ICCAUA Proceedings Journal
Proceedings of the international conference of contemporary affairs in architecture and urbanism-ICCAUA
Volume 9 (December 2026), 2610500

Journal homepage: https://journal.iccaua.com/

DOI: https://doi.org/10.38027/ICCAUA2026EN0500

Resilience by Design: Adaptive Urban Strategies for Uncertain Futures

*** [1] Gerd Wetzel**
[1] Department of Architecture, IU International University of Applied Sciences, Stuttgart, Germany
[1] E-mail: gerd.wetzel@iu.org
[1] ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-8081-4884

Received: 23.04.2026
Revised: 21.06.2026
Accepted: 01.07.2026
Available online: 10.07.2026

This article has been selected and peer-reviewed for publication in this journal as part of the 9th International Conference of Contemporary Affairs in Architecture and Urbanism, held on 7–8 May 2026 in Istanbul, Türkiye.

Abstract

Contemporary cities in Europe and the Mediterranean region are increasingly shaped by overlapping uncertainties, including climate change, migration, demographic shifts, and economic volatility. Conventional planning models based on predictability and control are becoming inadequate. This paper proposes an architectural and spatial understanding of urban resilience that bridges theory, historical precedent, and contemporary practice. Rather than defining resilience as a return to stability, it is framed as the capacity of urban environments to adapt, transform, and remain open to uncertainty over time. Drawing on resilience theory, historical examples, and contemporary urban strategies, the paper identifies adaptability, redundancy, and openness as key spatial principles of resilient urban environments. It further argues that resilience should be understood not merely as a technical or managerial concept, but as a spatial and architectural condition with implications for design, planning, governance, and education. By repositioning resilience as a capacity for transformation, the study contributes to discussions on adaptive urban futures.

Keywords: Urban resilience; adaptive urban design; climate change adaptation; spatial intelligence; architectural education; built environment

1. Introduction

Urban environments across Europe and the Mediterranean region are increasingly confronted with complex and overlapping forms of uncertainty. Climate change intensifies extreme weather events and long-term environmental shifts; migration alters demographic structures and spatial demands; economic volatility affects patterns of investment, maintenance, and transformation. These dynamics do not operate independently but intersect within urban space, producing conditions that are difficult to predict and even more difficult to control. As Leichenko (2011) observes, climate change increasingly challenges conventional assumptions of urban stability and long-term predictability.
Conventional planning approaches have largely been based on assumptions of stability, predictability, and linear development. Masterplans, zoning systems, and large-scale infrastructural interventions have often aimed to fix spatial configurations over long periods of time. Under conditions of accelerating change, however, such approaches reveal their limitations. They tend to produce rigid spatial systems that are insufficiently capable of adapting to unforeseen developments.
In response, resilience has emerged as a key concept within urban and architectural discourse. Yet in many cases, resilience is still interpreted in a narrow sense, focusing on technical performance, infrastructural robustness, or the capacity to recover from disruption. While these aspects are important, they risk reducing resilience to a reactive and often technocratic framework.
This paper proposes a broader understanding of resilience as a spatial and architectural capacity. It argues that resilience should not be understood as a return to a stable state, but as the ability of urban environments to adapt, transform, and remain open to uncertainty over time. By connecting theoretical perspectives, historical precedents, and contemporary design strategies, the paper aims to identify spatial principles that can inform resilient urban design.

1.1 Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative and interpretive research approach situated at the intersection of architectural theory, urban history, and design research. Rather than evaluating resilience through quantitative indicators, the paper investigates resilience as a spatial and architectural condition that can be identified across different temporal and spatial scales.
The methodological framework combines three complementary perspectives. First, a theoretical analysis is conducted through the work of Holling (1973), Rossi (1982), Jacobs (1961), Davoudi (2012), and related scholars in resilience and urban theory. These perspectives provide the conceptual basis for understanding resilience as adaptation, continuity, and transformation.

Second, the study examines historical precedents, including the Hagia Sophia in Istanbul and the medina of Marrakesh. These examples are not analysed as isolated monuments but as long-term spatial systems that demonstrate the capacity to accommodate changing cultural, environmental, and social conditions.
Third, contemporary projects and urban strategies are investigated as applied examples of resilient urban transformation. These include the adaptive reuse strategies of Lacaton & Vassal, the Superblocks initiative in Barcelona, the proximity-based urban policies of Paris, and the long-term human-centered planning approach of Copenhagen.
The comparative analysis of theory, historical precedents, and contemporary case studies is used to identify recurring spatial patterns. From this analysis, three key principles are derived: adaptability, redundancy, and openness. These principles subsequently form the conceptual framework through which resilience is discussed in relation to architectural education, urban governance, and future urban development.

2. Resilience as Transformation: The Case of Hagia Sophia

The Hagia Sophia in Istanbul provides a compelling example of resilience understood as transformation. Since its completion in the sixth century under Emperor Justinian I, the building has undergone multiple cycles of destruction, reconstruction, and reinterpretation. It has served as a Byzantine cathedral, an imperial mosque, a museum, and again as a mosque, each phase introducing new meanings and spatial practices.
What is remarkable about the Hagia Sophia is not simply its longevity, but its capacity to maintain spatial coherence across radically different historical contexts. The building has not preserved a single, fixed identity; rather, it has absorbed successive layers of cultural, political, and religious transformation. Its persistence lies in this ability to integrate change without losing its architectural presence.
From a spatial perspective, the Hagia Sophia combines a centralised dome structure with longitudinal spatial sequences, creating a complex and layered interior. This spatial configuration allows for multiple readings and uses, accommodating different ritual practices and symbolic interpretations. The building's resilience is therefore not only historical but also spatial: it is embedded in the way space is organised, articulated, and experienced.
This example challenges a common understanding of resilience as stability or resistance. Instead, it suggests that resilience can be understood as continuity through transformation. The Hagia Sophia demonstrates that architectural systems can remain relevant and meaningful precisely because they are capable of change. In this sense, it operates not only as a historical monument but as a spatial model for adaptive urban environments.

3. Theoretical Framework: Continuity, Complexity, Adaptation

The spatial understanding of resilience outlined above is supported by several strands of urban and architectural theory. Aldo Rossi's concept of the city as a locus of collective memory emphasises the temporal dimension of urban form. For Rossi, cities are shaped by accumulation rather than replacement. Urban elements persist, are reinterpreted, and gain new meanings over time. This continuity does not imply static preservation; rather, it involves a dynamic relationship between permanence and transformation (Rossi, 1982).
Jane Jacobs provides a complementary perspective by focusing on the complexity of urban systems. She describes cities as problems of organised complexity, where multiple variables interact in non-linear ways. Diversity, density, and mixed uses generate conditions for adaptability, enabling cities to respond to changing circumstances. In this view, resilience emerges from the capacity of urban systems to accommodate difference rather than eliminate it (Jacobs, 1961).
The concept of resilience itself has its origins in ecological theory. Holling defines resilience as the capacity of a system to absorb disturbances while maintaining its fundamental structure and relationships (Holling, 1973). Folke (2016) further argues that resilience should be understood as the capacity of social-ecological systems to learn, adapt, and reorganize while maintaining their identity. This definition shifts attention from equilibrium to persistence under changing conditions. Davoudi extends this concept to urban theory, arguing that resilience should be understood as a process of adaptation and transformation rather than recovery (Davoudi, 2012).
Davoudi, Brooks, and Mehmood (2013) further develop this perspective through the concept of evolutionary resilience, arguing that adaptation should not be understood as a return to equilibrium but as an ongoing process of transformation and learning. This perspective reinforces the view of cities as evolving systems that continuously reorganize in response to changing environmental, social, and economic conditions.
Taken together, these theoretical perspectives converge on a common point: cities are not static entities but evolving systems. Resilience is not achieved through control or optimisation alone; it emerges from the ability to engage with change. This provides the conceptual basis for understanding resilience as a spatial and architectural condition.

3.1 Modernist Planning and the Limits of Functional Separation

The spatial strategies described above stand in contrast to the principles of modernist urban planning, particularly those associated with the Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne (CIAM). Modernist planning sought to rationalize the city through functional separation, dividing urban space into distinct zones for living, working, recreation, and circulation, as formalized in the Athens Charter (CIAM, 1933/1943).
While this approach aimed to improve efficiency, hygiene, and living conditions, it also introduced a high degree of spatial rigidity. By separating functions, modernist planning reduced the complexity and overlap that characterize traditional urban environments. Mixed-use conditions were replaced by specialized zones, often resulting in mono-functional districts that lacked adaptability.
Jacobs (1961) strongly criticized this separation, arguing that diversity and mixed uses are essential for urban vitality and resilience. More recent analyses have reinforced this critique, showing that mono-functional zoning increases vulnerability to economic shifts and reduces the capacity of urban systems to adapt (Batty, 2013; Gehl, 2010; Amen et al., 2023; Aziz Amen, 2022).

This separation has had long-term consequences for urban resilience. Residential districts separated from workplaces increase dependency on transportation systems, contributing to environmental and social challenges. Public spaces, often designed as residual elements within zoning frameworks, lack the intensity and diversity of use that support social resilience.
In contrast, traditional urban environments in Europe and the Mediterranean region demonstrate how integration and overlap can enhance adaptability. The comparison highlights that resilience is not only a matter of technical performance, but also of spatial organization. The capacity to accommodate multiple uses and temporal variations is fundamental to resilient urban systems.

3.2 Resilience and Sustainability

The concepts of resilience and sustainability are frequently used together within contemporary architectural and urban discourse. While closely related, they address different dimensions of long-term urban development and should not be understood as interchangeable.
Sustainability has traditionally focused on reducing environmental impact, preserving resources, and maintaining ecological balance. Within architecture and planning, sustainability is often associated with energy efficiency, carbon reduction, resource management, and environmental performance.
Ahern (2011) argues that contemporary urban systems increasingly require a transition from “fail-safe” approaches toward “safe-to-fail” strategies capable of accommodating uncertainty and change.
Resilience, by contrast, focuses on the capacity of systems to respond to uncertainty and changing conditions. Rather than asking how systems can be maintained in equilibrium, resilience asks how they can adapt, reorganize, and transform while remaining functional. In this sense, sustainability is primarily concerned with endurance, whereas resilience is concerned with evolution.
Recent resilience research increasingly emphasizes this distinction. Sharifi (2021) argues that contemporary resilience discourse has expanded beyond disaster recovery toward broader questions of adaptation and systemic transformation. Similarly, Elmqvist et al. (2021) suggest that sustainable urban development requires not only environmental performance but also the capacity of urban systems to transform under changing social, ecological, and economic conditions.
This distinction becomes increasingly important under conditions of climate change, migration, economic instability, and social transformation. Urban systems can be highly sustainable according to environmental metrics while remaining vulnerable to unexpected disruptions. Conversely, resilient systems may incorporate redundancy, flexibility, and reserve capacity that appear inefficient in purely sustainability-based evaluations but become essential under changing conditions.
The relationship between sustainability and resilience should therefore be understood as complementary rather than contradictory. Sustainability seeks to reduce pressures on urban systems, while resilience seeks to increase their adaptive capacity. Together, they provide a broader framework for understanding the long-term performance of the built environment.

4. Spatial Intelligence and Mediterranean Precedents

Historical urban environments in Europe and the Mediterranean region demonstrate how resilience can be embedded in spatial organisation. These environments are characterised by dense fabrics, layered transitions, and climate-responsive forms that support multiple uses over time.
Courtyard typologies are particularly significant in this context. Found across Southern Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East, courtyard houses integrate environmental performance with social and spatial organisation. They provide shaded outdoor space, regulate temperature, and create flexible interior-exterior relationships. Importantly, they can accommodate changing patterns of use without requiring fundamental structural modification.
Similarly, the narrow streets and compact urban fabrics of historic cities create microclimatic conditions that mitigate heat and support social interaction. Threshold spaces - such as arcades, loggias, and semi-public courtyards - mediate between private and public realms, allowing for a range of activities and temporal uses.
These spatial configurations can be understood as forms of spatial intelligence. Spatial intelligence refers to the capacity of architecture to organise space in ways that enable adaptation. It operates through geometry, proportion, materiality, and orientation rather than through technological systems alone. It allows buildings and urban environments to respond to changing conditions without losing coherence.
Christopher Alexander’s notion of “living structures” resonates with this understanding. While his work is not directly framed in terms of resilience, it emphasises the importance of patterns that support long-term usability and adaptability (Alexander, 1979). Historical precedents suggest that such spatial intelligence has been central to urban development long before the term “resilience” entered contemporary discourse.

4.1 Climate, Culture, and Urban Form: The Medina of Marrakesh

The historic medina of Marrakesh provides a further example of resilience embedded in spatial organization. As an urban typology shaped by climatic conditions and socio-cultural practices, the medina demonstrates how urban form can respond to environmental constraints while supporting complex patterns of use.
Characterized by dense building fabric, narrow and shaded streets, and inward-oriented courtyard houses, the medina creates a microclimatic system that mitigates extreme heat. As has been widely observed in studies of traditional settlements, such configurations reduce solar exposure, enhance air circulation, and support passive cooling strategies (Fathy, 1986; Oliver, 2006).

At the same time, the urban structure allows for a high degree of functional integration. Residential, commercial, and social activities are closely interwoven, creating a continuous and adaptive urban environment. Hillier (1996) has shown that such spatial configurations, based on permeability and relational density, contribute to both social interaction and adaptability.

The medina does not rely on rigid zoning or separation of functions. Instead, it operates as a layered and overlapping system, where spaces can be reinterpreted and reused over time. This flexibility enables the urban fabric to adapt to changing economic and social conditions without requiring large-scale restructuring.

In this sense, the medina represents a form of spatial resilience that emerges from the integration of climate, culture, and urban form. It illustrates how architectural and urban systems can evolve incrementally while maintaining coherence and functionality. Rather than being designed for a single purpose, the medina functions as an open framework that accommodates change.

5. Contemporary Adaptive Strategies

Contemporary architectural and urban design practices increasingly engage with principles of adaptability, transformation, and openness under present conditions. Adaptive reuse has become a key strategy for extending the life of existing buildings, reducing resource consumption, and maintaining urban continuity. Rather than demolishing and replacing structures, designers work with existing frameworks, introducing new layers of use and meaning.

The transformation of the Tour Bois-le-Prêtre in Paris by Lacaton & Vassal exemplifies this approach. Instead of demolishing the existing social housing block, the project introduces additional spatial layers in the form of winter gardens and balconies. These interventions expand the usable area of each dwelling, improve environmental performance, and enhance living quality, while preserving the structural and social fabric of the building. The project demonstrates how relatively minimal and targeted interventions can significantly increase spatial capacity and adaptability. Resilience here is not understood as technical performance alone, but as a design strategy that builds upon existing conditions and enables future transformation.

The work of Lacaton and Vassal is particularly significant in this context because it proposes an alternative to demolition-based urban renewal. Their widely cited principle of “never demolish, never remove, always add, transform, and reuse” reflects a broader understanding of resilience as a process of spatial evolution rather than replacement (Lacaton & Vassal, 2017). Instead of maximizing efficiency through reconstruction, their projects demonstrate how existing buildings can become platforms for future adaptation.

On the urban scale, the Superblocks strategy in Barcelona provides a complementary example. By reorganizing the street hierarchy and restricting vehicular traffic within defined urban blocks, large areas of public space are reallocated to pedestrians and community use. These spaces are not defined by a single function; rather, they accommodate a wide range of activities, including social interaction, play, mobility, and environmental adaptation. The Superblocks illustrate how urban space can be reconfigured to remain open, flexible, and responsive to changing needs.

Both examples highlight a shift from replacement to transformation, and from fixed functions to adaptable spatial systems. They demonstrate that resilience can be operationalized through design strategies that support incremental change, spatial flexibility, and long-term usability.

5.1 Strategic Urban Transformation: Paris and Copenhagen

Beyond individual projects, resilience is increasingly addressed at the scale of strategic urban transformation. Cities such as Paris and Copenhagen demonstrate how adaptive principles can be translated into long-term urban policies and governance frameworks.

In Paris, recent urban strategies under Mayor Anne Hidalgo have focused on reducing car dependency, expanding public space, and reconfiguring urban mobility. Interventions such as the pedestrianization of the Seine riverbanks, the introduction of extensive cycling infrastructure, and the concept of the “15-minute city” aim to reorganize the urban fabric around proximity, accessibility, and environmental performance. These strategies reflect a shift from static planning toward adaptive and iterative urban transformation, responding to climate challenges and changing patterns of urban life. As Moreno (2020) argues, proximity-based urban models enhance resilience by reducing spatial fragmentation and increasing local capacity for adaptation.

In contrast to rapid policy shifts, Copenhagen represents a longer-term evolution of urban thinking. Influenced by the work of Jan Gehl, the city has developed a human-centered approach to urban design over several decades. Gehl emphasizes the importance of public space, walkability, and everyday social interaction as the foundation of urban life. As he states, “First life, then spaces, then buildings - the other way around never works” (Gehl, 2010, p. 195). This approach has led to a gradual but consistent transformation of the city, prioritizing pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure and creating high-quality public spaces.

Copenhagen’s development illustrates how resilience can emerge from long-term, incremental planning processes. Rather than relying on large-scale, one-time interventions, the city has continuously adapted its urban environment through small-scale, evidence-based changes. This reflects an understanding of resilience as a cumulative and socially embedded process.

Both Paris and Copenhagen demonstrate that resilient urban strategies operate not only through spatial design but also through governance, policy, and long-term planning. They show how contemporary cities can respond to uncertainty by combining immediate interventions with long-term structural transformation.

5.2 Barcelona: From Structural Transformation to Social Reconfiguration

Barcelona provides a particularly instructive case of urban resilience understood as a long-term process of transformation across multiple phases. The city’s development since the late twentieth century illustrates how different

planning paradigms can build upon one another while responding to changing social, economic, and environmental conditions.

The urban transformation associated with the 1992 Olympic Games, led in part by Oriol Bohigas, established a foundational shift in Barcelona's urban development. Rather than relying on large-scale tabula rasa interventions, the strategy focused on targeted urban projects, the reactivation of public space, and the reconnection of the city with its waterfront. Bohigas advocated for an approach based on "urban acupuncture," where precise interventions could catalyse broader spatial and social transformation (Bohigas, 1999). This phase emphasized spatial continuity, public space, and the incremental improvement of the urban fabric.

While the Olympic transformation has been widely regarded as a successful model of urban regeneration, it also introduced new challenges, including increased tourism pressure and processes of gentrification. These developments highlight that resilience is not a fixed achievement, but an ongoing condition that requires continuous adjustment.

In more recent years, the Superblocks strategy represents a second phase of transformation, addressing contemporary challenges such as climate change, mobility, and social equity. Implemented under the administration of Ada Colau, whose political background is rooted in grassroots housing activism, the strategy reflects a shift toward more socially driven urban policies.

The Superblocks reorganize the existing street grid by limiting vehicular traffic within defined blocks, thereby freeing space for pedestrians, social activities, and environmental functions. Unlike the Olympic projects, which often introduced new urban spaces, the Superblocks operate through the reconfiguration of existing infrastructure. This approach emphasizes reuse, redistribution, and adaptation rather than expansion.

Importantly, the political context of the Superblocks differs from earlier phases of urban transformation. Emerging from movements advocating for housing rights and social justice, the strategy reflects a broader understanding of resilience that includes social and environmental dimensions. It demonstrates how urban design can be used as a tool to address inequality, improve quality of life, and enhance local resilience.

Taken together, the two phases of Barcelona's transformation illustrate how resilient urban strategies evolve over time. The Olympic interventions established a spatial framework centered on public space and connectivity, while the Superblocks build upon this foundation to address contemporary challenges through adaptive reuse and social reconfiguration.

The layered development of Barcelona also resonates with broader understandings of urban resilience. As Vale and Campanella (2005) argue, cities rarely survive through restoration alone; rather, they persist through continuous processes of adaptation, reinterpretation, and transformation. Barcelona demonstrates how resilience can emerge through successive planning paradigms that build upon existing urban structures while responding to new social and environmental challenges.

6. Spatial Principles for Resilient Urban Design

The analysis of theoretical frameworks, historical precedents, and contemporary strategies allows for the identification of three key spatial principles that underpin resilient urban environments.

Adaptability refers to the capacity of spatial systems to accommodate change. This can be achieved through flexible layouts, modular structures, and spatial configurations that allow for different uses over time. Adaptability ensures that buildings and urban spaces remain functional under changing conditions.

Redundancy challenges the emphasis on efficiency that characterises many contemporary design approaches. In resilient systems, redundancy provides alternatives and reserves. It allows systems to continue functioning even when individual components fail or conditions change.

Openness describes the capacity of spatial systems to remain indeterminate in a productive sense. Open systems do not prescribe all future uses; they allow for appropriation and reinterpretation. Openness enables urban environments to respond to unforeseen developments.

These principles do not constitute a fixed methodology. Rather, they provide a conceptual framework for designing under conditions of uncertainty. They shift the focus from final outcomes to ongoing processes.

These principles can also be understood as a counterpoint to the rigid functional separation associated with modernist planning. While adaptability, redundancy, and openness support overlapping uses and temporal flexibility, zoning-based approaches tend to reduce spatial complexity. As Jacobs (1961) and Batty (2013) suggest, resilient urban systems depend on diversity and interaction rather than separation. The comparison indicates that resilient urban design requires reconsideration of spatial integration, moving beyond strictly separated functions toward more hybrid and interconnected systems.

7. From Knowledge to Application: Rethinking Architectural Education

Despite the availability of theoretical insights and practical examples, a gap remains between knowledge and application. Resilience is often addressed as a technical requirement—through energy systems, infrastructure, or risk management—rather than as a core design principle.

Coaffee and Lee (2016) argue that resilience requires planning cultures capable of working with uncertainty rather than attempting to eliminate it through control-based approaches.

This gap is partly rooted in design culture, which continues to prioritize formal resolution and visual coherence. Projects are often evaluated based on their final appearance rather than their capacity to adapt over time. As a result, spatial strategies that support resilience remain underutilized.

Recent research suggests that resilience requires a broader understanding of design and planning processes. Frantzeskaki (2020) argues that urban transformation depends on the capacity to work with uncertainty rather than

attempting to eliminate it. Similarly, Chelleri et al. (2021) emphasize that resilience involves trade-offs across spatial and temporal scales, requiring long-term thinking rather than short-term optimization.

Within architectural education, this implies a shift away from understanding projects as fixed objects. Instead, students should learn to think in terms of systems, scenarios, and processes of transformation. The design project becomes less a final solution and more a framework capable of accommodating change.

This perspective suggests a different role for design itself. Rather than producing complete and stable forms, architecture can be understood as creating capacities for future adaptation. Resilience therefore becomes not an additional layer applied after the design process, but a fundamental design logic embedded from the outset.

Bridging the gap between knowledge and application ultimately requires a shift in architectural culture. The challenge is not a lack of knowledge about resilience, but the difficulty of translating this knowledge into spatial strategies, planning frameworks, and educational models.

8. Multi-Level Implications: From Spatial Strategy to Systemic Transformation

If resilience is understood as a spatial and architectural condition, its implications extend beyond individual projects. At the level of design, it implies a shift from object-based thinking to the design of spatial systems that can evolve over time. Buildings are no longer conceived as finished products but as frameworks for transformation.

In planning, resilience calls for adaptive frameworks rather than rigid masterplans. Such frameworks allow for incremental development and adjustment in response to changing conditions.

In governance, resilience requires flexible and iterative decision-making processes. Policies and regulations must be capable of adapting to new information and emerging challenges.

Economically, resilience challenges the dominance of short-term efficiency. It emphasizes long-term robustness, durability, and the value of redundancy.

At the societal level, resilience depends on the capacity of users to appropriate and transform space. Architecture becomes a platform for participation rather than a fixed solution.

Recent resilience research increasingly supports this multi-scalar perspective. Meerow, Newell, and Stults (2016) argue that urban resilience cannot be reduced to individual sectors or infrastructures but must be understood as an integrated capacity operating across interconnected social, ecological, and spatial systems. Wilkinson (2012) similarly emphasizes that resilience emerges through interactions between social, ecological, institutional, and spatial systems. Likewise, Ribeiro and Gonçalves (2023) describe resilience as a relational framework linking multiple actors, institutions, and scales of intervention.

Elmqvist et al. (2021) similarly emphasize that resilience depends on the ability to coordinate transformation across governance structures, environmental systems, economic processes, and everyday urban life. This perspective moves beyond project-based approaches and reinforces the need for systemic thinking.

These multi-level implications highlight that resilience is not confined to a single discipline. It is a systemic condition that operates across scales and actors.

9. Conclusion and Outlook: Resilience as a Design Paradigm

Resilience is often framed as a response to contemporary crises. However, the analysis presented in this paper suggests that it should be understood more fundamentally as an inherent condition of urban environments.

Historical examples such as the Hagia Sophia and the medina of Marrakesh demonstrate that resilience has long been embedded in spatial organization. These environments were not designed for stability, but for continuity through change. Their capacity to adapt over time is rooted in spatial intelligence, integration, and openness.

In contrast, modernist planning approaches based on functional separation reveal structural limitations under conditions of uncertainty. By reducing complexity and overlap, they diminish the adaptive capacity of urban systems. This highlights that resilience is not only a matter of performance, but of spatial organization and design logic.

Contemporary examples - from adaptive reuse projects to strategic urban transformations in Barcelona, Paris, and Copenhagen - indicate a renewed interest in these principles. They show that resilience can be operationalized through design strategies that prioritize transformation, flexibility, and long-term usability.

The central argument of this paper is therefore not that new solutions need to be invented, but that existing knowledge must be reinterpreted and systematically applied. In this sense, resilience is less a technical innovation than a conceptual reorientation of architectural and urban practice.

Looking forward, this reorientation has implications beyond design and planning. It suggests a broader shift in how urban futures are conceptualized. Rather than aiming for stability and control, urban development must engage with uncertainty as a fundamental condition. This requires accepting incompleteness, embracing change, and designing systems that remain open over time.

Within this context, architecture takes on a different role. It becomes less about defining final forms and more about structuring possibilities. The architect is no longer only a designer of objects, but a mediator of processes, operating across spatial, social, and temporal dimensions.

The contribution of this study lies in repositioning resilience as a spatial and architectural concept rather than a primarily technical or managerial one. By linking resilience theory with historical urban precedents, contemporary design strategies, and architectural education, the paper proposes a framework through which resilience can be understood as an operational design principle. The identification of adaptability, redundancy, and openness as recurring spatial characteristics contributes to ongoing discussions regarding adaptive urban development and the future role of architecture under conditions of uncertainty.

Ultimately, resilience by design can be understood as a paradigm shift: from fixed outcomes to adaptive processes, from separation to integration, and from control to transformation. This shift is not optional. Under conditions of increasing uncertainty, it becomes a central task for architecture, urbanism, and the disciplines that shape the built environment.

References

Ahern, J. (2011). From fail-safe to safe-to-fail: Sustainability and resilience in the new urban world. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 100(4)*, 341–343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2011.02.021

Alexander, C. (1979). *The timeless way of building*. Oxford University Press.

Batty, M. (2013). *The new science of cities.* MIT Press.

Bohigas, O. (1999). *Barcelona: Between the sea and the mountains*. Electa.

Chelleri, L., Waters, J. J., Olazabal, M., & Minucci, G. (2021). Resilience trade-offs: Addressing multiple scales and temporal aspects of urban resilience. *Environment and Urbanization, 33(2),* 385–402. https://doi.org/10.1177/09562478211007870

Coaffee, J., & Lee, P. (2016). *Urban resilience: Planning for risk, crisis and uncertainty.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Davoudi, S. (2012). Resilience: A bridging concept or a dead end? "Reframing" resilience: Challenges for planning theory and practice. *Planning Theory & Practice, 13(2),* 299–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2012.677124

Davoudi, S., Brooks, E., & Mehmood, A. (2013). Evolutionary resilience and strategies for climate adaptation. *Planning Practice & Research, 28(3),* 307–322. https://doi.org/10.1080/02697459.2013.787695

Elmqvist, T., Andersson, E., Frantzeskaki, N., McPhearson, T., Olsson, P., Gaffney, O., Takeuchi, K., & Folke, C. (2021). Sustainability and resilience for transformation in the urban century. Nature Sustainability, 4(1), 72–73. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-00681-2

Fathy, H. (1986). Natural energy and vernacular architecture: Principles and examples with reference to hot arid climates. University of Chicago Press.

Folke, C. (2016). Resilience. Ecology and Society, 21(4), 44. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-09088-210444

Frantzeskaki, N. (2020). Seven lessons for planning nature-based solutions in cities. Environmental Science & Policy, 93, 101–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2018.07.033

Aziz Amen, M. (2022). The effects of buildings' physical characteristics on urban network centrality. Ain Shams Engineering Journal, 13(6), 101765. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asej.2022.101765

Gehl, J. (2010). Cities for people. Island Press.

Hillier, B. (1996). Space is the machine: A configurational theory of architecture. Cambridge University Press.

Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 4, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245

Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities*. Random House.

Lacaton, A., & Vassal, J.-P. (2017). *Freedom of use*. Sternberg Press.

Le Corbusier. (1973). *The Athens Charter*. Grossman Publishers. (Original work published 1943)

Leichenko, R. (2011). Climate change and urban resilience. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 3(3)*, 164–168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2010.12.014

Meerow, S., Newell, J. P., & Stults, M. (2016). Defining urban resilience: A review. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 147*, 38–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2015.11.011

Moreno, C. (2020). The 15-minute city: For a new chrono-urbanism. In C. Moreno, Z. Allam, D. Chabaud, C. Gall, & F. Pratlong (Eds.), *Smart Cities in the Post-Algorithmic Era (pp. 33–44).* Edward Elgar Publishing.

Oliver, P. (2006). *Built to meet needs: Cultural issues in vernacular architecture*. Architectural Press.

Ribeiro, P. J. G., & Gonçalves, L. A. P. J. (2023). Urban resilience: *A conceptual framework. Sustainable Cities and Society, 92, 104481*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2023.104481

Amen, M. A., Afara, A., & Nia, H. A. (2023). Exploring the Link between Street Layout Centrality and Walkability for Sustainable Tourism in Historical Urban Areas. Urban Science, 7(2), 67. https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci7020067

Rossi, A. (1982). *The architecture of the city*. MIT Press.

Sharifi, A. (2021). Urban resilience assessment: Mapping knowledge structure and trends. *Cities, 118*, 103329. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2021.103329

Vale, L. J., & Campanella, T. J. (2005). *The resilient city: How modern cities recover from disaster*. Oxford University Press.

Wilkinson, C. (2012). Social-ecological resilience: Insights and issues for planning theory. *Planning Theory, 11(2), 148–169*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095211426274