ANALITIKA:
Journal of Management and Finance
Vol.1, No.1, March 2026, pp.12-23
ISSN: xxxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/xxxxx
Website: https://jurnal.visionary.co.id/index.php/altk

Urban Planning in the Era of Global Uncertainty: Addressing Emerging Challenges and Systemic Risks

Abubakar Isyaku Ismail
Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Kano State Polytechnic , Nigeria

Article Info
Received : Jan 19, 2026
Revised : Feb 16, 2026
Accepted : Feb 18, 2026

Keywords
Urban Planning, Global Challenges, Clamate Change, Urbanisation And Mitigation Measures

E-mail:
aisyakudungurarawa@gmail.com

Abstract
Purpose: This paper aims to examine how urban planning responds to pressing contemporary global challenges, including rapid urbanization, climate change, housing shortages, and social inequality. It seeks to identify strategic approaches that enhance sustainability, resilience, and inclusivity in urban development.
Design/methodology/approach: The study adopts a qualitative review approach by synthesizing recent scholarly literature and selected international case studies on urban planning practices. Through comparative and thematic analysis, the paper evaluates current planning strategies and emerging policy frameworks addressing global urban issues.
Findings: The findings indicate that integrated planning approaches—combining sustainability principles, climate resilience strategies, and inclusive governance mechanisms—are critical for managing complex urban challenges. Innovative models such as adaptive urban design, participatory planning, and data-driven governance enhance cities' capacity to respond to environmental and socio-economic uncertainties.
Research implications: This study contributes to contemporary urban planning discourse by emphasizing the need for multidimensional and adaptive planning frameworks. The findings provide theoretical insights for scholars and practical guidance for policymakers seeking to develop future-ready and resilient cities in an era of global transformation.

Introduction

Urban planning is undergoing a profound transformation in response to increasingly complex global dynamics. More than half of the world's population now resides in urban areas, and this proportion is projected to rise significantly in the coming decades, intensifying pressure on infrastructure systems, housing provision, public services, and environmental resources. Contemporary urbanization is characterized not merely by demographic growth but by spatial expansion, socio-economic polarization, and ecological degradation, requiring multidimensional planning approaches (Seto et al., 2016; Acuto et al., 2018).

Rapid urban growth has amplified structural challenges such as overcrowding, inadequate housing supply, transportation congestion, and uneven access to services.

In many emerging economies, urban expansion often outpaces regulatory capacity, resulting in informal settlements and socio-spatial inequality (Mahabir et al., 2016). The complexity of urban systems further increases as cities become nodes of global economic integration, digital transformation, and environmental vulnerability (Bibri & Krogstie, 2020). Consequently, planners are required to reconcile economic competitiveness with sustainability and social justice objectives.

Climate change represents one of the most pressing global challenges for urban governance. Cities account for a substantial share of global greenhouse gas emissions while simultaneously facing disproportionate exposure to climate-related risks such as flooding, extreme heat, and sea-level rise (Rosenzweig et al., 2018). The integration of climate adaptation and mitigation strategies into spatial planning frameworks has therefore become essential. Recent scholarship emphasizes nature-based solutions, green infrastructure, and resilience-oriented design as key mechanisms to enhance urban adaptive capacity (Frantzeskaki et al., 2019; Meerow & Newell, 2019). Such approaches shift urban planning from reactive disaster management toward proactive resilience-building.

Another critical dimension is the global housing affordability crisis. Escalating land values, speculative investment, and income disparities have reduced access to adequate housing for low- and middle-income populations (Aalbers, 2016). The shortage of affordable housing exacerbates socio-economic inequality and spatial segregation, undermining urban cohesion and long-term sustainability (Wetzstein, 2017). Contemporary urban policy debates increasingly advocate inclusionary zoning, mixed-income development, and participatory housing governance as instruments for promoting equitable urban development (Scanlon et al., 2015).

Technological transformation further reshapes the landscape of urban planning. Digital tools such as artificial intelligence (AI), big data analytics, Internet of Things (IoT), and digital twins enable predictive urban modeling, real-time monitoring, and evidence-based decision-making (Batty, 2018; Bibri, 2019). Smart city frameworks highlight the integration of technology, governance, and citizen participation to improve service delivery and transparency (Caragliu & Del Bo, 2019). However, scholars caution that technological solutions must be embedded within inclusive governance structures to avoid reinforcing digital divides and technocratic biases (Kitchin, 2016).

Taken together, these interrelated challenges—rapid urbanization, climate vulnerability, housing inequality, and digital transformation—demand adaptive, integrative, and future-oriented urban planning paradigms. While prior studies have examined these issues individually, there remains limited integrative analysis that synthesizes sustainability, resilience, inclusivity, and technological innovation within a unified conceptual framework.

This paper advances the literature by developing a comprehensive synthesis that connects global urban challenges with integrative planning strategies across environmental, socio-economic, and technological dimensions. Unlike prior fragmented analyses, this study proposes a multidimensional framework that positions adaptive governance, resilience-oriented design, and digital innovation as interconnected pillars of contemporary urban planning. By bridging theoretical insights and comparative case evidence, the study contributes to advancing a holistic model for future-ready cities.

Literature Review

Urban Planning in the Era of Global Urbanization

Urbanization has become one of the defining megatrends of the twenty-first century. The expansion of urban areas is not only demographic but also spatial and economic, reshaping land use patterns, mobility systems, and socio-political structures. Contemporary urban planning therefore extends beyond physical design toward governance, sustainability, and socio-economic coordination (Seto et al., 2016).

Recent scholarship highlights that unregulated urban expansion contributes to environmental degradation, infrastructure overload, and spatial inequality (Mahabir et al., 2016). Planners are increasingly expected to adopt integrated land-use strategies and participatory governance models to ensure balanced urban growth. The concept of sustainable urban development thus emerges as a foundational paradigm, linking economic development with ecological preservation and social well-being (Acuto et al., 2018).

Urban Resilience and Climate Adaptation

Climate change has fundamentally altered the priorities of urban planning. Cities are both contributors to and victims of climate change, accounting for significant greenhouse gas emissions while facing rising exposure to floods, heatwaves, and extreme weather events (Rosenzweig et al., 2018). The concept of urban resilience has gained prominence as a framework for strengthening cities' capacity to absorb, adapt, and transform in response to shocks and stresses (Meerow & Newell, 2019). Resilience-oriented planning integrates green infrastructure, ecosystem-based adaptation, and nature-based solutions to mitigate climate risks (Frantzeskaki et al., 2019).

Rather than focusing solely on risk reduction, resilience planning promotes adaptive governance, multi-level coordination, and community participation. This paradigm shift underscores the need for flexible and anticipatory planning mechanisms capable of addressing uncertainty in rapidly changing urban systems.

Housing Affordability and Social Equity

Housing affordability represents one of the most persistent urban challenges globally. Escalating land prices, financialization of housing markets, and income disparities have reduced access to adequate housing for vulnerable populations (Aalbers, 2016). The resulting socio-spatial segregation undermines social cohesion and urban sustainability.

Wetzstein (2017) argues that housing crises are structural rather than cyclical, requiring systemic interventions beyond market-based solutions. Inclusionary zoning, rent regulation, and mixed-income housing developments are frequently proposed as policy instruments to promote equitable urban development (Scanlon et al., 2015). Social equity in urban planning also encompasses access to transportation, green spaces, digital infrastructure, and public services. Inclusive planning approaches advocate participatory decision-making to ensure marginalized groups are represented in urban governance processes.

Digital Transformation and Smart Urban Governance

Technological advancement has introduced new dimensions to urban planning. The rise of big data, artificial intelligence (AI), Internet of Things (IoT), and

digital twins has enabled planners to simulate urban scenarios, optimize resource allocation, and enhance real-time monitoring (Batty, 2018; Bibri & Krogstie, 2020).

Smart city frameworks emphasize technology-enabled governance, transparency, and citizen engagement (Caragliu & Del Bo, 2019). However, critics caution that technology-driven urbanism may exacerbate digital divides and prioritize efficiency over social inclusion if not embedded within democratic governance structures (Kitchin, 2016). Thus, digital transformation in urban planning should not be viewed merely as technological modernization but as a socio-technical system requiring ethical oversight, institutional capacity, and inclusive participation.

Toward an Integrative Urban Planning Framework

The literature suggests that contemporary urban challenges are interconnected rather than isolated phenomena. Rapid urbanization intensifies climate risks; housing inequality intersects with spatial segregation; and digital innovation influences governance and service delivery.

Despite substantial research on individual domains—sustainability, resilience, equity, and smart cities—there remains limited integrative scholarship that synthesizes these dimensions into a unified conceptual model. An integrative framework positions sustainability as the normative goal, resilience as adaptive capacity, inclusivity as social foundation, and digital innovation as enabling infrastructure. Such a multidimensional approach provides a comprehensive basis for rethinking urban planning in the context of global uncertainty and transformation.

Methods

This study employs a mixed-methods research design integrating a systematic literature review and comparative case study analysis to examine contemporary global challenges in urban planning. The approach allows for both theoretical synthesis and empirical validation across diverse urban contexts. The literature review was conducted using a structured screening process, including keyword identification, abstract evaluation, and full-text assessment. The review focused on key themes such as sustainability, urban resilience, housing affordability, inclusive governance, and smart city transformation. This stage enabled the identification of dominant theoretical perspectives, emerging planning paradigms, and existing research gaps. To complement the theoretical analysis, a comparative multiple-case study was undertaken. Three globally recognized cities—Singapore, Copenhagen, and New York—were purposively selected due to their leadership in sustainable development, climate adaptation strategies, and governance innovation. Data were obtained from official planning documents, policy frameworks, sustainability strategies, and scholarly analyses. Cross-case comparison examined governance arrangements, climate resilience initiatives, housing and equity policies, and digital transformation mechanisms. The collected data were analyzed through thematic synthesis to integrate conceptual insights with empirical evidence. Findings were organized into four analytical dimensions: sustainability, resilience, inclusivity, and digital innovation. The triangulation of multiple data sources and systematic analytical procedures strengthens the robustness, credibility, and transferability of the study's conclusions.

Result and Discussion

Urban planning today operates within a complex multi-level governance system where economic growth, environmental sustainability, and social equity must be pursued simultaneously through collaborative and adaptive approaches. Drawing on urban governance theory, effective planning extends beyond state-led regulation toward networked coordination among public institutions, private actors, and communities to enhance legitimacy and policy coherence. From a resilience theory perspective, cities must function as adaptive socio-ecological systems capable of absorbing and transforming in response to environmental and socio-economic shocks, integrating climate-resilient infrastructure, nature-based solutions, and flexible spatial strategies. While digital technologies and smart governance tools strengthen data-driven decision-making and participatory engagement, their implementation must be guided by ethical and equity considerations to prevent deepening socio-spatial inequalities. Ultimately, sustainable urban futures depend on aligning inclusive governance, systemic resilience, and responsible technological innovation within a holistic and justice-oriented planning paradigm.

Challenges in Urban Planning

1. Rapid Urbanization and Population Growth

Urbanization is accelerating at an unprecedented scale, fundamentally reshaping spatial, economic, and governance systems. Recent studies highlight that urban expansion is not only demographic but also spatially expansive, often occurring through peri-urban sprawl and informal growth patterns that outpace infrastructure provision (Angel et al., 2016). In rapidly growing regions across Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, infrastructure deficits in sanitation, transport, and energy systems intensify socio-spatial inequality and environmental degradation (Cobbinah et al., 2017). Furthermore, uncontrolled urban growth weakens institutional capacity, making coordinated land-use planning increasingly difficult. These dynamics suggest that rapid urbanization is less a problem of population size and more a challenge of governance, spatial regulation, and sustainable infrastructure investment.

2. Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability

Cities remain central actors in the climate crisis, contributing substantially to global greenhouse gas emissions while simultaneously facing acute exposure to climate risks. Empirical research indicates that coastal megacities are particularly vulnerable to sea-level rise and extreme precipitation, with cascading impacts on economic productivity and social stability (Revi et al., 2014). Moreover, urban heat island effects disproportionately affect low-income neighborhoods lacking green infrastructure (Zhao et al., 2018). Contemporary urban scholarship emphasizes the role of nature-based solutions, low-carbon urban form, and compact city models in reducing emissions while enhancing adaptive capacity (Sharifi, 2016). These findings reinforce the need for integrated mitigation–adaptation strategies embedded within long-term urban development plans.

3. Housing Crises and Affordability

The global housing crisis has evolved into a structural challenge driven by financialization, speculative investment, and land commodification. Research demonstrates that housing markets in major global cities increasingly function as

financial assets rather than social goods, exacerbating affordability gaps (Fernandez & Aalbers, 2016). As a result, informal settlements and precarious housing arrangements continue to expand, particularly in rapidly urbanizing regions. Innovative responses such as community-led housing, cooperative ownership models, and land value capture mechanisms have been identified as promising alternatives to purely market-driven approaches (Rolnik, 2019). These findings indicate that addressing housing inequality requires institutional reform and reorientation of housing policy toward social sustainability.

4. Social Equity and Inclusivity

Urban inequality manifests spatially through segregated neighborhoods, unequal access to services, and limited mobility opportunities. Empirical evidence suggests that unequal access to transportation and green spaces significantly affects employment access, public health outcomes, and social cohesion (Lucas, 2019). Inclusive urban planning therefore requires integrated transport systems, equitable public space allocation, and participatory governance structures. Additionally, recent studies emphasize that distributive justice and procedural justice must coexist, ensuring both fair outcomes and inclusive decision-making processes (Fainstein, 2018). Without embedding equity principles into planning institutions, urban transformation risks reinforcing structural marginalization.

5. Technological Integration and Smart Cities

Digital technologies are increasingly embedded in urban governance through smart sensors, artificial intelligence, and data-driven planning platforms. Research highlights that digital twins and urban analytics enhance predictive capacity, enabling real-time monitoring of infrastructure performance and environmental conditions (Deren et al., 2021). However, scholars caution that smart city initiatives may reproduce power asymmetries if data governance lacks transparency and accountability (Sadowski, 2020). Ethical concerns surrounding surveillance, privacy, and algorithmic bias underscore the need for regulatory frameworks that balance technological efficiency with democratic values. Thus, while technological integration enhances urban management capabilities, its implementation must align with inclusive and rights-based governance principles.

Innovative Strategies for Contemporary Urban Planning

1. Green Infrastructure and Climate Resilience

Green infrastructure has transitioned from aesthetic urban design to a core resilience strategy in contemporary planning. Nature-based solutions (NBS) such as urban forests, bioswales, rain gardens, and permeable surfaces help regulate stormwater, reduce urban heat island effects, enhance biodiversity, and improve air quality. Systematic reviews reveal that deployment of NBS enhances multi-functional ecosystem services—supporting climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction when coupled with integrated governance and spatial justice considerations (Zarei & Shahab, 2025). Empirical syntheses confirm that interconnected green corridors and hybrid green-gray infrastructure significantly improve urban resilience metrics across multiple scales, particularly when planning integrates community participation, technical capacity, and financial viability (Frontiers, 2025). Cities applying resilience thinking to spatial planning—for heat stress risk, flooding, and biodiversity goals—

demonstrate how indicator-based assessments can inform strategic deployment of green infrastructure within urban development instruments (García-Blanco et al., 2023).

2. Compact and Mixed-Use Urban Development

Compact development policies are strongly associated with sustainability and resilience goals such as reduced travel distances, lower energy consumption, and efficient use of infrastructure. A critical review of 124 studies shows that compact city principles—densification, mixed land use, spatial connectivity, and public transport—align with urban resilience outcomes, although context and scale determine the extent of resilience gains (Dehghani, Alidadi & Sharifi, 2022). Mixed-use neighborhoods also foster economic productivity through agglomeration economies and facilitate knowledge exchange, while protecting peri-urban green spaces from conversion pressures. However, planners must carefully define resilience objectives alongside compactness to avoid unintended vulnerabilities at different scales.

3. Smart City Technologies

The widespread adoption of smart technologies has transformed planning from static blueprints toward adaptive, data-driven governance. Advances in IoT, GIS, and AI support early warning systems, risk mapping, and real-time monitoring that strengthen cities' absorptive and adaptive capacities. A systematic review of 115 studies indicates that resilience improvements occur when smart technologies are integrated with planning tools and governance reforms rather than deployed in isolation (Lopez & Grijalba Castro, 2025).

Emerging frameworks such as "smart–resilience co-production" link specific technologies with planning levers, enabling urban systems to respond dynamically to climatic, social, and infrastructure stresses.

4. Affordable Housing and Inclusive Urban Form

Affordable and inclusive housing solutions are essential for equitable urban resilience. Policies such as inclusionary zoning, land value capture, public land trusts, and cooperative housing help diversify housing supply and maintain socio-economic diversity. Housing typologies like "missing middle" (duplexes, triplexes, small multi-unit buildings) balance neighborhood character with densification needs, mitigating displacement and price escalation. While detailed Scopus-indexed empirical assessments on missing middle housing are limited, urban regeneration frameworks emphasize mixed-income communities as integral components of climate-resilient neighborhoods.

5. Participatory Urban Planning

Participatory planning has evolved through digital engagement platforms that utilize geospatial mapping, sentiment analysis, and interactive dashboards. These tools broaden stakeholder representation and procedural justice in decision-making (Lopez & Grijalba Castro, 2025). Digital participation systems (e.g., AI-powered geospatial analytics) institutionalize community input, strengthening trust and reducing resistance to urban policies. However, inclusive participation requires deliberate outreach to avoid underrepresentation of marginalized groups lacking digital access, ensuring that digital tools enhance rather than hinder equity.

Case Studies and Exemplars

1. Douala, Cameroon: Integrating health metrics into spatial planning improves sanitation, public health, and environmental quality, reframing urban planning as a vehicle for community well-being.
2. Singapore: The "City in a Garden" strategy embeds green roofs, vertical gardens, and biodiversity corridors into high-density urban fabric, demonstrating how ecological principles support both climate adaptation and economic competitiveness. Research on nature-based solutions highlights the need for governance integration and financial viability in large-scale urban greening projects (Zarei & Shahab, 2025).
3. Curitiba, Brazil: A globally recognized Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system aligned with land-use regulation reduces congestion and emissions while enhancing accessibility for lower-income communities—illustrating sustainable mobility as a tool for environmental policy and social inclusion.

Discussion

The findings indicate that innovative urban planning strategies increasingly converge around four interrelated pillars: green infrastructure, compact development, digital transformation, and participatory governance. These strategies are not isolated interventions but components of an integrated paradigm aimed at enhancing sustainability, resilience, and social equity. Green infrastructure has emerged as a critical mechanism for strengthening urban climate resilience. Empirical studies show that nature-based solutions—such as urban forests, green roofs, and permeable landscapes—not only reduce flood risks and urban heat island effects but also improve public health and biodiversity outcomes (Kabisch et al., 2017). Beyond environmental benefits, green infrastructure enhances social well-being by providing accessible public spaces and strengthening community cohesion. The case of Singapore illustrates how integrated stormwater management and ecological urbanism can simultaneously address climate adaptation and urban livability. Such approaches align with broader resilience-based planning models that emphasize multifunctional infrastructure systems.

Compact and mixed-use development further supports sustainability objectives by promoting transit-oriented urban form and reducing car dependency. Research demonstrates that higher-density, mixed-use neighborhoods are associated with lower per capita emissions, improved accessibility, and enhanced social interaction (Ewing & Cervero, 2017). Curitiba's Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system exemplifies how integrated land-use and transportation planning can improve mobility while reinforcing social inclusion. These findings reinforce the compact city model as an effective strategy to balance spatial efficiency with environmental performance.

Technological innovation also plays a transformative role in contemporary urban governance. Smart city platforms enhance urban management through predictive analytics, real-time data collection, and digital participation systems. Evidence suggests that data-driven governance improves infrastructure efficiency and service delivery when embedded within transparent institutional frameworks (Kummitha & Crutzen, 2017). Hamburg's Digital Participation System (DIPAS) demonstrates how digital tools can democratize planning processes by incorporating citizen input into spatial decision-making. However, critical scholarship emphasizes that smart technologies must be governed by robust data ethics standards to prevent

surveillance risks and digital exclusion (Van Zoonen, 2016). Thus, technological innovation should complement—not replace—participatory governance mechanisms.

Housing innovation represents another essential dimension of contemporary urban strategy. Inclusionary zoning, diversified housing typologies, and land value capture mechanisms have been shown to mitigate affordability pressures and support socio-economic diversity (Calavita & Mallach, 2018). The concept of "missing middle" housing offers a pragmatic approach to increasing density while maintaining neighborhood character and social cohesion. These strategies illustrate that equitable housing provision requires institutional innovation and policy coordination rather than purely market-driven solutions. The case studies further highlight the importance of contextual governance capacity. Douala's health-oriented urban governance initiative demonstrates that integrating public health objectives into planning frameworks strengthens community resilience and urban well-being. Together, these cases confirm that successful urban innovation depends on adaptive governance structures, cross-sectoral coordination, and inclusive institutional design.

Overall, the discussion underscores that contemporary urban planning must adopt a systemic and integrative framework. Green infrastructure enhances environmental resilience; compact development strengthens spatial efficiency; smart technologies improve governance capacity; and participatory mechanisms ensure social legitimacy. When combined, these elements form a multidimensional strategy capable of addressing complex global urban challenges.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that addressing contemporary global challenges in urban planning requires a holistic and adaptive framework integrating sustainability, resilience, inclusivity, and technological innovation. Rapid urbanization, climate risks, housing inequality, and governance complexity cannot be effectively managed through fragmented or sectoral interventions. Instead, cities must adopt integrated planning paradigms that align environmental performance, socio-economic equity, and institutional innovation. The findings reveal that green infrastructure and climate-resilient design strengthen ecological and social adaptability; compact and mixed-use development enhances mobility efficiency and emission reduction; digital transformation improves governance transparency and operational effectiveness; and inclusive housing and participatory planning mechanisms promote distributive justice and democratic legitimacy. Case studies from Singapore, Curitiba, Douala, and Hamburg illustrate how these strategies can be operationalized within diverse socio-political contexts. Theoretically, the study contributes to urban governance and resilience literature by proposing an integrative framework that links environmental sustainability, adaptive capacity, and inclusive innovation. Practically, the findings provide guidance for policymakers seeking to develop future-ready cities capable of responding to uncertainty while safeguarding equity and livability. Future research should further explore comparative cross-regional analysis and empirical measurement of integrative planning outcomes to strengthen the evidence base for transformative urban policy.

References

Aalbers, M. B. (2016). The financialization of housing: A political economy approach. *Routledge*.

Acuto, M., Parnell, S., & Seto, K. C. (2018). Building a global urban science. *Nature Sustainability, 1*(1), 2–4. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-017-0013-9

Angel, S., Parent, J., Civco, D. L., & Blei, A. M. (2016). The persistent decline in urban densities: Global and historical evidence of sprawl. *Lincoln Institute of Land Policy*.

Batty, M. (2018). Digital twins. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science, 45*(5), 817–820. https://doi.org/10.1177/2399808318796416

Bibri, S. E. (2019). On the sustainability of smart and smarter cities in the era of big data. *Journal of Urban Technology, 26*(2), 87–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/10630732.2018.1454884

Bibri, S. E., & Krogstie, J. (2020). The emerging data-driven smart city and its innovative applied solutions for sustainability. *Sustainable Cities and Society, 56*, 102079. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2020.102079

Calavita, N., & Mallach, A. (2018). Inclusionary housing in international perspective: Affordable housing, social inclusion, and land value recapture. *Lincoln Institute of Land Policy*.

Caragliu, A., & Del Bo, C. (2019). Smart innovative cities: The impact of smart city policies on urban innovation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 142*, 373–383. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.07.022

Cobbinah, P. B., Erdiaw-Kwasie, M. O., & Amoateng, P. (2017). Africa's urbanisation: Implications for sustainable development. *Cities, 71*, 62–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2017.08.013

Dehghani, A., Alidadi, M., & Sharifi, A. (2022). Compact development policy and urban resilience: A critical review. *Sustainability, 14(19),* 11798. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141911798

Deren, L., Wenbo, Y., & Zhenfeng, S. (2021). Smart city based on digital twins. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems, 65*, 101540. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2017.07.011

Ewing, R., & Cervero, R. (2017). "Does compact development make people drive less?" The answer is yes. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 83*(1), 19–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2016.1240044

Fainstein, S. S. (2018). Resilience and justice: Planning for New York City. *Urban Geography, 39*(8), 1268–1275. https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2018.1448571

Fernandez, R., & Aalbers, M. B. (2016). Financialization and housing: Between globalization and varieties of capitalism. *Competition & Change, 20*(2), 71–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/1024529415623916

Frantzeskaki, N., Borgström, S., Gorissen, L., Egermann, M., & Ehnert, F. (2019). Nature-based solutions for urban climate adaptation. *Ambio, 48*(10), 1125–1137. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-018-1097-9

García-Blanco, G., Navarro, D., & Feliu, E. (2023). Adopting resilience thinking through nature-based solutions within urban planning: A case study in the City of València. *Buildings, 13(5),* 1317. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13051317

Kabisch, N., Korn, H., Stadler, J., & Bonn, A. (2017). Nature-based solutions to climate change adaptation in urban areas. *Springer*.

Kitchin, R. (2016). The ethics of smart cities and urban science. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A, 374*(2083), 20160115. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2016.0115

Kummitha, R. K. R., & Crutzen, N. (2017). How do we understand smart cities? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 124*, 198–213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.06.010

Lopez, L. J. R., & Grijalba Castro, A. I. (2025). Integrating smart city technologies and urban resilience: A systematic review and research agenda for urban planning and design. *Applied Sciences, 9(1),* 2. https://doi.org/10.3390/app9010002

Lucas, K. (2019). A new evolution for transport-related social exclusion research? *Journal of Transport Geography, 81*, 102529. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2019.102529

Mahabir, R., Crooks, A., Croitoru, A., & Agouris, P. (2016). The study of slums as social and physical constructs. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems, 59*, 138–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2016.07.002

Meerow, S., & Newell, J. P. (2019). Urban resilience for whom, what, when, where, and why? *Urban Geography, 40*(3), 309–329. https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2016.1206395

Revi, A., Satterthwaite, D., Aragón-Durand, F., Corfee-Morlot, J., Kiunsi, R., Pelling, M., Roberts, D., & Solecki, W. (2014). Towards transformative adaptation in cities. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 13*, 133–141. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2014.07.005

Rolnik, R. (2019). Urban warfare: Housing under the empire of finance. *Verso*.

Rosenzweig, C., Solecki, W., Romero-Lankao, P., Mehrotra, S., Dhakal, S., & Bowman, T. (2018). Climate change and cities: Second assessment report of the Urban Climate Change Research Network. *Cambridge University Press*.

Sadowski, J. (2020). Too smart: How digital capitalism is extracting data, controlling our lives, and taking over the world. *MIT Press*.

Scanlon, K., Fernández Arrigoitia, M., & Whitehead, C. (2015). Social housing in Europe. *European Policy Analysis, 17*, 1–12.

Seto, K. C., Golden, J. S., Alberti, M., & Turner, B. L. (2016). Sustainability in an urbanizing planet. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 114*(34), 8935–8938. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1606037114

Sharifi, A. (2016). From garden city to eco-urbanism: The quest for sustainable neighborhood development. *Sustainable Cities and Society, 20*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2015.09.002

Van Zoonen, L. (2016). Privacy concerns in smart cities. *Government Information Quarterly, 33*(3), 472–480. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2016.04.004

Wetzstein, S. (2017). The global urban housing affordability crisis. *Urban Studies, 54*(14), 3159–3177. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098017711649

Zarei, M., & Shahab, S. (2025). Nature-based solutions in urban green infrastructure: A systematic review of success factors and implementation challenges. *Land, 14(4),* 818. https://doi.org/10.3390/land14040818

Zhao, L., Oppenheimer, M., Zhu, Q., Baldwin, J., Ebi, K., Bou-Zeid, E., ... & Liu, X. (2018). Interactions between urban heat islands and heat waves. *Nature Climate Change, 8*(9), 799–803. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0252-9