

Successful frames for the integration of climate adaptation in urban planning: performance-based or conformance-based?

C.J. Uittenbroek - C.J.Uittenbroek@uu.nl
Prof. T. Spit - T.J.M.Spit@uu.nl
Prof. W. Salet - W.G.M.Salet@uva.nl
Dr. L. Janssen-Jansen - L.B.Janssen-Jansen@uva.nl
Dr. H. Runhaar - H.A.C.Runhaar@uu.nl

Utrecht University | Faculty of Geosciences, Department of Human geography and spatial planning, Post box 80115 | 3508 TC Utrecht | The Netherlands Office: 0031 (0) 30 253 4586 | 0031 (0) 20 525 1436

Key Words: Framing, Urban Planning, Climate Adaptation

Challenges related to climate change call for massive investments in the 21st century city and urges for the integration of climate adaptation in urban planning processes. However, in practice this integration is still very limited (Bulkeley, 2010). Research has shown that an important barrier to integration relates to the differences in the way the stakeholders frame the issues of climate adaptation (Eisenack et al., 2007). Because in many countries, adaptation policies and regulations are still being developed or simply non-existing, actors create a frame for climate adaptation depending on their access to knowledge and political, social and cultural background. Based on this normative frame, actors decide on the extent that climate adaptation needs to be integrated in the planning processes.

The involved actors in these processes not necessarily act from a common frame. On the contrary, they often use very different frames, based on various problem definitions regarding climate change. For example, some actors might consider the implementation of adaptation measures only relevant when compliant to the climate proof norms (conformance) while others may see climate adaptation as a structural issue; requiring more embedded solutions (performance). Besides having conflicting frames, it could also occur actors do share a frame that is too limited with respect to the problem. These situations can complicate the decision-making in the planning process. The aim of this paper is to provide an understanding of the climate adaptation frames actors use in planning processes. Which type of frame stimulates the integration of climate adaptation, how to create these frames and how do the frames relate to performance or conformance?

Performance is explained as including the issue to a feasible extent within the given context opposed to conformance which is just implementing the norms without understanding them (Faludi, 2000). It is hypothesized that frames linking to performance might present fewer barriers and more opportunities for the integration of adaptation measures in urban planning than frames linked to conformance outcomes. Consequently, in order to successfully integrate adaptation measures, actors aiming to integrate climate adaptation should pursue to change or reconstruct the adaptation frame in the decision making process to a more performance-based frame. This paper argues that the implementation of norms without understanding the relevance results in unsuccessful integration.

The paper illustrates this thesis using two Dutch cases related to urban planning that apply different frames towards the integration of climate adaptation. The case studies allow a more in-depth understanding the barriers and opportunities that relate to each frame. The article contributes to planning practice by providing insights on the effects of the use of certain frames concerning climate adaptation and explores specific strategies to promote the integration of climate adaptation in urban planning.

Bulkeley H, 2010, "Cities and the governing of climate change" *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 35(1) 229-253

Eisenack K, Tekken V, Kropp J, 2007, *Stakeholder Perceptions of Climate Change in the Baltic Sea Region*, *Coastline Reports* 8 245-255

Faludi A, 2000, "The performance of spatial planning" *Planning, Practice and Research* 15 299-318.