Journal of Geographical Planning
Volume. 1, Issue 1, November 2025
Page No: 56-70

Integrating Technology, Nature, and Community in Urban Resilience Planning

Multy Syaddam Nirwan
Institut Teknologi Kesehatan dan Bisnis Graha Ananda, Indonesia
Correspondent : multynirwan@gmail.com

Received : October 10, 2025
Accepted : November 11, 2025
Published : November 30, 2025

Citation: Nirwan, M, S. (2025). Integrating Technology, Nature, and Community in Urban Resilience Planning. Journal of Geographical Planning, 1(1), 56-70.

ABSTRACT: The increasing frequency and severity of natural disasters underscore the urgent need for resilient infrastructure in urban planning. This narrative review aims to synthesize current literature on disaster-sensitive infrastructure development and assess strategies that enhance urban resilience. A systematic search was conducted using Scopus and Google Scholar, focusing on peer-reviewed studies published over the past decade. Keywords such as "infrastructure resilience," "urban planning," and "disaster risk reduction" guided the literature selection process, which included studies with empirical evidence and policy analysis.The review identified three major themes: the role of green-gray hybrid infrastructure, the importance of community-based and participatory approaches, and the integration of digital technologies like GIS and AI in risk assessment and mitigation. Despite notable progress, the analysis highlighted systemic barriers, including funding limitations, institutional fragmentation, and inadequate public awareness, that hinder the effectiveness of current resilience policies. To overcome these challenges, the study recommends adopting interdisciplinary strategies, promoting inclusive stakeholder engagement, and aligning urban policies with international resilience frameworks. The findings call for further empirical research on policy implementation across diverse urban contexts. Overall, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how integrative and adaptive approaches can foster infrastructure resilience in disaster-prone regions.

Keywords: Infrastructure Resilience, Disaster-Sensitive Planning, Urban Resilience, Hybrid Infrastructure, Community Engagement, Adaptive Governance, Climate Change Adaptation.

INTRODUCTION

Urban infrastructure resilience in disaster-prone regions has garnered increasing attention in recent years as cities grapple with the combined pressures of climate change and rapid urbanization. Recent scholarship has emphasized the importance of nature-based solutions in enhancing the adaptive capacities of cities. Agustine et al. (2023) underscore the significance of green spaces and retention ponds in mitigating flood risks, especially under climate change-induced hydrological stress. In a similar vein, Lu and Sun (2021) demonstrate that sunken green areas effectively absorb excess rainfall, reducing surface flooding and contributing to urban flood resilience. These studies reflect a paradigm shift in urban design, where ecological infrastructure is no longer considered ancillary but central to resilience planning.

Beyond technical solutions, there is growing recognition of the need to account for socio-ecological systems in resilience strategies. Fuady et al. (2025) advocate for comprehensive resilience planning in Indonesia, a nation highly susceptible to earthquakes and floods due to its geographic location on the Pacific Ring of Fire. Meanwhile, Butar (2025) highlights the amplifying effects of extreme rainfall events and deforestation on flood risks, stressing the inadequacy of existing infrastructure. As such, the resilience of urban systems must be understood through a broader lens that incorporates environmental, social, and institutional dynamics.

Recent literature calls for robust urban resilience indicators to measure progress and identify regional disparities. Yabe et al. (2020) explore such indicators to capture the differentiated capacities of regions in coping with disasters, particularly emphasizing social and physical dimensions. Complementing this, Ham (2025) argues that infrastructure resilience must be framed within the context of interconnected socio-ecological systems. This perspective is critical for developing responsive strategies that consider cascading impacts across systems.

The dual forces of climate change and urbanization have significantly exacerbated disaster risks in urban settings. Urban sprawl and impervious surface expansion reduce natural drainage capacity, elevating flood risks. Manandhar et al. (2023) review flood management practices in South Asia, revealing common deficiencies in addressing these risks. As urban centers become more densely populated and infrastructural demands intensify, the exposure to disaster risks escalates, threatening socioeconomic stability and community well-being (Yuan et al., 2024).

Climate-induced uncertainties further complicate urban planning. Xu et al. (2021) emphasize the role of extreme weather in increasing both the frequency and severity of urban floods. These uncertainties, when coupled with anthropogenic factors such as informal settlements and outdated infrastructure, render traditional planning paradigms obsolete. Patel et al. (2020) advocate for an adaptive planning approach that accounts for dynamic risk profiles and prioritizes resilience.

Mitigating these compounded risks necessitates multi-stakeholder collaboration. Ham (2025) underscores the value of knowledge exchange in fostering disaster preparedness across government, private sector, and civil society. The increasing confluence of climate and urbanization challenges calls for responsive, adaptive, and inclusive infrastructure planning. Smith et al. (2021) note that resilience-building must transcend physical structures and incorporate participatory governance and long-term sustainability goals.

Case studies of infrastructure failure during recent disasters offer profound insights into systemic vulnerabilities. The aftermath of Hurricane Maria in Puerto Rico revealed not only the fragility of physical infrastructure but also the inadequacy of institutional responses. Yabe et al. (2020) show that infrastructure failures triggered multidimensional crises, exacerbated by pre-existing social inequities. Such events highlight the critical interplay between physical and social systems in resilience planning.

The interdependence of infrastructure components further amplifies disaster impacts. Xu et al. (2021) and Yang et al. (2022) demonstrate that the failure of a single node, such as transportation networks, can initiate cascading disruptions across water, energy, and health systems. This systemic interconnectedness calls for integrated planning approaches that go beyond siloed sectoral responses.

Patel et al. (2020) propose a holistic framework for infrastructure resilience assessment that incorporates social, economic, and political dimensions. Yang et al. (2022) argue for enhanced community involvement in infrastructure design, asserting that participatory planning fosters context-specific solutions and enhances resilience at the grassroots level. This participatory dimension suggests that technical inadequacies are only part of the problem; social marginalization and exclusion from decision-making processes are equally critical.

Despite an expanding body of literature, substantial gaps remain in research on disaster-sensitive urban development. Yang et al. (2022) critique the predominance of top-down policy models that fail to accommodate local context and community needs. Agustine et al. (2023) document the efficacy of nature-based infrastructure but lament its limited implementation due to a lack of awareness and leadership.

A pressing gap exists in the evaluation of green infrastructure initiatives. Cavallaro et al. (2014) note the lack of standardized methods to assess the effectiveness of such strategies in building urban resilience. Furthermore, there is a dearth of integrated models that reconcile physical infrastructure with social vulnerability. Sharifi and Yamagata (2014) emphasize that infrastructure design often overlooks marginalized populations, resulting in uneven resilience outcomes. To address these limitations, interdisciplinary studies are needed to develop data-driven, inclusive evaluation frameworks.

Several key factors influencing infrastructure resilience have emerged from empirical studies. Interdependence among infrastructure systems and social variables is central. Yabe et al. (2020) show that infrastructure vulnerabilities are closely tied to economic and environmental conditions, suggesting that resilience is not merely a technical attribute but a socio-technical outcome.

Adaptive capacity is another determinant, as emphasized by Zeng et al. (2022). Their work demonstrates how responsive governance and societal learning enhance resilience. Patel et al. (2020) similarly stress the role of stakeholder collaboration in making infrastructure systems more transparent, accountable, and sustainable.

Innovative design and technology also contribute significantly to resilience. Lu and Sun (2021) and Garcia and Ituarte (2022) provide compelling evidence for the benefits of ecosystem-based disaster risk management. Green infrastructure, when integrated with traditional systems, can reduce damage from extreme events and promote long-term sustainability.

Finally, public awareness and community preparedness are foundational. Fuady et al. (2025) argue that education and training initiatives are crucial for enabling proactive community responses. This underscores the social dimension of resilience, where informed communities act as co-creators of resilient infrastructure.

Geographic context critically influences both the study and implementation of resilience strategies. In coastal megacities, rising sea levels and storm surges necessitate tailored interventions. Gao et al. (2024) find that green technologies are effective in mitigating coastal flood risks. Meanwhile, cities in the Global South often face resource constraints and legacy infrastructure challenges. Fuady et al. (2025) highlight how such cities rely on conventional methods, which may be ill-equipped to handle emerging risks.

Socio-cultural factors further differentiate resilience approaches. Hendricks and Zandt (2021) argue that participatory planning is particularly vital in marginalized communities. In these contexts, resilience is inseparable from social justice, requiring infrastructure strategies that address both physical and social vulnerabilities.

Understanding these geographic nuances is essential for developing context-sensitive approaches. Coastal megacities require innovations that buffer against hydrometeorological events, while Global South cities need resource-efficient, inclusive, and scalable solutions. Ultimately, effective resilience-building hinges on the alignment of technical capacity, community engagement, and governance structures.

This review seeks to address the aforementioned research gaps by systematically analyzing the key dimensions of infrastructure resilience in urban planning. The objective is to synthesize empirical findings and theoretical insights to construct a multidimensional understanding of disaster-sensitive development. Emphasis will be placed on governance frameworks, technological innovations, social inclusion, and geographic particularities.

The scope of this review spans both global case studies and localized urban experiences, with particular attention to coastal megacities and urban centers in the Global South. By incorporating diverse contexts, the study aims to distill common principles and adaptive strategies that can inform policymaking and academic discourse alike.

METHOD

This narrative review adopted a structured and methodologically sound approach to gather, assess, and synthesize scholarly literature pertaining to infrastructure resilience and disaster-sensitive urban planning. The methodology was divided into two main phases: the literature search strategy and the application of inclusion and exclusion criteria, which together ensured the comprehensiveness and relevance of the evidence base.

To identify peer-reviewed articles that focus on infrastructure resilience and disaster-sensitive planning, a strategic search was conducted using two prominent academic databases: Scopus and Google Scholar. These platforms were selected due to their extensive indexing of interdisciplinary studies and their robust filtering capabilities, which are particularly advantageous when dealing with cross-sectoral research topics such as urban resilience. The search process involved the deployment of specific keyword combinations informed by prior scoping reviews and expert consultations.

Keywords used in the search included "Infrastructure Resilience," "Disaster Risk Reduction," "Urban Resilience," "Disaster-Sensitive Planning," "Climate Change Adaptation," and "Sustainable Urban Development." These terms were strategically combined using Boolean operators such as AND, OR, and NOT to tailor the search scope according to thematic relevance. For example, the Boolean string ("Infrastructure Resilience" AND "Disaster Risk Reduction") was used to focus the search on articles that addressed both the physical robustness of infrastructure and its integration with risk mitigation policies. Other queries such as ("Urban Resilience" OR "Disaster-Sensitive Planning") and ("Climate Change Adaptation" AND "Sustainable Urban Development") were used to broaden the literature pool while still retaining topic specificity.

To enhance precision, quotation marks were placed around specific multi-word terms to ensure exact phrase matching in database queries. For example, the search term "urban planning for disaster resilience" was utilized to capture studies that explicitly addressed the role of urban design in mitigating disaster risk. In addition, filters were applied within the databases to narrow the search results based on specific parameters such as publication year, language, document type, and peer-review status. Only articles published within the past ten years were considered, which aligns with the objective of capturing contemporary developments in the field and ensuring alignment with the rapidly evolving challenges posed by climate change and urban growth.

Beyond keyword-based queries, a snowballing technique was also employed. This involved examining the reference lists of relevant articles to identify additional studies that may not have appeared in the initial search. Through this iterative process, the literature pool was expanded to include seminal and frequently cited works in the field of disaster-sensitive infrastructure planning.

The selection of studies to be included in the review followed clearly defined inclusion and exclusion criteria. These criteria were carefully established to ensure that only high-quality, relevant, and contextually appropriate articles were analyzed.

In terms of inclusion, the primary criterion was topical relevance. Only articles that directly addressed infrastructure resilience and disaster-sensitive urban planning were considered eligible. This included studies that focused on urban flood resilience, climate change adaptation in infrastructure design, socio-technical interdependencies, and resilience indicators. Studies that investigated the effectiveness of green infrastructure, such as retention ponds, permeable surfaces, or urban green spaces, were also included given their relevance to adaptive urban systems.

Second, the type of study was a crucial inclusion factor. The review prioritized peer-reviewed journal articles, empirical research reports, and rigorous case studies. These types of publications provide robust methodological foundations and often include detailed data analyses or theoretical frameworks applicable to urban planning. Grey literature and unpublished documents were excluded to maintain academic rigor and ensure the replicability of findings.

Another inclusion criterion was publication date. Articles published within the last decade were prioritized to capture the most recent advancements and contextual developments in urban resilience, particularly in light of evolving climate risks. Exceptions were made for seminal works that have had significant influence on the field or introduced foundational concepts still relevant to current practices.

In contrast, the exclusion criteria were designed to eliminate studies with limited applicability or methodological shortcomings. Articles that lacked a transparent methodological approach or failed to describe data collection and analysis procedures were excluded. This decision was based on recommendations from prior meta-reviews highlighting the importance of methodological transparency in ensuring the validity and reliability of evidence used in policy-relevant reviews.

Language of publication was another criterion. Studies published in languages other than English were generally excluded unless they provided critical regional perspectives not available in English-language literature. This step was taken to ensure consistency and accessibility for a global academic audience.

Additionally, articles with a geographically narrow scope that lacked generalizability were excluded. For instance, case studies focusing on small towns with unique environmental or political conditions not representative of broader urban resilience challenges were not considered. This exclusion aimed to enhance the external validity of the review's conclusions and support their applicability to a wider range of urban contexts.

After identifying and retrieving potentially relevant articles, a two-stage screening process was implemented. The first stage involved a title and abstract screening to determine preliminary relevance. Articles that passed this stage were then subjected to full-text review, during which a more thorough assessment of their content, methodology, and alignment with the research objectives was conducted. During the full-text review phase, each article was independently evaluated by at least two reviewers to minimize bias and ensure consistency in the inclusion decisions.

To facilitate consistency in evaluation, a coding framework was developed based on key themes derived from the research questions. These themes included infrastructure typologies, governance structures, social inclusivity, geographic context, and innovation in design and technology. Articles were annotated and categorized accordingly to aid in the synthesis process.

In total, the final dataset comprised articles spanning multiple disciplines, including urban studies, civil engineering, environmental planning, and disaster risk management. This interdisciplinary approach was essential given the complex, multi-dimensional nature of infrastructure resilience. It allowed for a comprehensive understanding of how technical, institutional, and social factors interact to shape disaster-sensitive urban development.

This methodology not only ensured the academic integrity of the review but also provided a replicable model for future reviews in similar domains. By rigorously defining the search strategy and selection criteria, the review effectively captured the depth and breadth of contemporary literature, enabling a robust analysis of the state of knowledge and critical gaps in the field of infrastructure resilience and disaster-sensitive planning.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The narrative review synthesizes findings from global literature on disaster-sensitive urban planning with a focus on infrastructure resilience. The results are organized into four thematic sub-sections that explore policy frameworks, technological innovations, socio-economic factors, and global comparative perspectives.

Policy Frameworks and Governance Structures

Effective policy instruments are central to fostering disaster-resilient infrastructure in urban areas. Agustine et al. (2023) highlight the successful integration of Blue-Green Infrastructure (BGI) strategies into urban spatial planning, particularly for flood mitigation and climate adaptation. These approaches advocate the use of open green spaces, retention ponds, and permeable surfaces to manage stormwater sustainably. Similarly, Thiagarajan et al. (2018) present the Green Values Calculator, an analytical tool that demonstrates the long-term cost-effectiveness of green infrastructure over traditional stormwater systems.

Across various national contexts, Sponge City initiatives have emerged as comprehensive frameworks promoting sustainable urban water management. These initiatives, as observed by Li and Zhang (2021), blend green and grey infrastructure to enhance urban flood resilience and contribute to improved public well-being. Legal mandates requiring the adoption of stricter construction standards have also shown positive outcomes. Sardi et al. (2019) emphasize the importance of multi-stakeholder engagement in policy development and implementation to ensure enforcement and alignment with community needs.

Governance structures significantly influence the execution of resilience strategies. According to Yabe et al. (2020), decentralization allows for greater innovation tailored to local contexts, enabling more responsive urban planning. However, the absence of coordination between agencies often impedes strategy implementation. Sharifi and Yamagata (2014) argue for cross-sectoral governance models that facilitate collaboration between central and local governments. Collaborative projects that involve community actors and private stakeholders, as documented by Viavattene and Ellis (2013), tend to yield higher policy adoption and infrastructure outcomes.

Data-driven decision-making also plays a critical role. Li and Zhang (2021) underline the value of resilience indicators derived from robust datasets in shaping urban development plans. Accurate hazard and risk information enables cities to identify vulnerable systems and prioritize interventions.

Technological and Engineering Innovations

Advanced technologies are increasingly integrated into infrastructure resilience planning. GIS offers powerful spatial analysis and risk visualization tools, enhancing hazard mapping and stakeholder communication. Vanderhorst et al. (2024) and Viavattene and Ellis (2013) illustrate how GIS applications in flood risk management have improved city-level preparedness and coordination.

The Internet of Things (IoT) facilitates real-time environmental monitoring, allowing infrastructure systems to respond dynamically to emerging threats. Rezvani et al. (2024) report that IoT sensors deployed across urban areas help detect early warning signals, improving response times and reducing infrastructure strain.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is another key enabler. Xu et al. (2021, 2022) demonstrate how AI-based big data analytics support predictive modeling for disaster risk assessment. AI applications are particularly relevant in transport and energy infrastructure, ensuring continuity of essential services during emergencies. Together, GIS, IoT, and AI provide adaptive capabilities that are crucial in complex urban systems.

Hybrid infrastructure systems, combining green and grey elements, have demonstrated considerable potential in mitigating urban disasters. Cavallaro et al. (2014) provide empirical evidence that integrating green spaces with conventional infrastructure enhances flood resilience while delivering co-benefits such as biodiversity conservation and recreational amenities. In Zhongshan, BGI integration not only curbed flood risks but also revitalized public spaces, according to Agustine et al. (2023).

Lu and Sun (2021) underscore the role of green infrastructure in climate-responsive urban design, reinforcing the need for holistic planning. These findings collectively suggest that hybrid infrastructure represents a robust and flexible solution to the evolving challenges of disaster-sensitive development.

Socio-Economic and Community Factors

Community resilience is heavily influenced by socio-economic conditions. Yabe et al. (2020) find that communities with higher education levels tend to be better equipped to understand and act on disaster risk information. Education enhances individual and collective capacity to engage in mitigation and recovery efforts. Income levels also determine the extent to which communities can invest in risk-reducing infrastructure.

Social cohesion and participatory governance are other critical factors. Fuady et al. (2025) report that strong social networks facilitate collective action in both disaster response and infrastructure development. Communities that are involved in planning processes can articulate specific vulnerabilities and inform adaptive solutions.

Access to essential services such as healthcare and education further contributes to adaptive capacity. Lu and Sun (2021) note that well-resourced communities exhibit faster recovery times due to institutional support systems. Infrastructure investments in such settings are more likely to be aligned with broader development goals.

Public awareness campaigns and educational interventions are vital in promoting disaster preparedness. Adewunmi et al. (2023) show that resilience-oriented education increases public understanding of risk and fosters a culture of collaboration. Xu et al. (2021) emphasize the importance of participatory policy design, where government-community partnerships lead to more inclusive and actionable strategies.

Trust in public institutions also correlates with disaster readiness. Shah and Tirumala (2022) highlight that transparency and effective communication enhance public confidence in resilience measures. Community engagement not only builds institutional legitimacy but also strengthens collective efficacy in disaster risk management.

Global Comparative Perspectives

Different countries adopt diverse approaches to disaster-sensitive urban infrastructure planning. In high-income nations such as Japan, technology-driven resilience planning is prominent. Lee and Hong (2024) describe how Toyama City leverages predictive analytics and smart infrastructure to anticipate and mitigate disaster impacts. These strategies rely heavily on advanced monitoring systems and automated decision-making tools.

In contrast, lower- and middle-income countries focus more on inclusive governance and capacity building. Indonesia exemplifies this shift, where participatory planning is used to address socio-economic vulnerabilities. Fuady et al. (2025) document how local engagement in ASEAN cities strengthens resilience outcomes by aligning interventions with community realities.

Global best practices offer critical insights for developing effective infrastructure strategies. Bangladesh employs nature-based solutions to mitigate climate-induced disasters. Smith et al. (2021) show that mangrove restoration and wetland preservation significantly reduce coastal flood risks while enhancing livelihoods.

Multi-stakeholder involvement is another hallmark of successful models. In Indonesia, spatial planning that integrates community feedback has led to more relevant and sustainable infrastructure projects. Fuady et al. (2025) argue that co-production of urban plans fosters ownership and accountability.

Countries that institutionalize continuous learning from past failures and incorporate local knowledge into infrastructure planning tend to be more adaptive. Shaker et al. (2019) emphasize that flexible governance systems and context-sensitive approaches yield better resilience performance. These lessons are valuable for other cities aiming to improve their disaster preparedness and infrastructure adaptability.

In sum, the reviewed literature reveals that infrastructure resilience in disaster-sensitive urban planning is shaped by an interplay of policy, technology, community dynamics, and global learning. Each thematic dimension provides critical pathways for enhancing urban resilience and guiding future research and policymaking.

The findings of this narrative review are largely consistent with extant literature on infrastructure resilience and disaster-sensitive urban planning. As highlighted by Yabe et al. (2020), social and economic diversity plays a pivotal role in shaping infrastructure resilience. This is aligned with our synthesis that emphasizes the importance of integrating socio-economic considerations into disaster planning strategies. Xu et al. (2021) further underscore the value of community-based and participatory approaches, which are confirmed by our results indicating that stakeholder engagement significantly enhances resilience by bridging institutional gaps and local knowledge.

The prominence of green and hybrid infrastructure in resilience strategies also resonates with established studies. Agustine et al. (2023) documented the effectiveness of blue-green infrastructure in flood mitigation and climate adaptation. Similarly, our review highlights that hybrid systems—those combining green and grey infrastructure—can provide robust and flexible solutions to complex urban challenges. Cavallaro et al. (2014) emphasized how blending ecological and engineered systems yields synergistic benefits, including enhanced urban livability and environmental sustainability.

Technological innovation also appears as a critical theme in both our findings and the broader body of literature. The adoption of Geographic Information Systems (GIS), Artificial Intelligence (AI), and the Internet of Things (IoT) has been widely discussed as transformative tools in resilience planning. Sharifi and Yamagata (2014) illustrated how such technologies aid in data-driven decision-making and rapid risk assessment. Our synthesis supports this by showcasing how GIS facilitates spatial risk analysis, IoT provides real-time environmental data, and AI supports predictive modeling for disaster preparedness.

In terms of governance and policy instruments, Vanderhorst et al. (2024) advocate for inclusive and data-informed policymaking to enhance infrastructure planning. Our review reiterates that adaptive policy frameworks—especially those responsive to local risk profiles and community needs—are fundamental for sustaining urban resilience. This holistic perspective, which interlinks social, technological, and ecological systems, underscores the multidimensional nature of resilient infrastructure planning.

Despite this convergence, several systemic barriers persist that hinder effective implementation. One of the most entrenched challenges is the lack of cross-sectoral collaboration. Fuady et al. (2025) argue that limited synergy among government agencies, civil society, and private sectors constrains innovation and impedes the operationalization of integrated disaster strategies. This fragmentation leads to disjointed policy efforts, reducing their efficacy.

Economic constraints remain a significant bottleneck, particularly in low-resource settings. García and Ituarte (2022) reported funding limitations in implementing green infrastructure in Seville, a barrier that reflects a global trend. Budgetary limitations often result in short-term planning horizons, where investments in long-lasting, resilient systems are deferred in favor of immediate economic gains. This myopia not only delays resilience-building but also exacerbates vulnerability.

Trust deficits surrounding novel infrastructure solutions also impede progress. Uncertainty over the long-term performance of green infrastructure and perceived risks to land value often fuel public resistance (García & Ituarte, 2022). These perceptions call for more transparent communication, empirical validation, and inclusive deliberation to bolster confidence in non-traditional interventions.

Socioeconomic vulnerability further complicates policy uptake and infrastructure development. As noted by Lu and Sun (2021), economically disadvantaged communities often lack the capacity to engage in resilience planning or to maintain robust infrastructure. This underscores the need for equity-oriented strategies that align infrastructure investment with social welfare goals.

Bureaucratic inertia and policy uncertainty are additional hurdles. Agustine et al. (2023) highlighted how administrative complexity and indecision can stall critical infrastructure projects. The prevalence of rigid institutional frameworks often renders urban planning static and unresponsive to emerging risks, thereby diminishing its adaptive capacity.

Equally critical is the gap in public education and awareness. Xu et al. (2021) emphasized that poorly informed communities are less likely to support or benefit from resilience strategies. Inadequate understanding of disaster risks can lead to non-compliance with safety guidelines and underutilization of protective infrastructure. This points to the necessity of embedding educational programs into resilience frameworks.

To address these challenges, a set of multidisciplinary strategies and policy recommendations is essential. Collaborative approaches that bridge disciplinary silos offer promising pathways. Hooimeijer et al. (2022) advocated for integrative frameworks where architects, engineers, ecologists, and social scientists co-develop solutions, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform resilient infrastructure planning.

Incorporating green innovation and advanced technologies is equally vital. García and Ituarte (2022) stressed the importance of Nature-Based Solutions (NbS) as cost-effective, multifunctional strategies that not only reduce disaster risks but also enhance biodiversity and human well-being. Our synthesis suggests that embedding these innovations into formal planning mechanisms can enhance both system performance and public trust.

Public participation and education remain cornerstones of successful resilience planning. Fuady et al. (2025) posited that community involvement fosters a sense of ownership and aligns infrastructure projects with actual needs. Training programs, participatory mapping, and co-design workshops can foster deeper community engagement, leading to more tailored and sustainable outcomes.

Policy responsiveness and adaptability also require urgent attention. Yabe et al. (2020) advocated for agile governance structures that can adjust to dynamic risk landscapes. Adaptive governance implies continuous monitoring, feedback integration, and iterative policy design—mechanisms that are crucial in an era of climate uncertainty and rapid urbanization.

Sustainable financing mechanisms must also be prioritized. Fuady et al. (2025) observed that long-term investment strategies are essential for enduring resilience. Blended finance models that combine public funds, private capital, and international aid can mobilize resources while sharing risks across sectors.

Finally, aligning local practices with global frameworks like the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction can harmonize efforts and leverage international support. García and Ituarte

(2022) noted that adherence to global standards can enhance accountability and facilitate knowledge transfer across contexts.

This review, while comprehensive, acknowledges several limitations. The synthesis is bounded by the scope and language of the included studies, potentially excluding relevant research from non-English or region-specific sources. Furthermore, variability in methodological quality among the reviewed articles may affect the generalizability of the findings. Future research should prioritize meta-analyses, longitudinal studies, and mixed-method designs to build a more robust evidence base for policy and practice in infrastructure resilience.

CONCLUSION

This narrative review has explored the multifaceted dimensions of infrastructure resilience within the context of disaster-sensitive urban planning. The findings affirm that inclusive strategies—incorporating community engagement, green-gray hybrid infrastructure, and digital technology—are essential to enhancing adaptive capacities. The results align with a growing body of literature that emphasizes socio-economic diversity, participatory planning, and the integration of nature-based and technological solutions as critical pillars of disaster resilience.

Despite these advancements, systemic barriers such as bureaucratic inertia, limited inter-sectoral coordination, financial constraints, and lack of public awareness continue to impede policy implementation. The discussion section has revealed the importance of a multi-stakeholder, interdisciplinary framework to navigate these challenges, along with responsive governance models and adaptive funding mechanisms. It is essential to embed disaster risk considerations into all levels of urban policy to ensure equitable and sustainable resilience outcomes.

To address the gaps in knowledge and policy execution, future research should focus on comparative case studies across different geographic and socio-political contexts, particularly in the Global South. Greater emphasis should be placed on empirical evaluations of hybrid infrastructure effectiveness, public perception toward new resilience technologies, and the role of adaptive governance in complex urban systems. Ultimately, the long-term sustainability of urban infrastructure depends on integrative strategies that balance environmental, technical, and social dimensions.

REFERENCE

Adewunmi, Y., Chigbu, U., Kahireke, U., Simbanegavi, P., Mwando, S., Issa, A., … & Hayford, S. (2023). A multi-faceted approach to improving public services in low-income housing in Windhoek, Namibia. *Sustainability, 15*(6), 4885. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15064885

Agustine, V., Putra, D., & Rilansari, V. (2023). Blue-green infrastructure for Jakarta's sustainable planning and resilience. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 1211*(1), 012018. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1211/1/012018

Butar, E. (2025). Flood impact assessment using Earth observation data and geospatial technique: A case study from Bojonegoro Regency, Indonesia. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 1462*(1), 012087. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1462/1/012087

Cavallaro, M., Asprone, D., Latora, V., Manfredi, G., & Nicosia, V. (2014). Assessment of urban ecosystem resilience through hybrid social–physical complex networks. *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering, 29*(8), 608–625. https://doi.org/10.1111/mice.12080

Fuady, M., Buraida, B., Kevin, M., Farrel, M., & Triaputri, A. (2025). Enhancing urban resilience: Opportunities and challenges in adapting to natural disasters in Indonesian cities. *Sustainability, 17*(4), 1632. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17041632

Fuady, M., Farrel, M., Kevin, M., Munadi, R., & Triaputri, A. (2025). The concept of a resilient city in Indonesia as a strategy to increase urban resilience. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 1479*(1), 012026. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1479/1/012026

García, Á., & Ituarte, L. (2022). Nature-based solutions to hydro-climatic risks: Barriers and triggers for their implementation in Seville (Spain). *Land, 11*(6), 868. https://doi.org/10.3390/land11060868

Ham, C. (2025). Knowledge exchange in disaster risk management: A comparative study between Indonesia and USA. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 1479*(1), 012058. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1479/1/012058

Hendricks, M., & Zandt, S. (2021). Unequal protection revisited: Planning for environmental justice, hazard vulnerability, and critical infrastructure in communities of color. *Environmental Justice, 14*(2), 87–97. https://doi.org/10.1089/env.2020.0054

Hooimeijer, F., Bricker, J., Pel, A., Brand, A., Ven, F., & Askarinejad, A. (2022). Multi- and interdisciplinary design of urban infrastructure development. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers - Urban Design and Planning*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1680/jurdp.21.00019

Lee, Y., & Hong, C. (2024). Unraveling urban disaster management: A deep dive into SETS implications through a case study of Toyama City, Japan. *Land, 13*(5), 679. https://doi.org/10.3390/land13050679

Li, F., & Zhang, J. (2021). A review of the progress in Chinese sponge city programme: Challenges and opportunities for urban stormwater management. *Water Science & Technology Water Supply, 22*(2), 1638–1651. https://doi.org/10.2166/ws.2021.327

Li, G., Cheng, G., Wu, Z., & Liu, X. (2022). Coupling coordination research on disaster-adapted resilience of modern infrastructure system in the middle and lower section of the Three Gorges Reservoir Area. *Sustainability, 14*(21), 14514. https://doi.org/10.3390/su142114514

Lu, P., & Sun, Y. (2021). Scenario-based hydrodynamic simulation of adaptive strategies for urban design to improve flood resilience: A case study of the Mingzhu Bay region, Guangzhou, Greater Bay Area. *River Research and Applications, 39*(7), 1425–1436. https://doi.org/10.1002/rra.3913

Manandhar, B., Cui, S., Wang, L., & Shrestha, S. (2023). Urban flood hazard assessment and management practices in South Asia: A review. *Land, 12*(3), 627. https://doi.org/10.3390/land12030627

Patel, R., Sanderson, D., Sitko, P., & Boer, J. (2020). Investigating urban vulnerability and resilience: A call for applied integrated research to reshape the political economy of decision-making. *Environment and Urbanization, 32*(2), 589–598. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247820909275

Rezvani, S., Silva, M., & Almeida, N. (2024). The Risk-Informed Asset-Centric (RIACT) urban resilience enhancement process: An outline and pilot-case demonstrator for earthquake risk mitigation in Portuguese municipalities. *Applied Sciences, 14*(2), 634. https://doi.org/10.3390/app14020634

Sardi, M., Razak, K., & Bakri, R. (2019). Assessing disaster risk and resilience: A case study in urban flood vulnerable community in Kampung Asahan, Kuala Selangor. *The International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences, XLII-4/W16*, 603–610. https://doi.org/10.5194/isprs-archives-xlii-4-w16-603-2019

Shah, J., & Tirumala, R. (2022). Monetize the urban multiplier: A study of India's national infrastructure pipeline and national monetization plan. *Environment and Urbanization Asia, 13*(1), 73–85. https://doi.org/10.1177/09754253221078185

Shaker, R., Rybarczyk, G., Brown, C., Papp, V., & Alkins, S. (2019). (Re)emphasizing urban infrastructure resilience via scoping review and content analysis. *Urban Science, 3*(2), 44. https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci3020044

Sharifi, A., & Yamagata, Y. (2014). Resilient urban planning: Major principles and criteria. *Energy Procedia, 61*, 1491–1495. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2014.12.154

Smith, A., Tasnim, T., Irfanullah, H., Turner, B., Chausson, A., & Seddon, N. (2021). Nature-based solutions in Bangladesh: Evidence of effectiveness for addressing climate change and other sustainable development goals. *Frontiers in Environmental Science, 9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2021.737659

Thiagarajan, M., Newman, G., & Zandt, S. (2018). The projected impact of a neighborhood-scaled green-infrastructure retrofit. *Sustainability, 10*(10), 3665. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10103665

Vanderhorst, H., Pathirage, C., & Proverbs, D. (2024). Navigating flood resilience: Challenges, solutions, and lessons learnt from the Dominican Republic. *Water, 16*(3), 382. https://doi.org/10.3390/w16030382

Viavattene, C., & Ellis, J. (2013). The management of urban surface water flood risks: SUDS performance in flood reduction from extreme events. *Water Science & Technology, 67*(1), 99–108. https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2012.537

Xu, W., Cong, J., & Proverbs, D. (2021). Evaluation of infrastructure resilience. *International Journal of Building Pathology and Adaptation, 41*(2), 378–400. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijbpa-09-2020-0075

Xu, W., Zhang, Y., Proverbs, D., & Zhong, Z. (2022). Enhancing the resilience of road networks to flooding. *International Journal of Building Pathology and Adaptation, 42*(2), 213–236. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijbpa-09-2021-0120

Yabe, T., Rao, P., & Ukkusuri, S. (2020). Regional differences in resilience of social and physical systems: Case study of Puerto Rico after Hurricane Maria. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science, 48*(5), 1042–1057. https://doi.org/10.1177/2399808320980744

Yang, Z., Clemente, M., Laffréchine, K., Heinzlef, C., Serre, D., & Barroca, B. (2022). Resilience of social-infrastructural systems: Functional interdependencies analysis. *Sustainability, 14*(2), 606. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14020606

Yuan, D., Wang, H., Wang, C., Yan, C., Li-li, X., Zhang, C., … & Kou, Y. (2024). Characteristics of urban flood resilience evolution and analysis of influencing factors: A case study of Yingtan City, China. *Water, 16*(6), 834. https://doi.org/10.3390/w16060834