On September 15, 2009 the City of Montréal, announced an open competition to design street furniture consisting of a bus shelter including a poster advertising frame, bench and solar power system; the best design solution would be picked, and the outdoor media companies that wished to, would bid to supply the city with that design. The arrangement will potentially also cut the costs of bidding for those companies, as they will no longer have to engage designers and prototype their own designs. This new model will, according to the Mayor of Montréal, Gérald Tremblay “open up access to public design commissions to greater numbers of practitioners” (2008). In positioning the importance of this initiative André Lavallée, Montréal Executive Committee member responsible for the Transportation Plan, Urban Planning, Heritage and Design states

Bus shelters are a significant part of the urban landscape. With the design competition, we can call upon the creativity of Montréal designers to find solutions that are innovative, sustainable and respectful of the urban diversity that is a hallmark of our city. (2008)

This competition call has a strong resonance with the City of Edinburgh’s Design Leader Riccardo Marini’s plea for cities to ‘have standards for streets based upon empathy and context’ (2009). Kevin Lynch (in his book, ‘The Image of the City’) discusses the need for a city to have four key components if it is able to successfully create this visual sensibility within the urban dweller’s mind: a “continuous region”; a “mentally traversable order”; “a sense of ‘interconnectedness at any level’”; and “no isolating boundaries” (Lynch,1960). Public transport and its corresponding street furniture, if thoughtfully designed and planned, has the potential to form an integral element in the promotion of a sense of identity, interconnectedness and flow within a city.

By using Montréal as a case study this work-in-progress examines the extent to which the newly designed street furniture will provide a local context for the user and underpin a sense of the City’s identity. Our research questions the conceptual framework and methodology chosen by Design Montréal: will such a proactive approach to the initial planning and design stages within these spaces stimulate creative potential? Finally we offer a theoretical reflection on the cultural outcomes of such practice.
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1 Introduction

Over the last two centuries many major cities have undergone large-scale modernisation, which has led to the growing sense of homogenisation associated with such locales across the globe. The fractal logic that is at the heart of so many urban settings, where the whole system is made up of parts that are identical to the whole, serves to anonymise our everyday experiences of the cityscape. The urban designer, Kevin Lynch (1960) in his book, The Image of the City discusses the importance of being able to sense a city and to see it in the mind’s eye.” He considers the need for a city to have four key components if it is able to successfully create this visual sensibility within the urban dweller’s mind: a ‘continuous region’ [with a] “mentally traversable order”, a sense of “interconnectedness at any level”, [here he emphasises the importance of each “part” of the city being able to flow into the next], and finally he states that “there should be no isolating boundaries” (1960). Public transport and its corresponding street furniture, if thoughtfully designed and planned, has the potential to form an integral element in the promotion of a sense of identity, interconnectedness and flow within a city.

All too often, however, such planning falls woefully short of this ideal. As Sharon Zukin comments in The Culture of Cities: “Cities are often criticised because they represent the base instincts of human society. They are built versions of Leviathan and Mammon, mapping the power of the bureaucratic machine of the social pressures of money.” (1995)

One of the starting points for this collaborative research project has been to question the extent to which the design of the streetscape adds to this negative image of the city as a monster. Bus stops, benches and litter bins, for example, offer interesting cases to consider in terms of the way we experience a contemporary urban space, they are familiar, yet often not thought about, objects that can drive our daily routines; they have the potential to dictate which streets we walk along and the shops we most frequently see.

The common model for the commissioning of street furniture is linked with outdoor media advertising. This frequently sees local authorities putting out requests for tender and usually opting for the design, which is most appealing financially rather than aesthetically. Additionally once the design is agreed and commissioned there is little coordination to regulate subsequent changes or initiatives in the urban streetscape. The design is then mass-manufactured and replicated in cities throughout the world, thus reinforcing the sense of homogeneity.

The City of Montréal in Canada is attempting to avoid this problem. On September 15, 2009 the city announced a competition to design street furniture consisting of a bus shelter including a poster advertising frame, bench and solar power system; the best design solution will be picked, and the outdoor media companies that wish to, will bid to supply the city with that design. The arrangement will potentially also cut the costs of bidding for those companies, as they will no longer have to engage designers and prototype designs. This new model will in the words of Stéphanie Jecrois of Design Montréal “open urban design up for design and designers” (2009).

This competition call has a strong resonance with Edinburgh City Design Leader Riccardo Marini’s (2009) plea for cities to “have standards for streets based upon empathy and
context.” Furthermore, the importance of the role of the designer in such quotidian scenes has been clearly observed by Sharon Zukin (1995) who comments:

We owe the clearest cultural map of structural change not to novelists or literary critics, but to architects and designers. Their products, their social roles as cultural producers, and the organisation of consumption in which they intervene create shifting landscapes in the most material sense. As both objects of desire and structural forms, their work directly mediates economic power by both conforming to and structuring norms of market-driven investment, production and consumption.

We wish to study the process occurring in Montreal in order to investigate whether this approach will allow the city to adapt and organise its streets with a clearer view to context and empathy contributing to the urban dweller’s experience of their environment as unique yet interconnected.

By using Montreal as a case study we hope to examine the extent to which the newly designed street furniture will provide a local context for the user and underpin a sense of the City’s identity. Finally we will question whether a more proactive approach to the initial planning and design stages within these spaces can engender a creative potential which might be transferred to cities such as Edinburgh which is also undergoing a substantial change in its character and environment.

As a way of combating the perception of homogeneity, a key element in the on-going development of our contemporary cities is the importance of the creation of a sense of place. There is general agreement between architects, designers and urban planners and dwellers that the physical and spatial design of our city and town centres have a critical social role to play in the development of a sense of place which in turn stimulates social cohesion and a strong sense of well-being and conviviality within a community.

According to the eighteenth century Utilitarian philosopher Jeremy Bentham, the best society is the one that is happiest thus prompting the economist Richard Layard to research the idea of happiness; he turned his results into what he calls the “Big Seven factors affecting happiness”, (Layard, 2006) and fourth in importance on this list is community and friendship. Layard is perhaps thinking at micro level but if you take this idea up to a broader macro level it is clear to see that local government or municipal decisions play an integral role in enabling people to form friendships and communities through the provision of spaces for meeting and ease of transporting individuals from one place to another to facilitate such meetings. Public art is also implicated in this attempt to forge a sense of community, as cultural geographer Joanne Sharpe (2007) notes, such art is often a popular choice for urban managers because of its participatory quality although she observes that “the extent to which ‘participation’ is seriously pursued rather than rhetorically invoked is variable across projects, but nevertheless it has become a touchstone for contemporary urban policy in its attempts to provide a sense of collective identity and ownership”

A sense of place and fostering of a cultural identity can be further established through the positive symbolic language communicated by a city. Sharon Zukin (1995) discusses the importance of the message given by a city through its aesthetic choices:
Building a city depends on how people combine the traditional economic factors of land, labor and capital. But it also depends on how they manipulate symbolic languages of exclusion and entitlement. The look and feel of cities reflect decisions about what - and who - should be visible and what should not, on concepts of order and disorder, and on uses of aesthetic power.

The importance of the visual language of a city is long established. Georg Simmel through his work considers the sensory experience of the city and the implications of the absence of personal contact. The absence of touching and speaking to one another is replaced by looking, because “it is by looking at people and places that people categorise them and thereby organise their perceptions of the city, its internal and external boundaries and flows.” (Wells 2007). Walter Benjamin’s Arcade Projects, which so beautifully describes 19th century Paris, gives a similar sense of the importance of objects in terms of replacing people as identifiers of the city. There is little doubt then that in contemporary society we too ‘get a feel’ of a city by looking and seeing such things as its historical and contemporary buildings, its public art and its uses of the street. Together this visual information forms a tangible representation of an identity which in turn serves as a reflection of the intangible “we” of a city.

Given that the ground is so well prepared in terms of awareness of the importance of happiness and the visual aesthetic in creating a sense of community and local identity it is of interest that generally so little attention, in this sense, is paid to street furniture design given that it is a crucial element of every city’s life.

2 Frame-work for the Examination of the Competition Outcomes

In the light of this context, the main element of this research in progress will be a focus on the winner of the design competition and the fitness for purpose of the proposed work. Christopher Alexander in his ‘Notes on the Synthesis of Form’ (1972) states:

The form is part of the world over which we have control, and which we decide to shape while leaving the rest of the world as it is. The context is the part of the world which puts demands on this form; anything in the world that puts demand on form is context. Fitness is a relation of mutual acceptability between the two.

Of particular interest then is how designers chose context, and how well their designs relate and adapt to Montréal’s urban landscape. The Academy of Urbanism (2006) is an interdisciplinary body of thinkers and practitioners operating in the sphere of urban design its principle aim is to “advance the understanding and practice of urbanism”. The Academy’s manifesto sets out principles on the practice of good urbanism in order to: “…establish a high quality of living, nurture a healthy and creative way of life, support economic, social, political and cultural activity and deliver robust, distinctive and attractive physical environments.”

Principal 11 of the academy’s manifesto is especially relevant:

The design of spaces and buildings should be influenced by their context and seek to enhance local character and heritage whilst simultaneously responding to current day needs, changes in society and cultural diversity’ It is important that urban design understands it’s context and enhances the character of place. (Academy of Urbanism, 2006)

From an initial entry of 31 Québec design firms and consortiums, five finalists were chosen to submit a detailed design and budget bus shelter, advertising frame and seat to be used by the Société de transport de Montréal (STM). The finalists were instructed to work to a regulation
document that included budget details for the project as set by the STM. These separate elements of a bus shelter are illustrated in figure 1.

Figure 1 Adshe/Grange Bus shelter

In assessing the impact of the competition on Montreal’s sense of place and identity we believe it important to question the role of street furniture, in terms of the affect it has on the experience of people who work, live and play in urban spaces. As observed earlier, bus stops offer an interesting case to consider in terms of the way we experience a contemporary urban space because they are such familiar yet often unthought about objects that can drive our daily routines.

On the 30th of September 2009 Gérald Tremblay issued five creative challenges to Québec’s creative practitioners who stated:

This initiative is further proof of our administration’s desire to make such competitions a widespread practice, to promote innovation and excellence in architecture and design, and to continue positioning Montréal as a UNESCO City of Design. (2009)

This paper seeks to understand how far the city’s stated desire for ‘innovation and excellence’ extends to what has traditionally been an area dominated by the needs of outdoor media advertising and the commercial implications of this. For example, in 2005 Spanish outdoor Media Advertising company Cemusa won the rights to supply New York with street furniture on a 20-year contract. The city stated that one of the main factors in their choice was the financial package offered to the city by Cemusa, who offered the most money. Mayor Bloomberg commented ‘It will mean for the city a billion dollars in revenues over 20 years, which we certainly can use’ (New York Times, 2005).

Through our on-going research we seek to understand how the designers, without direct pressure from the outdoor media industry, will address the city’s desire for innovation and excellence. Our research will question the extent to which traditional bus shelter design, as practiced by international outdoor media companies such as Clear Channel, JC Deceaux and Cemusa affected or influenced the entrants’ competition entries; what were the competitors
design methodologies and research strategies? It will also question how the winning entrant will deal with issues such as identity, sense of place and relevance to Montréal’s built environment and its urban diversity? We refer again to context and empathy and ask the question how will the designers integrate this with the functional physical elements of the bus shelter and the competition regulations? Figure 2 illustrates how in 1999 Adshel communicated the relevance of its Richard Meier designed shelter to the surrounding architecture of midtown Manhattan (NY). As highlighted the leading edge of the shelter apes the architectural features of the building it was situated against. This is a superficial reference to locality that has been standard practice in the outdoor media industry in persuading local authorities of the authority of their street furniture designs. We hope to demonstrate that there is a clear argument for developing a strong relationship between locality and design for our street furniture and that the fit of the design really does make a difference to the user.

Figure 2 Adshel/Meier Bus Shelter

As contemporary lives become more stressful so the importance of creating a harmonious urban environment also increases. We believe street furniture should give the idea of being sourced from a well-planned design true to itself rather than to the taste of commissioning bodies. To address this belief, our study will take a phenomenological approach to how users perceive Montréal’s new bus shelters in relation to place. Christopher Tilley’s statement that: “Phenomenology involves the understanding and description of things as they are experienced by a subject” (Tilley, 1994) will be central to this facet of the examination.
Through this paper we attempt to make an assessment of the competition: how the competitors addressed place and identity and how the operation and regulations of the competition stimulated this process. We also assess the extent to which the final design meets the requirements of the public, transport authority and potential suppliers of the equipment. How does the winning competitor seek to capture what the public’s perception and understanding of these artefacts are within the context of experiencing Montréal. Finally, we will question the level of innovation within the designs especially in terms of dealing with the typically challenging urban landscape of Montréal whilst maintaining cohesion to the stated aims of the competition.

3 Context

In context, the competition for the design of new bus stops for Montréal must be discussed with reference to all five design competitions or shûko launched by Réalisons Montréal. It is important to note that the bus shelter completion was part of a greater structured process of stimulating indigenous investment in design and manufacture and generating public interest in good quality design. Réalisons Montréal was set up by Design Montréal in June 2009 and given an investment of $1.2-million over 3 years to run the initial competitions and to promote design awareness within Montréal. Their (Réalisons Montréal) mission as Stephanie Jecrois (2010) states is:

“That we want to promote design and Montréal designers, but also to educate the general public about what is design and how we can have good quality. By doing public event like Design Montréal Open House where citizens can meet designers in there offices to have a better understanding what is the work of designers.”

The five initial design competitions were;

1. The development of moveable street furniture elements for use by festivals – competition launched on June 8th 2009.
2. Redesigning the area around Champ-de-Mars metro station – competition launched on November 3rd 2009.
3. Transformation of the east wall of the Palais de Justice
4. Design of a New Bus shelter – competition launched on September 15th 2009
5. Development of a distinct brand identity for Montréal’s taxis - competition launched on march 10th 2010

The promotion of design competitions as a vehicle to engage with ideas and creation of infrastructure within the built environment was chosen because of ‘their transparency, their educational scope and the quality that they generate’ (Réalisons Montréal, 2008). In relation to quality Lecrois (2010) adds ‘the competitions are set up to evaluate on quality not only price so it simulates designers to make sure what they are proposing is interesting’. The mention of the word transparency is key here as it is integral to the desires of Design Montréal to ‘facilitate access to public commissions both by emerging and existing designers’ (Réalisons Montréal, 2008) which serves to invigorate the local design community. Transparency is also an important factor in public support for good design.
‘In the case of Champ de Mars public conference, we wanted the public to see and interact with the winning team. For a citizen just to see those proposals (drawings and models) sometimes it is not always self-explanatory. You need to have someone to explain. And we want them (the public) to participate, to understand the process because we want them after that to claim for more for good quality (in design). We not only launch competitions, we also want to have an interaction between the public and designers so that they can ask questions and understand the process.

This drive to procure public backing for Design Montréal’s design initiatives, and to educate them in an understanding of what work goes into producing design is an important one. As Andre Desrosiers Consigne Profesional for the competition states

“or most citizens there is still this perception that design is superficial, it raises prices, and produces estranged aesthetic qualities out of the vocabulary of ordinary people. If we say for example the fee or cost to design and develop a family of bus shelters is $100,000 people will react highly negatively to this”

He went on to say

“Even sometimes with the client it is hard in this case STM. They did not perceive at all the (design) work that went into this because they are essential used to choosing a shelter design (that no longer has patents on it) and asking companies to copy it.”

4 Analysis of the competition

The competition was set up so that from the thirty-one entrants who initially participated, five were chosen to go to the second stage which involved proposing an actual design. The five finalists were to work to a brief, and they were given a presentation format in which to submit their designs. The press briefing from Réalisons Montréal (2008) stated

“In the second stage of the competition, the five finalists will develop a concept that meets the STM’s design requirements as well as its safety, accessibility, cleanliness and maintenance, and public-use standards. Each team will receive compensation of $15,000, as stipulated in the competition regulations. The jury’s assessment of the competitors’ concept developments will consider each design’s formal, functional and ecological quality, among other aspects, and how well it matches the technical and commercial criteria.”

Given the hotly contested discussion around free pitching within the design industry as featured regularly in the UK design press (Design Week, 2010) It is important to note here that the five finalists who did produce designs were paid a fee for their time. The finalists’ presentations were judged by a jury, they included two co-chairs and six jurors. The Jury including one of the co-chairs had three members from the client STM, the remainder comprised professional designers, architects, and educators.
As part of the process the finalists were asked to submit costs for their designs. Desrosiers’ role was defined as

- Author of the competition rules.
- Author of the design brief.
- Liaison between the client and the designers.

His role throughout the process was to liaise between the client (identified as the STM) and the designers if any clarification was required. All information resulting from this dialogue was transmitted to all contestants. The conseille professionnel had no voice in the final decision. Desrosiers was also the author of a report to the local government on the legal issues surrounding public procurement and design competitions (Desrosiers, 2009). In which he states

“...The Problem with the shukos is that they are really illegal. In general public procurement requires that you go for the lowest price bidding. Here the notion of the meats system (most economical advantageous tender) does not exist in public procurement, it’s always the cheapest. So if you do a design contest and you have a design winner then what the law says is that essentially that you take that designers concept and you offer it to other designers and the lowest bidder will realise it. Of course this is far from the design culture. So we have been working very hard to get around this until we have the laws changed law is changed.” (Desrosiers, 2010)

On January the 18th 2010 the winning design was unveiled as submitted by the consortium Leblanc, Turcotte and Spooner. The winner’s designs and the runners up were shown on the Réalisons Montréal website. This was done in order to demonstrate the organiser’s commitment to transparency, although there was no direct invitation for the public to participate in any post competition debate.

In interview Tatjana Leblanc of Leblanc, Turcotte and Spooner was asked what had motivated the successful design. She claims to have used a “context sensitive approach” (2010). When asked what were the contexts she replied

“...We must consider how it lives with the other elements around we asked ourselves – should it be revolutionary? We were almost under pressure in terms of saying should it be really screaming, is this really an object whose role is to decorate?” (2010)

The team recognised that the design, in serving all areas and cultural quarters of the city, needed to fit in and not compete visually with its surroundings but

“...at the same time it needs to be somewhat strong enough a visual or architectural statement that people recognise it as an element that has its own identity that is connected to the bus service and the bus company”

This recognition of the role of the shelter in its service to the client was an important factor in the success of the team. In its statement on the competition, Réalisons Montréal states that part of the reason for the Consortium’s success was their ability in terms of “drawing inspiration from the STM’s newly created brand signature” (2010)
Leblanc states

‘…we wanted to improve the quality of the bus stop and by association the quality of the company STM and the services they provide. It (the design) needed to be iconic enough so that it becomes an identity element for the service provider.’

A major context then was to link the transport authority to the equipment by using the STM’s new branding. In a sense encouraging them to not only to consider physical ownership, but also the intellectual (design) ownership of the shelters. This has resonance with the teaming of design and the (now defunct) London Transport Authority (LTA) who had major award winning successes in the late 90s. By working closely with media advertising company Adshel and Kenneth Grange of Pentagram the LTA’s procurement policy became design and quality driven as they took a more active role in design. This eventually led to the LTA forming an in-house design team.

Other contexts recognised by Leblanc were user and place.

“On the other hand we looked at what it is used for, for example it is also used by many to simply hang out as a point to assemble for young people. Tourists would want to know what types of service pass by, and for the bus driver it is a sign a stop sign. As a (bus service) user you want to see which (bus stop) is the closest one. We wanted it to be recognised, today it is barley the case”

In terms of context of place the team suggested that the glass panels of the bus stop could be used to indicate and give information where they were situated in areas of cultural interest, and in festival times temporary vinyl’s could be applied for the same purposes. “We tried to show it in it’s context of use…It’s not just an object it’s an object in the landscape, and I think that is the only reason why we won” (Leblanc, 2010)

The requirements for the bench seating from the STM is quite interesting in terms of who is defined as the public, and the concern for accessibility. In the current design for bus shelters in Montréal the seat is segregated and only has two spaces (see figure 3). The reasons for the physical separation were to prevent vagrants from occupying the seating, a common theme in international urban seating design and implementation.
This specific requirement was repeated in the brief that was issued to the five finalists. Leblanc was opposed to this segregation and her design attempted to illustrate that there was room for more people to use the seating, as it did not feature any separating elements that allowed a greater variety of seating positions. (See figure 4)

In her schemes presented to the jury Leblanc also showed how she had provided seating outside the shelter to cope with user’s demands for more space to sit. By doing this she effectively and intelligently questioned the STM’s position on vagrancy. This subject of access is an interesting one: if such an iconic urban street element as a bus shelter seeks to limit accessibility what does that say to other areas of urban design? In their book People Places, Marcus and Francis comment

“An underlying issue faces the public realm with increasing urgency – namely the question of who comprises the “public” in public space. In plazas, parks, and other
public spaces, there is considerable tension between perceptions of public safety and the comfort of typically middle-class primary users, and civil-liberties arguments for the rights of all members of a community to spend time in the public realm. Around the country, concerns over the presence of the homeless, groups of young people, panhandlers, and other groups deemed undesirable, have lead to designs that intentionally discourage, sitting or lingering.” (1998)

Furthermore, in relation to urban street furniture design they discuss the relationship between desirable and undesirable usage:

“The presence of these two groups (undesirables and the mainstream public) in public space is rarely associated with crime (a common defence). While some may feel offended, embarrassed, or guilty at seeing others less fortunate than themselves in public spaces, designs that specifically aim at eliminating have-nots need to be questioned.”

In on going negotiations with the STM the theme of seat separation has emerged as a discussion point between designer and client. Leblanc comments

“Then they insisted in putting something in the middle (of the seat); initially we thought it was for ergonomic reasons but actually it is to stop people sleeping on it. It is just provoking the debate about the social problem of homeless so of course if it is windy or cold why wouldn’t they use it, it’s a shelter it’s the name of the thing!”

This paper does not seek to comprehensibly answer this debate, but to illustrate the tensions between a socially aware designer and their client. We also point out that since that the design has emerged within a public setting there is, potentially, a greater opportunity for debate around this subject.

In summing up her feelings about the process Leblanc states

“I felt the project would not have been nearly as good if were done (directly) with a manufacturer. It would have right away been a design brief extremely constrained, extremely tailored to what they have already practiced for years.”

She also believed that because the project is in the public eye and the great political and cultural imperatives around the formation of Réalisons Montréal that “they (STM) are in a way obliged to respect it, to stick with it and nurture it”

Leblanc’s and Design Montréal’s enthusiasm for the public competition should be tempered by Desrosiers’ overview when he called for more time to be allotted for judging and debate on the finalist’s schemes.

“Generally the decision is taken in a day. After this it can take a month to announce the result and two months to go to public tender. These are important decisions, all this time spent bureaucracy and a day for a major decision. This to me is lopsided.”

He also was critical of the communication process that the competition allowed between the client and designer
“You are avoiding the discussion that should be going on between the customer and the designer. You can reinstall it afterwards, but it’s harder because the designer has set his mind and the customer has set his mind.”

Here Desrosier is alluding to the lack of engagement so critical in the early days of a discussion between designer and client when concepts and thinking is more dynamic.

5 Conclusion

One of the positives of the competition format was the lack of pre-conditions on background or qualifications that are normally associated with requests for tender RFT. Of the selected finalists, though all accomplished design professionals, none had actually designed this type of street furniture element before. This absence of insistence of a specific track record actually opened out the competition to a both emerging and experienced designer’s methods and ideas. Montréal’s methods here also allow for public dissemination and provide a discourse on urban design and urban place making.

What part outdoor media companies will play in the full-scale implementation of the 400 shelters is not yet in the public domain. The options are for the STM to finance the manufacture, install and maintain the bus shelters, and hiring out the advertising space to an outdoor media company. With an option of building maintenance into that contract. An alternative is to announce a request for tender (RFT) to interested parties (outdoor media companies) to quote for the manufacture, installation and maintenance of the shelters in return for a percentage of the advertising revenue. A disadvantage for the latter is a possible slight loss of control in the manufacturing phase, and the expertise gained on the part of the prototype manufacturer might be lost. The impact of this in terms of time scales and quality should not be underestimated. It must be said that since it is assumed that the manufacture of the 400 will be put out for tender anyway the previous statement might be a mute point. What can be said of this exercise is that overall work of Design Montréal and Réalisation Montréal and the relative transparency that the design competition has been run will have had a positive effect on the citizen’s perception of public procurement and the need for quality design, never a bad thing. That the competition was open without too many onerous pre-qualifications meant that Design Montréal have demonstrated their commitment to emerging designers and developing an expertise in design within the city. The Jury’s bold choice of competition winner has and will pay dividends, as they are undoubtedly a team committed to thoughtful design interventions made from thorough design research. These local designers imagined the successful design with a feel for local and user centred context, this is essential for the integration of this type of design within the urban landscape and the creation of good quality places.

Design Montréal with significant public funding given to Réalisons Montréal is, through its active website, raising public awareness and whetting their appetite for good design whilst also nurturing design talent. In addition, they have government commitment to amending the law to allow competition. Together these elements appear to be working in the right direction and this methodology raises pertinent questions regarding how it might work in other Cities such as Edinburgh who are also developing new transportation systems. In the words of Tatjana Leblanc on the future of Montréal design “we believe it is only the beginning”
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