

Planning Support Tools in Urban Adaptation Practice

McEvoy, S.

DOI

[10.4233/uuid:48b7649c-5062-4c97-bba7-970fc92d7bbf](https://doi.org/10.4233/uuid:48b7649c-5062-4c97-bba7-970fc92d7bbf)

Publication date

2019

Document Version

Final published version

Citation (APA)

McEvoy, S. (2019). *Planning Support Tools in Urban Adaptation Practice*. [Dissertation (TU Delft), Delft University of Technology]. <https://doi.org/10.4233/uuid:48b7649c-5062-4c97-bba7-970fc92d7bbf>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Propositions

accompanying the dissertation

Planning Support Tools in Urban Adaptation Practice

by

Sadie McEvoy

1. In the conceptual phase of design, the process of collaboratively developing plans is more valuable than the plans that are produced. (*This thesis*)
2. Simulated workshops are insufficient substitutes for testing planning support tools in practice. (*This thesis*)
3. The postulate that facilitation is necessary for Planning Support System workshops is not based on sound evidence. (*This thesis*)
4. The distinctions commonly made between the capacities to adapt to climate change in the “developing” and “developed” world, or the “global south” and “global north”, are specious and unhelpful.
5. Current project-based funding structures for urban climate change adaptation are counterproductive to creating resilience and adaptive capacity.
6. It is easier to publish meaningless quantitative results in scientific journals, than to publish meaningful qualitative findings.
7. Practice and society suffer because science values innovating over implementing, testing and evaluating.
8. For increased adoption of Planning Support Systems in the conceptual phase of design, the tools should be generic and flexible, rather than tailored and detailed.
9. The call for Planning Support Systems to be customized to the specific needs of individual cases is inconsistent with the view of planning as a complex, adaptive process.
10. While long a source of pride to the Dutch, tolerance is antithetical to the acceptance of diversity.

These propositions are regarded as opposable and defensible, and have been approved as such by the promotors Prof.dr. J.H. Slinger and Dr.ir. F.H.M. van de Ven.