threat or competition by pre-existing businesses and the cause of more traffic congestion by car owners, we can say that public commuters see these in a more positive light with respect to the transport feature.

Manchester

As in Hong Kong, the majority of bus terminals within the Greater Manchester conurbation are publically funded, built and run, whilst the bus services themselves are franchised to private operators (**TfGM, 2012**).

Due to the dominant position of buses for municipal public transport, the public body has vital responsibilities in overseeing the bus network. Virtually all the bus terminals in the conurbation remain owned and developed by TfGM.

As a result of this public sector ownership and the generally lower land values, particularly outside the

[3] Some malls (e.g. SM Mega Mall and Harrison Plaza) provide well ornamenetd chapels, while others set-up chairs in open spaces within the mall premises to celebrate MassMass held on Sundays is for the convenience of Catholic employees who work in these malls in observing their Sunday worship obligation but is open to anyone who wishes to participate. It may also be worth noting that some protestant denominations also hold their services in the malls, which are air-conditioned and conveniently located.

Manchester city centre core, it is notable that, unlike Hong Kong, Shenzhen or Manila, none of Greater Manchester's original, or even recently redeveloped, bus terminals are particularly linked to major retail or commercial developments. Indeed, although all but type (d) terminals can be found in this city with its glorious industrial past, the vast majority are arguably of type (a), open in character and, frankly, with a rather low key and nondescript appearance of associated terminal buildings and passenger information and waiting facilities.

Very few might be considered significant civic spaces of either historic or more contemporary importance. The lack of interest in incorporating associated real estate is generally clear from the virtual absence of even type (c) terminals (enclosed, but utilitarian design). The former Arndale Bus Station would have fallen fully under this category, being enclosed in a cavernous space beneath the Arndale Shopping Centre in the City Centre, but the IRA bomb that exploded immediately outside the Arndale in 1996, led to a major redevelopment of the city centre, which included the relocation of this terminal to a new site to the north west of the shopping centre itself. The development of this new Shudehill Bus Station was not without its planning controversies and delays, but these mainly revolved around the technicalities and legal wranglings over compulsory purchase orders and land acquisition. Urban and architectural design issues also featured strongly since the site lay within the Shudehill conservation area and concerns were raised by English Heritage and the Manchester Civic Society on the impact on both the traditional

street pattern and some of the older and, in several cases, listed buildings in the vicinity.

A similar situation is seen with the modern, utilitarian design of the semi-enclosed Chorlton Street Coach Station. Unlike Chorlton Street however,, Shudehill was conceived from the outset as an integrated 'Interchange' (rather than bus) terminal, being linked to a new Metrolink stop immediately next to it. In civic design terms, this general area of the northern fringes of Manchester City Centre is of much interest, including as it does the Grade II listed CIS Tower complex, the new, Co-operative developed, £800 million, 20 hectare Noma development including a new Coop headquarters building at One Angel, which opened in 2013, a refurbished Victoria Train station and the 16,000+ capacity Manchester Concert Arena as well as some newly created public spaces in amongst them. Against these developments, the bus station, however, barely merits much attention.

It is therefore one of the City's most famous civic squares that connects most directly with the focus of this paper and can be considered Manchester's only obvious type (b) form of development (open and visually integrated with an iconic urban space). Indeed, Manchester Piccadilly Gardens Bus station has been a focal point for bus commuters to the city centre since it was first used in the 1930s. There is no terminal, as such; just a series of stands and bus stops adjacent to the Gardens themselves. **(Figure 7)** The Gardens are enclosed by a range of buildings of diverse age and architecture from old Victorian warehouses, converted into department stores, through to the concrete towers of the 1960s Piccadilly Plaza

and, from 2003, the new mixed use development of One Piccadilly Gardens. Generations of bus users have thus boarded buses over the years from the Mancunian suburbs and simply asked the driver (or conductor in the old days) for a single or return ticket to 'Piccadilly'. As well as being a significant city centre transport hub, with two Metrolink lines also passing through next to the buses, the Gardens have been somewhat controversial over the years as a succession of different landscaping schemes, incorporating both hard and soft landscaping in different proportions at different times, seemed never to quite create an attractive large central square as can more easily be encountered in many other European cities.

Discussion and conclusion

This paper is about how the sign significance and insignificance of bus terminals are conditioned by design because of the broader perceptions of municipal bus travel as a mode of transport. The findings indicate that bus terminals have a place in collective memory that design masks. Limited as it is by the number of observations, our trans-national study has a few interesting findings.

First, bus terminals do matter in the minds of the people who use and experience them in their everyday lives as sign structures. The ways in which the public have responded to conserve the Tsimshatsui Ferry Bus Terminal is a case in point.

Second, the cases do show how differences in urban property rent gradients and institutional backgrounds affect the mode of bus terminal development. At one end is capitalist Hong Kong, with a long tradition of state involvement in public

transport operation as a franchisor and the highest property prices, having the greatest absolute and relative number of bus terminals integrated as part of private high-rise real estate projects. At the other is Manila, with its laissez faire tradition, and no government terminals whether open or covered. The socialist market economy of Shenzhen is like Hong Kong with many examples of bus terminals with high rise property development above. The story of Manchester is in fact very similar to Hong Kong, but for its far more participatory way of planning which constrains redevelopment.

Third, the absence of type D terminals is surprising and needs further exploration. It may be related to provision for long-distance coach services. Shenzhen and Manila have long distance coach connections and do have special terminals but they are not of this type. A tentative hypothesis to guide further research would build on the perceived status of bus travel, the role of long-distance bus travel in a given society's long-distance transport mix and, perhaps, an historical element embedding the development of bus travel in a particular conjuncture.

Perhaps the most obvious conclusion, referring back to an earlier point about the perceived comparative statuses of transport modes, is that after almost two centuries[4] of public bus services, buses have seldom occasioned high-profile, iconic design for their termini.

[4] It seems generally agreed that the world's first scheduled bus service was in Manchester in 1824 – see Greater Manchester Museum of Transport at http://www.gmts.co.uk/museum/trivia.html.

All transport modes are almost by definition transitory; rickshaws, sedan chairs and hackneys, for example, are almost beyond recall. Public transport modes share this inevitable fate. Yet the importance of their services to very large numbers of people has sometimes given them and their infrastructure a role in public life that mitigates utter evanescence. Some live on in iconic buildings from yesteryear. Some are immortalized in image and text, film and fable. Yet bus termini seem never to have warranted a status in urban space equivalent to the great Victorian railway termini of the 19th century, the grand ocean liner piers and *gares maritimes* of the 1930s, or the starchitecture of modern airports and cruise liner terminals. That has left them exposed, natural victims of a globalized world's commodification of land and the encroachment of real estate development on public open spaces. From economic, social and perhaps also environmental points of view, bus terminals beneath buildings seem an inevitable trend. The workaday bus is less glamorous and far smaller than a cruise ship, jumbo jet or train and so an unrelated building suitably covers its mundane business. So, hidden within or under buildings, such a 'terminal' loses the chance to gather any sign value. It is no coincidence that all examples of conservation campaigns mentioned here are of the open air type.

References

Adhvaryu, B. (2006). "Design of Bus Station: a Case Study in Brighton," Traffic Engineering and Control, May, pp.182-187.

Aurbach, L. (2005). TND Design Rating Standards. Manuscript.

Ayala Land, I. (2012). Annual Report for Security and Exchange Commission (SEC) Form 17-A, Disclosed on 15 April, 2013, http://ir.ayalaland.com.ph/Disclosures.aspx?id=1.

Bacero, R.S. and Vergel, K. (2009). "Assessment of Jeepney's Components, Systems and Separate Technical Units for the Development of Standards," Proceedings of the 17th Annual Conference of the Transportation Science Society of the Philippines, CD ISSN: 2012-3922.

Boonchuen, P. (2002). "Globalisation and Urban Design: Transformations of Civic Space in Bangkok," International Development Planning Review, Vol.24, No.4, pp.401-417.

Chiu, C.L. (2008). "Lessons from Jeepney Industry in the Philippines," International Review of Business Research Papers, Vol.4, No.1, pp.68-84.

Culler, J. (1981). "Semiotics of Tourism," American Journal of Semiotics, Vol.1, No.1-2, pp.127-140.

Daniere, A. and Douglass, M. (2008). The Politics of Civic Space in Asia: Building Urban Communities, Routledge: London and New York.

Department of Transportation and Communication [DOTC], Republic of the Philippines (2014). "Transit Data," Retrieved June 9, 2014, from http://www.dotc.gov.ph/index.php?option=com_k2&view=item&id=704:open-data&Itemid=167.

Douglass, M. (2002). "Civic Spaces, Globalisation and Pacific Asia Cities," International Development Planning Review, Vol.24, No.4, pp.345-361.

Batchis, W. (2011). "Free Speech in the Suburban and Exurban Frontier: Shopping Malls, Subdivisions, New Urbanism, and the First Amendment," Southern California Interdisciplinary Law Journal, Vol.21, pp.201-358.

Capulong-Reyes, R. (2012). "Everyday Life in Everyday Public Spaces: Multiple Outcome Possibilities of Spatial Regulations," International Proceedings of Economics Development and Research,Vol.51, No.15, pp.65-69.

Erkan, Y.K. (2012). "Railway Heritage of Istanbul and the Marmaray Project," International Journal of Architectural Heritage, Vol.6, No.1, pp.86-99.

Freudenheim, Tom. (2010). "'Starchitecture' and its Drawbacks," Curator, Vol.53, No.4, pp.411-420.

(1956). G.R. No.L-7945. National Labor Union vs. Dinglasan, Supreme Court (Philippines). 98 Phil. 649.

Garrod, B. (2008). "Understanding the Relationship between Tourism Destination Imagery and Tourist Photography," Journal of Travel Research, pp.1-13.

Ginkel, B.L.V. (1961). "The Form of the Core," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol.27, No.1, pp.56-69.

Gordon, D.L.A. and Tamminga, K. (2002). "Large-scale Traditional Neighbourhood Development and Pre-emptive Ecosystem Planning: The Markham Experience, 1989-2001," Journal of Urban Design, Vol.7, No.3, pp.321-340.

Gould, P. and White, R. (1973). Mental Maps. New York: Routledge.

Grammenos, F, Craig, B., Pollard, D. and Guerrea, C. (2008). "Hippodamus Rides to Radburn: A New Model for the 21st Century," Journal of Urban Design," Vol.13, No.2, pp.163-176.

Haila, A. (2000). "Real Estate in Global Cities: Singapore and Hong Kong as Property States," Urban Studies, Vol.37, No.12, pp.2241-2256.

Henderson, J. (2011). "Railways as Heritage Attractions: Singapore's Tanjong Pagar station," Journal of Heritage Tourism, Vol.6, No.1, pp.73-79.

Jamilah, M. (2005). "Urban Transport and Growth Management Strategies: A Tale of Two Southeast Asian Cities at the Dawn of the New Millennium". Malaysian Journal of Society and Space,Vol. 1, pp. 11-22.

Japan International Cooperation Agency [JICA] and Metropolitan Manila Development Authority [MMDA] (2004). "Metropolitan Manila Transit Map," 2014, from http://www.jica.go.jp/philippine/english/office/topics/news/whats01.html.

Koh, K., Cal, P., and Diaz, C.E. (2011). "Preferences of Amenities in Public Transport Terminals Desired by Makati CBD Workers." Journal of the Eastern Asia Society for Transportation Studies, Vol.9, pp.1170-1185.

Kranich, N. (2006). "Civic Partnerships: The Role of Libraries in Promoting Civic Engagement," Resource Sharing & Information Networks, Vol.18, No.2, pp.89-103.

Lai, L.W.C. and Lorne, F.T. (2012). "Schumpeterian Innovations, the Coase Theorem, and Sustainable Development: a Hong

Kong Case Study of Bus Innovations," in David Emanuel Andersson ed., The Spatial Market Process, Advances in Austrian Economics, Bingley: Emerald, Vol.16, pp.141-179.

Lai, L.W.C. (2000). "The Contractual Nature of the Coasian Market-firm Dichotomy and Sub-contracting in the Construction Industry," Construction Management and Economics, Vol.18, No.3, pp.355-362.

Lai, L.W.C., Davies, S.N.G., and Cheung, P.A.C.W. (2011). "Government Transport-land Use Planning and Development by Implicit Contract for Franchised Buses and Ferries in Hong Kong: 1933 to 1972," Planning Practice and Research, Vol.26, No.4, pp.435-464.

Lai, L.W.C., Chau, K.W. and Cheung, P.C.W. (2012). "Scale Economies of the Franchised Buses and Ferries of Hong Kong, 1948 to 1998," Review of Urban and Regional Development Studies, Vol.24, No.3, pp.121-140.

Lai, L.W.C., Chau, K.W., Lee, C.K.K. and Lorne, F.T. (2014a). "The Informational Dimension of Real Estate Development: a Case of a "Positive Non-interventionist" Application of the Coase Theorem," Land Use Policy, Vol.41, pp.225-232.

Lai, L.W.C. Lai, Lu, W.S., Lorne, F.T. (2014b). A Catallaxis Framework of Government Land Reclamation: the Case of Hong Kong and Shenzhen. Habitat International, Vol.44, pp.62-71.

Miao, P. (2003). "Deserted Streets in a Jammed Town: The Gated Community in Chinese Cities and Its Solution," Journal of Urban Design, Vol.8, No.1, pp.45-66.

Jutla, R.S. (2000). “Visual Image of the City: Tourists' versus Residents' Perception of Simla, a Hill Station in Northern India,” Tourism Geographies, Vol.2, No.4, pp.404-420.

Metro Manila Development Authority [MMDA] (2010). “Southwest Integrated Provincial Transport Terminal (SWIPTT)”. Retrieved 9 April 2014, from http://mmda.gov.ph/SW-integrated-provincial-terminal.html.

Okamura, T., Kaneko, Y. Nakamura, F. and Wang, R. (2013). "Passengers’ Attitudes to the Service items of Jeepneys in Metro Manila by Different Lifestyles." Journal of the Eastern Asia Society for Transportation Studies, Vol.10, pp.1384-1395.

Otsuka, K. et al. (1986). "Community and Market in Contract Choice: The Jeepney in the Philippines," Economic Development and Cultural Change, Vol.34, No.2, pp.279-298.

Peterson, C.A. (2005). “Space Designed for Lifelong Learning” in Library as Place: Rethinking Roles, rethinking Space. Council on Library and Information Resources: Washington D.C., pp.56-65.

Piaojia.cn (2014). Bus fare searching in China. http://www.piaojia.cn/bus/ (accessed on 11-May 2014).

SM Prime Holdings, I. (2013). SM Prime Sustainability Report 2013, Manila, Retrieved June 2014 from www.smprime.com/smprime/uploads/image/smaction/SMSR13-LR.pdf.

Steer, J.K. (1979). “Factors Influencing the Planning and Design of Bus Terminals,” Traffic Engineering and Control, August/September, pp.406-409.

Transport for Greater Manchester (2012) 2011/12 Annual Report, TfGM, Manchester.

Voyce, M. (2006). "Shopping Malls in Australia: The End of Public Space and the Rise of 'Consumerist Citizenship'?" Journal of Sociology, Vol.42, No.3, pp.269-286.

Voyce, M. (2007). "Shopping Malls in India: New Social 'Dividing Practices'," Economic and Political Weekly, Vol.42, No.22, pp.2055-2062.

Warnaby, G. (2009). "Non-place Marketing: Transport Hubs as Gateways, Flagships and Symbols?" Journal of Place Management and Development, Vol.2, No.3, pp.211-219.

Williams, G. (2003). The Enterprising City Centre, Spon Press, London and New York.

Yung, W.C. (2012). The Fleet Directory of Hong Kong Buses 29012-2013, Hong Kong: BSI Publishing. (Chinese publication).