

Article

Contesting Spatial Injustice: Palestinian Housing Cooperatives, Collective Agency and Transformative Resilience in Jerusalem

Maha Samman

Department of Architecture, Al-Quds University, Jerusalem 51000, Palestine; mahawad99@yahoo.com

Abstract

Cooperative Housing has become a vital participatory urban strategy to address the growing housing challenges of the 21st century, particularly in contexts marked by political, socio-economic and spatial inequalities. This paper examines cooperative housing in East Jerusalem as a form of transformative resilience that operates under conditions of colonial domination and spatial injustice. In response to the systemic challenges confronting the Palestinian housing sector—including the denial of building permits, land confiscation, restrictive planning regimes, and the absence of equitable legal and institutional frameworks—this paper explores locally driven cooperative housing initiatives as alternative pathways for securing housing rights and sustaining urban presence. Grounded in the theoretical frameworks of spatial injustice, transformative resilience, and participatory design, and drawing on selected Palestinian-led cooperative housing cases, the study demonstrates how communities mobilize collective action, shared resources, and participatory processes to navigate exclusionary planning systems and resist spatial injustice. By examining the relationship between participatory design and transformative resilience, this paper highlights the critical role of community agency in producing adaptive, inclusive, and context-sensitive spatial practices. It contributes to broader debates on housing justice by demonstrating how cooperative models can challenge dominant housing paradigms, and offer alternative frameworks for collective governance, spatial empowerment, and transformative resilience in contexts shaped by persistent inequality and political constraints.

Keywords: cooperative housing; spatial in/justice; participatory design; transformative resilience; colonial urbanism; East Jerusalem

1. Introduction

Access to adequate housing has become one of the most pressing urban challenges of the twenty-first century. Rapid urbanization, widening socio-economic inequalities, land scarcity, and increasingly exclusionary planning systems have intensified housing insecurity across cities worldwide. These challenges are particularly acute in colonized urban environments, where prolonged colonial practices, and successive attempts of the colonized to defend territorial rights, transform housing from a developmental concern into a central arena of spatial and political struggle. Under such conditions, housing is no longer merely a physical commodity but a mechanism through which power, citizenship, and the right to remain in the city are contested.

East Jerusalem represents one of the most striking examples of this intersection between housing, planning, and colonial control. Palestinian neighborhoods experience chronic housing shortages generated by restrictive planning policies, discriminatory zoning



Academic Editor: Tigran Haas

Received: 1 August 2026

Revised: 18 September 2026

Accepted: 20 September 2026

Published: 28 September 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the author.

Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license.

regulations, land confiscation, and highly unequal access to planning institutions. Although Palestinians constitute nearly 40% of Jerusalem's population, they have access to less than 10% of the city's land for development. Obtaining a building permit remains an almost impossible mission, with fewer than 5% of Palestinian applications reportedly approved annually [1–4]. These conditions have produced a persistent housing crisis characterized by overcrowding, informal construction, demolition risks, and continuous threats of displacement. These outcomes are embedded within broader structures of spatial inequality that regulate access to land, housing, and urban development.

Critical urban scholarship conceptualizes such unequal conditions through the notion of **spatial injustice**, which understands urban inequalities as products of political, institutional, and economic processes that unevenly distribute opportunities, resources, and rights across space [5–7]. Spatial injustice extends beyond unequal access to housing or infrastructure to include exclusion from planning processes, unequal recognition of communities, and limitations on the ability to shape urban futures. In settler-colonial contexts such as in East Jerusalem, planning policies become instruments through which territorial control is exercised, producing differentiated rights to land, mobility, development, and citizenship [4,8,9].

While these structural constraints have been extensively documented, less attention has been devoted to the collective strategies through which affected communities actively negotiate and contest these unequal urban conditions. Recent debates in planning theory increasingly emphasize that communities are not passive recipients of planning decisions but active producers of space whose knowledge, networks, and organizational capacities constitute essential resources for urban transformation [10–14]. Collaborative planning, and community-led development therefore represent more than inclusive planning techniques; they provide mechanisms through which marginalized communities exercise agency, strengthen social cohesion, and influence the production of urban space.

Within this context, cooperative housing has emerged internationally as an alternative housing model that combines collective ownership, and community participation to improve housing accessibility while strengthening local capacities [15]. Unlike conventional housing provision based primarily on individual ownership or market allocation, cooperative housing enables communities to pool financial resources, share risks, collectively manage land, and participate directly in decision-making processes. Such arrangements tend to reinforce social networks, collective responsibility, and long-term tenure security. In contexts characterized by exclusionary planning systems, cooperative housing is considered an alternative way for communities to access land and assert their rights to the city [16].

The significance of cooperative housing extends beyond housing provision itself, and offers an opportunity to reconceptualize resilience as a collective and political process. Early resilience research focused primarily on the ability of ecological engineering, or social systems to absorb disturbances and recover from external shocks [17]. Community resilience emphasizes collective agency, self-organization, collaborative governance, and adaptive learning as key mechanisms through which communities respond to prolonged uncertainty [18–21]. More recent scholarship, however, argues that resilience should be understood as the capacity of communities not only to adapt but also to reorganize, learn, and transform the institutional conditions that generate vulnerability, in addition to exploring the potential links between social and ecological resilience [22–27].

This perspective is particularly relevant for colonized cities, where vulnerability is continuously reproduced through political and institutional processes. In such contexts, resilience cannot be understood simply as adaptive recovery from disruption. Instead, it involves developing collective capacities capable of challenging exclusionary urban systems

while creating alternative forms of governance, participation, and spatial organization. Cooperative housing therefore provides a participatory urban strategy through which communities strengthen collective agency, negotiate access to land, and develop innovative institutional arrangements capable of addressing long-term spatial inequalities.

Despite growing scholarship on spatial justice/injustice, participatory planning, resilience, and cooperative housing, these bodies of literature have largely developed independently. Studies of East Jerusalem have primarily focused on discriminatory planning systems, housing shortages, and settler-colonial urbanism [2,3,8,9], while resilience scholarship has concentrated on disaster recovery, climate adaptation, or socio-ecological systems [19,28]. Similarly, cooperative housing has been examined predominantly as an affordable housing or governance model rather than as a mechanism through which communities confronting spatial injustice cultivate transformative resilience. Consequently, there remains limited theoretical understanding of how participatory housing initiatives can simultaneously challenge exclusionary planning systems, strengthen collective agency, and contribute to more just urban futures.

This paper addresses this gap by conceptualizing cooperative housing as a participatory strategy of transformative resilience operating under conditions of spatial injustice. Drawing upon theories of spatial justice [5,6,29], vulnerability [30], participatory design [12–14], collaborative planning [10,11], cooperative housing [15], and transformative resilience [24–26], the paper develops an integrated conceptual framework linking **spatial injustice, urban vulnerability, participatory design, and transformative resilience**.

This study examines selected Palestinian-led cooperative housing initiatives in East Jerusalem designed to navigate and counter systemic urban obstacles, including the pervasive denial of building permits, land confiscation, and the structural absence of equitable legal planning frameworks [31,32]. It explores how collective forms of housing production enable communities to negotiate restrictive planning environments, strengthen social solidarity, and develop alternative pathways for securing housing and territorial belonging. In East Jerusalem, the scale of this grassroots response is increasing. Recent scholarship notes that there are over ten cooperative housing projects in East Jerusalem, encompassing developments ranging from 20 to 135 housing units per initiative [33].

To capture the complex socio-spatial dynamics of these interventions, the paper employs a qualitative case study methodology, triangulating primary NGO reports, and critical urban literature, with participant observation. By synthesizing data from academic research and policy reports, in addition to personal experience as part of a cooperative housing committee in Jerusalem, the investigation provides a comprehensive assessment of cooperative housing. This provides a discussion on how Palestinian communities in East Jerusalem creatively engage with cooperative housing as a mechanism of urban resilience and spatial survival.

By positioning cooperative housing as a transformative urban practice rather than solely a housing delivery mechanism, the paper contributes to expanding resilience theory beyond adaptation and recovery towards a justice-oriented understanding of urban transformation. It further contributes to urban planning scholarship by demonstrating how participatory housing initiatives can function as mechanisms for confronting structural inequalities and advancing spatial justice in cities experiencing prolonged colonial domination and control.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. From Spatial Injustice to Transformative Resilience

Urban space is not a neutral physical container but a socially, politically, and economically produced environment shaped by relations of power, governance, and territorial

control. Unequal access to housing, infrastructure, mobility, services, and political representation is not merely the result of uneven development or technical deficiencies; rather, it reflects the processes through which urban space is produced, regulated, and contested. Understanding urban inequality therefore requires examining the spatial mechanisms through which disadvantage is created, experienced, and reproduced.

The concept of spatial justice provides a critical framework for analysing these processes by linking social inequalities with their spatial expressions. Emerging from critical geography and theories of social justice, spatial justice emphasizes that space is both a product of social relations and an active medium through which power operates [5,6,29]. Lefebvre's [5] influential theory of the production of space established the foundation for this perspective by arguing that space is socially constructed through the interaction between spatial practices, representations of space, and representational spaces. His triadic conceptualization of perceived, conceived, and lived space demonstrates that urban environments are simultaneously material, institutional, and experiential formations. Consequently, urban space becomes a site where social relations are reproduced and challenged through everyday practices and struggles.

Building upon Lefebvre's contribution, Soja [6] developed the concept of spatial justice to demonstrate that social injustices are frequently embedded within spatial arrangements. Spatial inequality is therefore not simply an outcome of unequal distribution, but a process generated through political decisions, institutional structures, and historical trajectories. Unequal access to land, public services, infrastructure, and opportunities reflects broader systems of power that determine whose needs are prioritized and whose claims to the city are marginalized. Similarly, Harvey [29] emphasizes that urban inequalities are deeply connected to political-economic structures, particularly processes of capitalist urbanization, land commodification, speculative development, and uneven investment. From this perspective, spatial injustice emerges through the interaction between economic systems, governance practices, and territorial strategies that shape patterns of inclusion and exclusion. It is thus closely connected to the production of urban vulnerability. Vulnerability is not simply a consequence of exposure to environmental or political hazards; it emerges from the unequal access to resources, institutional support, decision-making power, and social protection [30]. This understanding challenges approaches that treat vulnerability as a primarily technical condition and instead highlights its social and political foundations. Resilience scholars similarly argue that vulnerability is produced through structural inequalities that limit communities' capacities to anticipate, respond to, and recover from disruption [24–26].

These theoretical insights become particularly significant in contexts characterized by settler colonialism and prolonged territorial control and domination. In such contexts, spatial inequalities are not incidental but systematically produced through planning regulations, land policies, infrastructure distribution, and development strategies that function as mechanisms of control and governance [4,6]. Communities often experience multiple and interconnected vulnerabilities, including insecure housing, inadequate infrastructure, restricted mobility, environmental risks, and limited political participation. These conditions are not isolated deficiencies but interconnected outcomes of unequal spatial systems and governance structures [34,35]. The relationship between spatial injustice and vulnerability is therefore fundamental: unjust spatial arrangements shape not only where risks occur but also who has the capacity and resources to respond to them. Consequently, resilience cannot be separated from questions of justice, power, and rights. Planning becomes more than a technical practice; it becomes a political instrument through which authority is exercised, territories are reorganized, and populations are differentially included or ex-

cluded [5,34]. Urban space consequently becomes a contested field where processes of domination, resistance, and identity formation unfold simultaneously.

The concept of resilience has become central in urban studies as cities face increasing environmental, economic, political, and social uncertainties; however, it remains contested due to different interpretations of stability, adaptation, recovery, and transformation. Early resilience approaches emphasized the capacity of urban systems to absorb shocks and return to previous conditions, but such perspectives have been criticized for overlooking the structural inequalities and power relations that produce vulnerability in the first place [36]. Critical resilience scholars argue that restoring pre-disruption conditions may reproduce existing injustices, particularly in marginalized contexts where “recovery” can reinforce exclusionary systems rather than generate more equitable futures. Therefore, resilience should be understood not simply as a technical capacity for adaptation but as a socially and politically embedded process involving questions of justice, governance, and transformation [24,25,37–39]. Davoudi [24] argues that resilience reflects competing values, interests, and visions of the future, raising fundamental questions about whose knowledge is recognized, whose risks are prioritized, and whose futures are protected. Similarly, MacKinnon and Derickson [37] caution that resilience approaches may become problematic when they emphasize community adaptation while overlooking the structural conditions that generate vulnerability. These critiques have contributed to the emergence of **transformative resilience**, which moves beyond maintaining existing systems toward restructuring the social, institutional, and spatial arrangements that shape vulnerability. Contemporary resilience scholarship highlights that transformation depends on interconnected social, economic, environmental, ecological, and governance capacities [40]. Meerow et al. [25] conceptualize urban resilience as an ongoing process of adaptation, negotiation, and transformation involving multiple actors. Likewise, Ziervogel et al. [26] emphasize that transformative resilience requires addressing structural inequalities while enhancing the capacity of marginalized groups to actively participate in shaping urban futures. In this context, resilience is increasingly viewed as the capacity to use crises as opportunities to redirect development pathways toward more sustainable, inclusive, and equitable trajectories rather than restoring pre-existing conditions [41]. Zeng et al. [42] also distinguish between absorptive, adaptive, and transformative capacities, arguing that while absorptive capacities enable communities to withstand immediate disruptions and adaptive capacities support incremental responses, transformative capacities enable societies to challenge existing structures and create alternative pathways. Developing such capacities requires effective communication, institutional flexibility, multi-actor collaboration, and community-oriented planning processes.

Transformative resilience therefore represents a shift from resilience as recovery toward resilience as a systemic change. It involves questioning governance structures, institutional arrangements, and spatial practices that reproduce vulnerability, while reshaping relationships between communities, institutions, and the production of urban space. It involves fundamental changes in socio-political values, governance systems, and collective visions of urban futures [43]. This distinction is particularly significant in contexts of deep inequality, where adaptation alone may enable survival within unjust conditions without addressing their underlying causes. As Ajibade [44] and Kochskämper et al. [45] argue, resilience strategies that ignore power relations risk reinforcing existing inequalities and undermining broader goals of sustainability and social justice.

Accordingly, transformative resilience recognizes marginalized communities not as passive recipients of interventions but as active producers of knowledge, practices, and solutions. Everyday forms of adaptation, collective action, informal organization, and place-making represent important sources of resilience and agency [25,26]. These practices

demonstrate how communities experiencing spatial injustice develop alternative strategies to negotiate, resist, and transform unequal urban conditions.

This understanding creates a direct conceptual connection between transformative resilience and participatory urban practice. Participation is not simply a procedural mechanism for improving the acceptance of planning decisions; rather, it represents a political process through which communities gain greater influence over the production of space. By enabling affected populations to contribute their knowledge, experiences, and aspirations, participatory approaches challenge hierarchical models of urban governance and create opportunities for more inclusive forms of spatial decision-making.

Participatory design has become a critical component of transformative resilience by emphasizing that urban transformation depends on collaboration among diverse actors, including communities, planners, researchers, institutions, and civil society organizations. Participatory approaches highlight the importance of social networks, collective ownership, and shared governance in shaping resilient urban futures [46]. This is significant in research on various cases such as the Indonesian coastal communities which demonstrates the importance of local social networks, community change agents, and knowledge exchange between local and external actors in enabling long-term transformation [47]. Transformation is a gradual process shaped by continuous negotiation, learning, and institutional adaptation rather than immediate systemic change.

From a spatial justice perspective, participatory approaches are significant because they challenge unequal systems of knowledge production and urban decision-making. This is particularly relevant in contexts shaped by colonialism, where planning practices have contributed to displacement, exclusion, and territorial control. Nevertheless, participation is not inherently transformative; without meaningful redistribution of decision-making power, it may reproduce existing inequalities. It needs to move beyond vulnerability management toward processes of spatial empowerment and long-term urban transformation. Transformative participation therefore requires processes through which communities can actively shape priorities, negotiate alternatives, and influence institutional practices, making participation a pathway toward spatial justice.

Despite growing scholarship on transformative resilience, important theoretical and methodological challenges remain. Although it is increasingly understood as a cross-sectoral approach for systemic change, scholars emphasize the need for clearer conceptual definitions, comparative methodologies, and empirical evidence explaining how transformation unfolds across diverse political and socio-spatial contexts [46,48,49]. Because transformation involves shifts in values, power relations, and development pathways, simplified indicators may overlook the political and relational processes shaping change. Therefore, context-sensitive frameworks are needed to capture qualitative and multi-scalar dimensions, including participation, institutional learning, empowerment, and spatial justice outcomes [45,50,51].

Within this theoretical framework, transformative resilience is understood as a process through which communities and institutions collectively confront the structural conditions producing vulnerability towards creating more equitable urban futures. Spatial injustice provides the analytical foundation by revealing how unequal spatial arrangements generate vulnerability and constrain adaptive capacities. Transformative resilience extends this analysis by emphasizing that resilience requires not merely surviving disruption but transforming the systems, institutions, and spatial practices that create inequality. Participatory urban practice represents the critical link between these concepts by providing mechanisms through which marginalized communities can become active producers of urban knowledge, governance, and space.

2.2. Cooperative Housing and Transformative Resilience

Housing represents one of the most fundamental dimensions through which spatial justice/spatial injustice are experienced. Access to adequate housing extends beyond the provision of physical shelter; it is closely connected to social belonging, economic security, cultural continuity, and the ability of communities to maintain a presence within urban space. Consequently, housing inequalities reflect broader patterns of uneven development, exclusion, and unequal access to urban resources. Conventional housing models frequently reproduce spatial inequalities through market-based mechanisms, speculative development, unequal access to land, and exclusionary planning practices. As Rolnik [52] argues, contemporary housing systems increasingly position housing as a financial asset rather than a social right, producing forms of exclusion that disproportionately affect marginalized populations.

These dynamics become particularly intensified in contexts affected by colonialism, where housing is not only a question of shelter but also a question of territorial rights, identity, and collective survival. Restrictions on land access, limited infrastructure provision, and uneven planning regulations contribute to conditions in which certain communities experience persistent housing vulnerability. Under these conditions, cooperative housing can function not only as a housing strategy but also as a form of collective spatial agency through which communities maintain their presence and strengthen their capacity to negotiate urban change. It provides an alternative approach to the production of urban space.

Unlike market-oriented housing systems that primarily conceptualize housing as an individual commodity, cooperative housing is based on principles of collective ownership, shared responsibility, and resident participation. It represents a different mode of urban production in which inhabitants are active participants in shaping, managing, and sustaining their living environments in response to embedded challenges. The significance of cooperative housing lies in its potential to transform relationships between communities, institutions, and urban space. Cooperative models integrate participatory principles throughout the processes of planning, design, construction, and management, allowing residents' knowledge and experiences to influence spatial outcomes. Cooperative housing contributes to the development of social infrastructures that support resilience and community empowerment [15]. From a spatial justice perspective, cooperative housing challenges unequal systems of ownership, access, and decision-making. It creates opportunities for communities to collectively negotiate their relationship with land and resources while resisting processes that transform housing into a mechanism of exclusion.

The relationship between cooperative housing and transformative resilience is therefore significant. Cooperative housing transforms residents from isolated individuals facing urban vulnerability into organized communities capable of responding collectively to uncertainty. The process of producing and managing housing through participatory design becomes a mechanism through which communities develop knowledge, strengthen relationships, and build institutional capacities. It enables communities to generate knowledge, organize collective responses, and develop alternative spatial practices.

3. Housing Cooperatives in East Jerusalem

3.1. Housing and the Production of Spatial Inequality in East Jerusalem

The contemporary urban structure of East Jerusalem has been profoundly shaped by successive geopolitical transformations and a colonial planning regime that institutionalizes spatial inequality. The 1948 War divided Jerusalem into West Jerusalem under Israeli control and East Jerusalem under Jordanian administration. Following the 1967 Six-Day War, Israel occupied East Jerusalem, expanded its municipal boundaries, and unilaterally annexed

the area in 1980, although the annexation remains internationally unrecognized [53,54]. Since then, Israeli authorities have expanded settlements in East Jerusalem, such as Pisgat Ze'ev, Ramot, and Gilo on expropriated Palestinian land. Settler enclaves in Palestinian neighborhoods including Sheikh Jarrah, Silwan, and the Old City were also established, fundamentally reshaping the city's demographic and territorial configuration [32]. According to the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics, in mid-2025, approximately 331,000 Palestinians, holding permanent residency status, resided East Jerusalem within the Israeli municipal boundary, while the Jerusalem Governorate contained approximately 513,000 Palestinians in total. Israeli settler population are approximately 243,000 in Israeli settlements in East Jerusalem [55].

Since 1967, Israeli planning and land policies have played a central role in restructuring Palestinian space in the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and facilitated Israeli territorial consolidation. Under military rule, military orders enabled the seizure and closure of Palestinian land, including through its designation as "state land." By 1972, approximately 28% of West Bank land had reportedly been confiscated, much of it initially designated for "military purposes" and subsequently transferred for settlement development [7,56].

Planning institutions were placed under military authority, while zoning, permit requirements, and infrastructure provision constrained Palestinian development and supported Israeli settlements [31,57]. These interconnected administrative, spatial, and infrastructural practices increasingly constituted what Halper [7] (pp. 150–154) terms a "Matrix of Control." The 1993 Oslo Accords subsequently divided the West Bank into Areas A, B, and C without ending Israeli territorial control or settlement expansion. Area C, comprising more than 61% of the West Bank, remained under Israeli civil and security control, while Palestinian construction was subject to restrictive permitting; between 2010 and 2014, only 33 of 2020 Palestinian applications were reportedly approved [4,58].

East Jerusalem represents one of the most striking examples of this intersection between housing, planning, and colonial control. Following 1967, the Israeli planning system redrew the city's municipal boundaries, incorporated extensive areas of Palestinian land, and facilitated the development of Israeli settlements and connecting infrastructure. Palestinians have been subjected to an extensive regime of spatial control through restrictive zoning, limited residentially zoned land, insufficient detailed planning, and costly and restrictive building-permit procedures, in addition to the construction of barriers. This resulted in overcrowding, building without permits, displacement, and chronic housing shortages [2,3,59]. The literature consistently conceptualizes housing inequality in East Jerusalem as the outcome of a politically driven planning regime based on land confiscation, restrictive zoning, unequal infrastructure investment, limited residential expansion, and regulatory constraints that restrict Palestinian urban development. Although Palestinians constitute nearly 40% of the population of Jerusalem, they have access to less than 10% of land for development in the city. Obtaining a building permit remains highly difficult, with fewer than 5% of Palestinian applications reportedly approved annually [1,3,60–62].

The separation wall has further produced differentiated spaces of inclusion and exclusion within Jerusalem's municipal boundaries. Palestinian neighbourhoods inside the wall remain subject to restrictive Israeli planning and building regulations, while areas outside the wall, such as Kufr Aqab and Shu'fat Refugee Camp, have experienced weaker regulation, inadequate services, and extensive unregulated development, resulting in severe urban disorder. The wall has thus fragmented Palestinian urban space, constrained mobility and development, and produced uneven housing and infrastructure conditions across East Jerusalem [4,58,60,63]. Palestinian neighborhoods in East Jerusalem therefore experience chronic housing shortages generated by restrictive planning policies, discriminatory zoning regulations, land confiscation, and highly unequal access to planning institutions.

Israeli planning instruments are widely understood as mechanisms of territorial governance and demographic management rather than merely technical planning tools. Planning policies, zoning regulations, master plans, permit procedures, green-area designations, land expropriation, and infrastructure allocation systematically restrict Palestinian urban growth while facilitating Israeli territorial consolidation and settlement expansion. The plan that has been referenced to planning decisions is the unratified Jerusalem Municipality Master Plan 2020, published in 2004, which sought to reduce the Palestinian population share from 40% to 30% through settlement expansion and neighborhood densification [4,57,59,64–66]. Many Palestinian neighborhoods also lack approved detailed plans and land registration, severely limiting access to legal building permits and encouraging informal construction. These inequalities are reinforced through land expropriation, administrative boundaries, green-area zoning, density restrictions, settlement expansion, bypass roads, and the Separation Wall, which fragment urban continuity and reduce land available for Palestinian residential development [54,63,64,67,68].

Building permits constitute one of the most significant structural barriers shaping Palestinian housing conditions in East Jerusalem. The permit system operates as a complex regulatory framework through which housing development is constrained by administrative, financial, and bureaucratic requirements, including incomplete land registration, stringent ownership documentation, the absence of approved neighborhood plans, lengthy approval procedures, high fees, restrictive planning standards, and inadequate infrastructure provision. Together, these constraints significantly limit Palestinians' ability to access formal housing development pathways and reinforce conditions of housing insecurity. A high percentage of the Palestinian building permit applications were rejected. The building permit costs may reach over \$40,000 for a 100 m² apartment, reflecting the substantial financial burden embedded within the planning system. As a result, building without permit has become an adaptive response to exclusion from formal planning processes. However, it exposes households to legal uncertainty, financial penalties, demolition orders, and displacement risks [60,61,64,69]. According to OCHA [70], 100,000 Palestinians face the risk of being displaced, due to being left with no other option than building without permit. This reflects structural limitations rather than individual regulatory violations. Within this context, home demolition functions as a planning enforcement mechanism, and a driver of displacement linked to restrictive permit regimes. Furthermore, demolition practices fragment communities, intensify residential insecurity, and impose significant social, financial, and psychological burdens on affected households [33,71].

The asymmetric planning regime enables comprehensive planning, infrastructure investment, and continued residential growth in West Jerusalem and Israeli settlements, while Palestinian neighborhoods remain characterized by fragmented planning, informal development, and prolonged efforts to retroactively legalize existing housing. Differential property valuation between West and East Jerusalem further reinforces uneven investment patterns and socio-spatial disparities [62]. Unlike state-supported Jewish housing development, Palestinians face lengthy bureaucratic procedures, high planning costs, and the continuing threat of demolitions. Demolishing of housing units has been accelerating with around 700 Palestinian homes demolished between 2023–2025 [32], and self-demolition of tens of housing units; when the owner is forced to demolish his home by him in silence, [71].

Planning restrictions extend beyond housing to affect mobility, public services, health, and urban citizenship, particularly in neighborhoods beyond the Separation Wall. The experience of escalating housing costs, deterioration of living conditions produces urban vulnerability; reinforces enduring patterns of socio-spatial fragmentation and institutionalized housing insecurity, constraining development opportunities, and threaten the long-term sustainability of Palestinian urban life [60,61,63,64,67,69].

The cumulative effects of restrictive zoning and permit systems have displaced housing demand beyond Jerusalem's municipal boundaries, particularly toward areas such as Kufr Aqab and Dahiyat al-Bareed, where housing costs are lower and regulatory control is comparatively weaker [72,73]. While these areas provide housing opportunities for Palestinians excluded from the formal Jerusalem housing market, they also generate new vulnerabilities, including inadequate infrastructure, limited services, uncertain legal conditions, residency insecurity, and political marginalization. Emerging research highlights additional forms of housing precarity associated with informal high-rise development in Kufr Aqab, displacement pressures in Silwan, and the influence of settlement-related and transnational real-estate dynamics on Palestinian residential geographies [72,74,75]. The resulting housing shortages, overcrowding, rising costs, and deteriorating living conditions are cumulative outcomes of restrictive planning structures and unequal urban development processes. There is a high imbalance between housing needs and demographic growth, with a need of a minimum of 2000 apartments annually. [64,68,76,77]. Housing insecurity in East Jerusalem therefore extends beyond issues of construction and affordability to encompass broader processes of spatial exclusion, social vulnerability, and insecure urban citizenship. Prolonged uncertainty regarding housing legality, service provision, and residency status contributes to psychosocial stress, declining wellbeing, and conditions of structural displaceability, transforming housing into a central expression of spatial injustice [54,69].

Consequently, formal housing supply has failed to meet population needs, producing chronic shortages, overcrowding, and inadequate infrastructure. These conditions have produced a persistent housing crisis characterized by overcrowding, demolition risks, and continuous threats of displacement. Despite these constraints, Palestinian communities have demonstrated significant agency through informal construction, community-based planning initiatives, independent zoning proposals, legal advocacy, and everyday practices aimed at maintaining residency and sustaining their presence in Jerusalem. Thus, since formal planning has not provided viable housing options, Palestinians have increasingly relied on informal or unauthorized construction, including small-scale, privately initiated development, despite the associated risks of demolition, fines, and legal sanctions [4,60,70,78]. Informal housing has therefore developed partly in response to restrictive conditions produced by the planning system.

However, such responses remain adaptive strategies within an unequal planning system rather than equitable access to housing rights or urban resources [54,64]. They outcomes are embedded within broader structures of spatial inequality that regulate access to land, housing, and urban development. This condition highlights the need to explore alternative collective approaches capable of transforming housing vulnerability into community capacity.

Within this context, cooperative housing emerges as a potentially significant but underexplored strategy for strengthening transformative resilience in East Jerusalem. While existing scholarship has extensively examined permit restrictions, demolitions, and territorial fragmentation, limited attention has been given to cooperative housing as a collective mechanism for securing land, pooling resources, strengthening participation, and challenging exclusionary housing structures.

3.2. Housing Development Models and Cooperative Approaches in East Jerusalem

Cooperative housing is a significant strategy for strengthening community resilience within the context of restrictive planning environments in East Jerusalem. Nasrallah and Dodwell [33] identify seven housing development models relevant to East Jerusalem: commercial development, self-build, partnership models, cooperatives, purchase groups,

collective development, and development agencies. However, housing production remains dominated by commercial development and individual self-build approaches, and to a less extent the other models including collective housing. Both models have significant limitations within the existing political and planning context. Commercial housing development is constrained by uncertainty surrounding planning approvals, lengthy permit procedures, financial risks, and limited access to developable land. The self-build model tends to generate incremental and small-scale housing production. It allows households to reduce costs by avoiding developer profits. Nevertheless, its capacity to respond to broader housing demand is restricted because it depends on land ownership, household financial resources, and individual family requirements. Alternative collective approaches offer possibilities for overcoming some of these limitations. Cooperative and collective housing models introduce mechanisms for shared ownership, collective financing, and risk distribution among future residents. By reducing dependence on speculative development and commercial profit, these models can potentially increase affordability, accessibility, respond to housing shortages, while strengthening community participation in housing production [33].

Though in a limited scale, collective practices of Palestinian urban communities have been embedded in strategies of survival and spatial resistance. The first documented housing cooperative in East Jerusalem is Dahiyat al-Barid established in 1958, during the Jordanian rule, by approximately 40 employees of the central post office. Through collective land acquisition and development, the cooperative introduced an early model of modern, community-led housing that responded to changing residential needs and demonstrated the potential of collective action in shaping urban development [73]. However, despite the historical significance of Dahiyat al-Barid and subsequent cooperative initiatives, academic research and documentation on cooperative housing experiences in East Jerusalem remain limited, leaving an important gap in understanding their contribution to addressing housing challenges.

Contemporary housing cooperatives in East Jerusalem have emerged through diverse forms of collective organization, including professional groups, religious institutions, and community associations seeking alternatives to increasingly constrained housing conditions. Collective housing initiatives are particularly relevant within East Jerusalem because they respond simultaneously to financial constraints, limited land availability, and fragmented institutional structures.

Some of the documented examples include Physicians Housing in Beit Hanina (70 units), Bayt Al Maqdis Engineers Housing (54 units), Orient House Employees Housing (35 units), Sur Bahir Teachers Housing (72–86 units), El Farouk Teachers Housing (21 units), Engineers Housing in Beit Hanina (26 units), Sharafat Latin Monastery Housing (60 units), Beit Hanina Housing Cooperative (21 units), Jerusalem Social Society (20 units), and Shufat Housing Association (135 units). These initiatives vary in scale, organisational structure, and membership composition, with projects ranging from approximately 20 to 135 housing units [33]. Their emergence demonstrates the capacity of Palestinian communities to develop collective mechanisms for housing provision despite significant institutional constraints, although their scale, governance structures, and long-term sustainability require further investigation. Such initiatives demonstrate how professional associations and community organisations can initiate alternative pathways for housing delivery by pooling resources, coordinating land access, and reducing individual risks. However, their expansion remains constrained by organisational capacity, limited financial mechanisms, fragmented governance arrangements, and dependence on external infrastructure provision [33].

The cases of cooperative housing in East Jerusalem demonstrate that resilience is not an externally imposed framework, but a lived spatial practice rooted in resistance, adaptation, and collective visioning. Rather than representing passive responses to housing shortages, these initiatives reveal collective capacities to negotiate, imagine, and construct alternative urban futures. In this context, cooperative housing enables communities to sustain their presence and strengthen resilience in the face of dispossession and exclusionary urban governance.

Across the examined cases, cooperative housing reflects overlapping participatory strategies that combine legal, social, spatial, and financial forms of resilience. Legal navigation represents a central dimension of these initiatives, as communities engage in property rights negotiations, collective land acquisition, communal spatial planning, and zoning processes as pathways toward securing building permits and protecting long-term habitation.

Participatory processes are equally fundamental, with all initiatives relying on collective decision-making, community meetings, shared risks, and local design inputs to ensure contextual relevance and social cohesion. While some cooperatives operate under the umbrella of professional or religious organizations, others emerge from groups of individuals mobilizing independently. Some seek support from NGOs for legal, technical, and organizational assistance.

Attempts to collective resource mobilization, including pooled funds, diaspora contributions, local labor, shared tools, and distributed expenses, reduces dependence on formal financial systems and mitigates economic risks. However, financial challenges often result in dependence on loans. Shared infrastructure and collective services further reinforce social cohesion and what can be understood as “social impregnability,” strengthening communities’ ability to withstand socio-economic and political pressures.

Nevertheless, cooperative housing initiatives continue to confront substantial institutional, legal, and financial barriers within the Israeli planning context. Restrictive permit regimes, frequent rejection of building applications, limited recognition of Palestinian land ownership, demolition risks, prolonged approval processes, and various constraints to their development and long-term sustainability. The implementation of cooperative housing projects is often very slow.

Despite these obstacles, the cases demonstrate that cooperative housing advances adaptive strategies capable of circumventing restrictive planning conditions, enhancing social solidarity, and asserting Palestinian spatial agency. Collective engagement in legal struggles creates new planning and spatial strategies to resist eviction and settlement expansion, while repeated exclusion from formal housing rights encourages cooperatives to mobilize international legal and human rights frameworks. These practices illustrate that Palestinian communities are not passive recipients of spatial inequality but active agents who negotiate, reinterpret, and sometimes transform restrictive urban conditions. Community-based planning initiatives, independent zoning proposals, and collective advocacy efforts represent attempts to reclaim planning agency within a system characterised by unequal access to decision-making power [2,16,54,64].

By collectively confronting colonial planning structures, cooperative housing opens possibilities for rethinking relationships between planning systems, finance mechanisms, and property regimes. These initiatives therefore challenge narratives of Palestinian housing as one of vulnerability alone, instead revealing creativity, agency, and alternative urban imaginaries grounded in collective traditions and offering inspiration for future community-led resilience models.

3.3. Cooperative Housing and Transformative Resilience in East Jerusalem

The emergence of cooperative housing with its participatory initiatives in East Jerusalem could be interpreted within a broader framework of transformative resilience, where communities develop collective participatory capacities to respond to persistent structural constraints while creating alternative pathways for urban continuity within a colonial context. The transition from participatory design to transformative resilience is not a linear process but an iterative pathway through which communities continuously learn, adapt, and reshape their spatial conditions. The cases show that cooperative housing shifts production from an individualized process dependent on private ownership and market capacity towards a participatory collective practice based on shared resources, mutual support, and decision-making. They represent a transition from individual survival strategies towards collective participatory forms of development, where the communities transform fragmented individual responses into organised collective action, creating stronger institutional capacities for negotiating land, planning, and infrastructure challenges. Participatory design also enables knowledge exchange across generations and sectors, producing adaptable housing solutions responsive to changing community needs, embedding social cohesion within spatial configurations, and mobilizing collective narratives to challenge dominant planning discourses.

The relationship between cooperative housing and transformative resilience is particularly evident through participatory design approaches. Participatory design challenges conventional top-down planning practices by positioning residents as active contributors to the production of their built environment. In East Jerusalem, where formal planning processes have historically marginalised Palestinian communities, participatory approaches create opportunities for incorporating local knowledge, social networks, cultural practices, and community priorities into housing development. Integrating speculative design, scenario planning, and participatory co-design workshops involving residents, architects, planners, and civil society organizations has further expanded the capacity of these initiatives to develop context-specific and adaptive housing solutions in Jerusalem. Participatory decision-making reflects long-standing Palestinian traditions of collective action and community consultation, strengthening local ownership and social cohesion while enhancing communities' capacity to withstand displacement pressures. Incremental construction provides a pragmatic response to restrictive permit regimes by enabling gradual development and coping with changing legal and financial conditions. However, the absence of secure land tenure remains a fundamental obstacle, highlighting the need to explore collective ownership, land trusts, and other innovative tenure arrangements. Financial sustainability likewise depends on cooperative savings schemes, alternative financing mechanisms, and support from international donors, given Palestinians' limited access to conventional credit.

Transformative resilience emphasizes deep processes of institutional, spatial, and social change that challenge the conditions producing vulnerability [25]. In the context of East Jerusalem, where housing insecurity is produced through intersecting mechanisms of land fragmentation, permit exclusion where obtaining building permits remains highly restrictive, demolition, and displacement, resilience cannot be reduced to adaptation within existing conditions, extending beyond coping mechanisms. Instead, it involves the development of collective strategies that provide possibilities for collective negotiation, shared ownership arrangements, and alternative financing structures that may reduce some of the barriers. Such strategies provide a form of collective spatial agency that enables the Palestinian community to maintain place attachment, strengthen social networks, and assert their right to urban belonging.

The development of cooperative housing also requires consideration of broader institutional and policy frameworks. Although cooperative models can enhance community

resilience, they cannot independently overcome structural inequalities embedded within the planning system. Their effectiveness depends on supportive mechanisms, including accessible financing, legal recognition of collective ownership arrangements, transparent planning procedures, and improved coordination between communities, professional actors, and relevant institutions. Without such enabling conditions, cooperatives risk remaining isolated examples of community adaptation rather than becoming transformative mechanisms capable of addressing housing inequality at a wider scale. Some cases in East Jerusalem have taken over ten years and even twenty years to be implemented and resided.

Emerging experiences with community land trusts and collective land management initiatives provide additional insights into how shared ownership models may contribute to housing security under conditions of spatial exclusion. In areas such as Silwan and Sur Baher, collective approaches have been explored as strategies for maintaining land control, resisting displacement pressures, and strengthening community cohesion. Similarly, community networks responding to eviction threats in Sheikh Jarrah demonstrate how collective mobilisation can create forms of solidarity and spatial resistance even within highly restrictive legal environments. Although these initiatives differ in legal structure, funding mechanisms, and institutional capacity, they share common principles of participation, collective responsibility, and attachment to place.

From this perspective, cooperative housing represents a form where communities use spatial practices to maintain social continuity and challenge processes of exclusion. It does not eliminate the structural causes of housing insecurity, including discriminatory planning regulations, land restrictions, and unequal governance systems. Instead, it creates alternative spaces of agency through which communities can negotiate these constraints and develop collective capacities for survival and transformation. Thus, transformation lies in the capacity of individuals to access land and housing within that system. In a context where the cost of land, construction, taxes, professional services, and legal procedures can make individual home ownership inaccessible, collective organization allows these burdens to be shared among members. Land costs, engineering and legal fees, taxes, and other construction expenses can be distributed collectively, while members contribute different forms of financial, professional, and organizational resources. Through this process, activities that may be beyond the capacity of individual households become collectively achievable. Members participate in different aspects of the process, sharing responsibilities, knowledge, resources, and risks, while benefiting from the collective outcome. Housing provision consequently shifts from an individual financial and legal undertaking to a shared social and organizational process. This collective resource mobilization constitutes an important dimension of transformative resilience.

The transformative character of cooperative housing should therefore not be understood as the replacement or reform of the existing planning system. Rather, it operates within and against its constraints by expanding the possibilities available to Palestinian residents. By collectively mobilizing resources to secure land, finance construction, navigate legal and professional requirements, and produce housing, cooperatives partially counter the exclusionary effects of the prevailing planning regime. In this sense, resilience becomes transformative through the creation of collective capacities that enable households to maintain their presence and claim the possibility of home ownership in Jerusalem.

These initiatives do not eliminate the structural barriers to housing or constitute a fully developed alternative housing sector; instead, they anchor Palestinians in Jerusalem and create practical spaces of agency within a system that otherwise restricts Palestinian housing development. They secure a place to live in the city rather than being gradually displaced or eventually forced to leave, which is important to maintaining a material and social presence in Jerusalem. In this sense, remaining becomes a form of collective agency:

a practical assertion of the possibility to live, build, and sustain everyday life in Jerusalem despite the constraints imposed upon Palestinian housing.

The experience of East Jerusalem demonstrates that housing resilience must be understood as a socio-political process embedded within struggles over land, identity, and urban rights. Cooperative housing initiatives reveal how communities can transform vulnerability into collective capacity by developing shared mechanisms of ownership, participation, and decision-making. In this sense, cooperatives represent more than alternative housing delivery models; they constitute strategies of spatial resilience that challenge exclusionary planning practices and contribute to the production of more inclusive urban futures.

Beyond providing affordable housing, cooperatives create spaces where residents collectively confront unjust forms of urban governance, social relations, and land stewardship. By de-linking housing from market speculation and emphasizing collective ownership and decision-making, cooperatives strengthen community agency and reinforce housing as a social right and political right, rather than a commodity, safeguarding the right to remain and develop in the city.

4. Conclusions

This study demonstrates that cooperative housing in East Jerusalem represents an important emerging strategy through which Palestinian communities negotiate housing insecurity, spatial exclusion, and the constraints imposed by restrictive planning regimes. By combining collective governance, shared ownership, participatory design, and community-based decision-making, cooperative housing initiatives create alternative pathways for securing housing and sustaining urban presence under conditions of prolonged uncertainty. These initiatives should not be understood as substitutes for structural reforms to planning and governance systems; rather, they represent forms of transformative resilience that enable communities to develop collective capacities, strengthen social solidarity, and assert their right to the city. Through cooperative models, housing becomes not only a material necessity but also a means of producing spatial agency, protecting belonging, and challenging processes of displacement. Nevertheless, their long-term effectiveness depends on broader institutional recognition, supportive legal frameworks, and integration with more equitable planning approaches. Building on the findings of this study, several interventions are recommended to strengthen cooperative housing as a viable housing strategy in East Jerusalem and other colonially affected contexts.

Realizing transformative possibilities requires embedding cooperative housing within broader infrastructures of resistance and community resilience. Housing initiatives could be linked to legal aid, urban data platforms, media advocacy, and policy engagement to strengthen communities' capacity to challenge restrictive planning systems and advocate for secure housing rights. International organisations and donors also have an important role in supporting participatory, and community-driven housing initiatives in contexts of colonial displacement.

Cooperative forms of tenure and collective ownership require legal recognition within municipal and national planning frameworks to enable communities to establish legitimate housing entities and access development opportunities. Community-based planning processes should be strengthened through partnerships among municipalities, universities, non-governmental organisations, and grassroots organisations, supported by technical assistance and participatory design programmes. Strategic alliances with educational institutions, artists, cultural organizations, and international solidarity networks can amplify these efforts by generating knowledge, mobilizing resources, and expanding global advocacy for the right to housing in colonized contexts. Furthermore, integrating colonial contexts and participatory methodologies into architectural and planning edu-

cation can strengthen future professional capacities to engage with communities facing spatial injustice.

Flexible planning mechanisms are needed to accommodate community-initiated proposals in areas affected by restrictive zoning, while dedicated legal and technical support units could assist communities in navigating complex planning and land procedures. Also, integrating cooperative housing with agroecological practices, communal services, and the preservation of collective spatial memory can further strengthen local self-reliance while reinforcing cultural identity and social cohesion.

Collectively, these approaches position cooperative housing not merely as an alternative tenure model but as a transformative framework for advancing spatial justice, self-determination, and inclusive urban futures.

Despite their potential, cooperative housing initiatives in East Jerusalem remain underexplored, and significant research gaps require further investigation. Future research should document the long-term sustainability, governance structures, and scalability of existing cooperative housing projects, while examining how these models can operate under conditions of legal uncertainty and political constraint. Comparative studies with cooperative housing experiences in other conflict-affected contexts, especially in the Global South, could provide valuable insights into alternative pathways for community resilience and spatial transformation. Addressing these research gaps would advance understanding of how communities can co-produce alternative urban futures through housing practices that combine participatory design, transformative resilience, towards spatial justice.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or collected for this study. All data analyzed in the study were obtained from secondary and publicly available sources, which are appropriately cited in the manuscript. The data supporting the findings can be accessed through the original sources cited in the relevant sections of the article.

Acknowledgments: The author acknowledges the use of ChatGPT-5 for language editing and refinement during the preparation of this manuscript. The author retains full responsibility for the content, ideas, arguments, interpretations, and final text of the article.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

1. Najjar, R. Urban Planning and Land-Use Management in Jerusalem—Chronological Analysis: Urban Perspectives in Contested Cities. In *Land-Use Management—Recent Advances, New Perspectives, and Applications*; Lousada, S., Ed.; IntechOpen: London, UK, 2023. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
2. B'Tselem. *A Policy of Discrimination: Land Expropriation, Planning and Building in East Jerusalem*; B'Tselem: Jerusalem, 1995.
3. Margalit, M. *Discrimination in the Heart of the Holy City*; International Peace and Cooperation Center (IPCC): Jerusalem, 2006.
4. Samman, M. Land use and urban planning in Palestine: Over a century of ongoing colonial legacy. In *Routledge Handbook on Palestine*; Dumper, M., Badran, A., Eds.; Routledge: Abingdon, UK, 2024; pp. 240–256. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
5. Lefebvre, H. *The Production of Space*; Original work published 1974; Blackwell: Oxford, UK, 1991.
6. Soja, E.W. *Seeking Spatial Justice*; University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, MN, USA, 2010. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
7. Halper, J. *An Israeli in Palestine: Resisting Dispossession, Redeeming Israel*; Pluto Press: London, UK, 2008.
8. Yiftachel, O. Theoretical notes on 'gray space': The coming of urban apartheid? *Plan. Theory* **2009**, *8*, 88–100. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
9. Yacobi, H. *The Jewish-Arab City: Spatio-Politics in a Mixed Community*; Routledge: Abingdon, UK, 2009.
10. Healey, P. *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*; UBC Press: Vancouver, BC, Canada, 1997.
11. Friedmann, J. *Empowerment: The Politics of Alternative Development*; Blackwell: Oxford, UK, 1992.
12. Sanoff, H. *Community Participation Methods in Design and Planning*; Wiley: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2000.

13. Till, K.E. *The New Berlin: Memory, Politics, Place*; University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, MN, USA, 2005.
14. Awan, N.; Schneider, T.; Till, J. *Spatial Agency: Other Ways of Doing Architecture*; Routledge: Abingdon, UK, 2011. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
15. Lang, R.; Roessl, D. The governance of co-operative housing: Current challenges and future perspectives. *Int. J. CO-Oper. Manag.* **2013**, *6*, 8–12.
16. Ghadban, S.S. Housing cooperatives in the Palestinian territories: Development and current practice. *Open House Int.* **2014**, *39*, 69–81. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
17. Holling, C.S. Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **1973**, *4*, 1–23. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
18. Magis, K. Community Resilience: An Indicator of Social Sustainability. *Soc. Nat. Resour.* **2010**, *23*, 401–416. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
19. Berkes, F.; Ross, H. Community Resilience: Toward an Integrated Approach. *Soc. Nat. Resour.* **2012**, *26*, 5–20. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
20. Aldrich, D.P. *Building Resilience: Social Capital in Post-Disaster Recovery*; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA, 2012.
21. Aldrich, D.P.; Meyer, M.A. Social Capital and Community Resilience. *Am. Behav. Sci.* **2015**, *59*, 254–269. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
22. Folke, C.; Carpenter, S.; Elmqvist, T.; Gunderson, L.; Holling, C.S.; Walker, B. Resilience and sustainable development: Building adaptive capacity in a world of transformations. *AMBIO A J. Hum. Environ.* **2002**, *31*, 437–440. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
23. Walker, B.; Holling, C.S.; Carpenter, S.R.; Kinzig, A. Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social–ecological systems. *Ecol. Soc.* **2004**, *9*, 5. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
24. Davoudi, S. Resilience: A bridging concept or a dead end? *Plan. Theory Pract.* **2012**, *13*, 299–333. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
25. Meerow, S.; Newell, J.P.; Stults, M. Defining urban resilience: A review. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* **2016**, *147*, 38–49. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
26. Ziervogel, G.; Cowen, A.; Ziniades, J. Moving from adaptive to transformative capacity: Building foundations for inclusive, thriving, and regenerative urban settlements. *Sustainability* **2017**, *9*, 955. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
27. Adger, W.N. Social and ecological resilience: Are they related? *Prog. Hum. Geogr.* **2000**, *24*, 347–364. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
28. Koliou, M.; van de Lindt, J.W.; McAllister, T.P.; Ellingwood, B.R.; Dillard, M.; Cutler, H. State of the research in community resilience: Progress and challenges. *Sustain. Resilient Infrastruct.* **2018**, *5*, 131–151. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
29. Harvey, D. *Social Justice and the City*, Revised ed.; University of Georgia Press: Athens, GA, USA, 2009.
30. Adger, W.N. Vulnerability. *Glob. Environ. Chang.* **2006**, *16*, 268–281. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
31. Khamaisi, R. Israeli use of the British mandate planning legacy as a tool for the control of Palestinians in the West Bank. *Plan. Perspect.* **1997**, *12*, 321–340. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
32. Peace Now. *Eyes on Jerusalem, How the Government is Undermining the Prospects for a Two-State Solution Jerusalem: Situation Report, 2023–2025*; Peace Now: Jerusalem, 2025.
33. Nasrallah, R.; Dodwell, E. *Affordable Housing Development in East Jerusalem Delivery Models*; International Peace and Cooperation Center (IPCC): Jerusalem, 2022.
34. Porter, L. *Unlearning the Colonial Cultures of Planning*; Ashgate: Chesterfield, UK, 2010.
35. Veracini, L. *Settler Colonialism: A theoretical Overview*; Palgrave Macmillan: London, UK, 2010.
36. Folke, C. Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social–ecological systems analyses. *Glob. Environ. Change* **2006**, *16*, 253–267. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
37. MacKinnon, D.; Derickson, K.D. From resilience to resourcefulness: A critique of resilience policy and activism. *Prog. Hum. Geogr.* **2013**, *37*, 253–270. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
38. Meerow, S.; Newell, J.P. Urban resilience for whom, what, when, where, and why? *Urban Geogr.* **2019**, *40*, 309–329. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
39. Elmqvist, T.; Andersson, E.; Frantzeskaki, N.; McPhearson, T.; Olsson, P.; Gaffney, O.; Takeuchi, K.; Folke, C. Sustainability and resilience for transformation in the urban century. *Nat. Sustain.* **2019**, *2*, 267–273. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
40. Datola, G. Implementing urban resilience in urban planning: A comprehensive framework for urban resilience evaluation. *Sustain. Cities Soc.* **2023**, *98*, 104821. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
41. Trippl, M.; Fastenrath, S.; Isaksen, A. Rethinking regional economic resilience: Preconditions and processes shaping transformative resilience. *Eur. Urban Reg. Stud.* **2024**, *31*, 101–115. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
42. Zeng, X.; Yu, Y.; Yang, S.; Lv, Y.; Sarker, M.N.I. Urban resilience for urban sustainability: Concepts, dimensions, and perspectives. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 2481. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
43. Leixnering, S.; Höllerer, M.A. ‘Remaining the same or becoming another?’ Adaptive resilience versus transformative urban change. *Urban Stud.* **2022**, *59*, 1173–1188. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
44. Ajibade, I. The Resilience Fix to Climate Disasters: Recursive and Contested Relations with Equity and Justice-Based Transformations in the Global South. *Ann. Am. Assoc. Geogr.* **2022**, *112*, 2230–2247. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
45. Kochskämper, E.; Glass, L.-M.; Haupt, W.; Malekpour, S.; Grainger-Brown, J. Resilience and the Sustainable Development Goals: A scrutiny of urban strategies in the 100 Resilient Cities initiative. *J. Environ. Plan. Manag.* **2025**, *68*, 1691–1717. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
46. del Rocio Castañeda Rodríguez, L.; Galvez-Nieto, A.; Aguilar Chunga, Y.A.; Ccalla Chusho, J.A.; Salinas Romero, M.E. Transformative urban resilience and collaborative participation in public spaces: A systematic review of theoretical and methodological insights. *Urban Sci.* **2026**, *10*, 51. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

47. Maurischa, S.D.; Fahmi, F.Z.; Suroso, D.S.A. Transformative resilience: Transformation, resilience and capacity of coastal communities in facing disasters in two Indonesian villages. *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.* **2023**, *88*, 103615. [CrossRef]
48. Asadzadeh, A.; Kötter, T.; Fekete, A.; Moghadas, M.; Alizadeh, M.; Zebardast, E.; Weiss, D.; Basirat, M.; Hutter, G. Urbanization, migration, and the challenges of resilience thinking in urban planning: Insights from two contrasting planning systems in Germany and Iran. *Cities* **2022**, *125*, 103642. [CrossRef]
49. Abudu, R.; Thompson, E.A.; Dzawu, F.S.; Roa-Henriquez, A. A meta-analysis assessment of adaptive and transformative approaches to supply chain resilience. *Supply Chain Anal.* **2025**, *10*, 100124. [CrossRef]
50. Esposito, D. A ladder of urban resilience: An evolutionary framework for transformative governance of communities facing chronic crises. *Sustainability* **2025**, *17*, 6010. [CrossRef]
51. Zapata-Barrero, R. Resilient urban turnaround in migration governance studies. *Int. Migr.* **2024**, *62*, 20–40. [CrossRef]
52. Rolnik, R. *Urban Warfare: Housing Under the Empire of Finance*; Verso: London, UK, 2019.
53. Samman, M. The Production of Colonial Temporal Patterns in East Jerusalem. *J. Holy Land Palest. Stud.* **2018**, *17*, 59–74. [CrossRef]
54. Khamaisi, R. The Trap of Urban Planning Development in Jerusalem. *Contemp. Arab. Aff.* **2019**, *12*, 105–138. [CrossRef]
55. Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics. *Jerusalem Statistical Yearbook, 2025*; PCBS: Ramallah, Palestine, 2025.
56. B'Tselem. *Under the Guise of Legality Israel's Declarations of State Land in the West Bank*. Jerusalem; B'Tselem: Jerusalem, 2012.
57. Samman, M. *Trans-Colonial Urban Space in Palestine: Politics and Development*; Routledge: Oxfordshire, UK; New York, NY, USA, 2013.
58. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN-OCHA). *Under Threat-Demolition Orders in Area C of the West Bank*; OCHA: Jerusalem, 2015.
59. Arafah, N. How strategic is the strategic sectorial development plan for Jerusalem? A review of the “Strategic Sectorial Development Plan for Jerusalem (2018–2022)”. *Jerus. Q.* **2018**, *24*, 79. [CrossRef]
60. United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat). *Right to Develop: Planning Palestinian Communities in East Jerusalem*; UN-Habitat: Palestine, 2015.
61. Jafari, M.; Abdulla, S. *East Jerusalem's Economic Cluster Report*; Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute (MAS): Ramallah, Palestine, 2019.
62. Ansenberg, L. Uneven application of real estate valuation standards: A comparative study in Palestine and Israel. *J. Econ. Geogr.* **2026**, 1–19. [CrossRef]
63. Samman, M. From moments to durations: The impact of Israeli checkpoints on Palestinian everyday life in Jerusalem. *Int. J. Urban Sci.* **2021**, *25*, 124–148. [CrossRef]
64. El-Atrash, A. Politics of Informal Urbanization and the Battle for Urban Rights in the Context of Palestinian Communities in East Jerusalem. *Jerus. Q.* **2016**, *65*, 104–110.
65. International Peace and Cooperation Center (IPCC). *Housing in East Jerusalem 2020 Review*; International Peace and Cooperation Center (IPCC): Jerusalem, 2020.
66. Office of the Quartet, Housing Sector in East Jerusalem, a Market Opportunity Analysis. By Dimensions Consulting. 2015. Available online: <https://www.quartetoffice.org/page.php?id=5d89e2y6130146Y5d89e2> (accessed on 19 September 2026).
67. Baumann, H. Enclaves, borders, and everyday movements: Palestinian marginal mobility in East Jerusalem. *Cities* **2016**, *59*, 173–182. [CrossRef]
68. Salha, R. Morphological Luring in Jerusalem during the democratic and political challenges. *AlMubadara* **2022**, *1*, 1–56. (In Arabic) [CrossRef]
69. Bouquet, B.; Muhareb, R.; Smith, R. “It’s not wherever, because this is where the problem starts”: Racialized strategies of elimination as determinants of health in Palestine. *Health Hum. Rights J.* **2022**, *24*, 237–254.
70. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN-OCHA). Record number of demolitions, including self-demolitions, in East Jerusalem. *The Monthly Humanitarian Bulletin*, 14 May 2019. Available online: <https://www.ochaopt.org/content/record-number-demolitions-including-self-demolitions-east-jerusalem-april-2019> (accessed on 19 September 2026).
71. Samman, M.; Mansour, A.I. Inflicting Self-Demolition of Home in East Jerusalem: The Violent Act of Colonial Domicide. In Proceedings of the 8th ZEMCH 2020, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, 2–4 November 2021.
72. Abu Hatoum, N. For “a no-state yet to come”: Palestinian urban place-making in Kufr Aqab, Jerusalem. *Environ. Plan. E Nat. Space* **2020**, *4*, 85–108. [CrossRef]
73. Saifi, Y.; Samman, M. Housing in Jerusalem: From a flourishing hope to slow Urbicide. *Open House Int.* **2019**, *44*, 27–35. [CrossRef]
74. Hammoudeh, D.; Hamayel, L.; Welchman, L. Beyond the physicality of space: East Jerusalem, Kufr ‘Aqab, and the politics of everyday suffering. *Jerus. Q.* **2016**, *65*, 35–50. [CrossRef]
75. Chiodelli, F. The multifaceted politics of informality in Jerusalem at the time of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In *The Routledge Handbook on Informal Urbanization*; Rocco, R., van Ballegooijen, J., Eds.; Routledge: Abingdon, UK, 2019; pp. 135–146.

76. Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute (MAS). *Preserving East Jerusalem in the Context of the Two- State Solution Short- and Medium-Term Sectoral Development Agenda for East Jerusalem (SMSDA-EJ) (2019–2023)*; Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute (MAS): Jerusalem, Palestine, 2018.
77. Kaminker, S. For Arabs Only: Building Restrictions in East Jerusalem. *J. Palest. Stud.* **1997**, *26*, 5–16. [[CrossRef](#)]
78. Chiodelli, F. The Jerusalem master plan: Planning into the conflict. *Jerus. Q.* **2012**, *51*, 5–20. [[CrossRef](#)]

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.