

### **Kateryna Sehida**

*DSc (Geography), Professor, Head of Kostyantyn Niemets Department of Human Geography and Regional Studies, V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Svobody Sq., 4, Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine*  
e-mail: [kateryna.sehida@karazin.ua](mailto:kateryna.sehida@karazin.ua), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1122-8460>

### **Nataliia Husieva**

*PhD (Geography), Associate Professor, Kostyantyn Niemets Department of Human Geography and Regional Studies, V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Svobody Sq., 4, Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine*  
e-mail: [nataliya.guseva@karazin.ua](mailto:nataliya.guseva@karazin.ua), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3620-1213>

### **Olha Suptelo**

*PhD (Earth Sciences), Associate Professor, Kostyantyn Niemets Department of Human Geography and Regional Studies, V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Svobody Sq., 4, Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine*  
e-mail: [olha.suptelo@karazin.ua](mailto:olha.suptelo@karazin.ua), <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2901-8565>

### **Serhii Batura**

*Masters Student (Geography), Kostyantyn Niemets Department of Human Geography and Regional Studies, V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Svobody Sq., 4, Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine*  
e-mail: [serhii-batura@student.karazin.ua](mailto:serhii-batura@student.karazin.ua), <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1227-1374>

## **TACTICAL URBANISM IN WARTIME (CASE STUDIES: KYIV, LVIV, KHARKIV)**

The full-scale war in Ukraine has caused radical transformations in urban systems. It has called into question the effectiveness of traditional models of strategic and spatial planning. This has highlighted the need for adaptive, rapid, and low-resource forms of response to crisis-related challenges. Under these conditions, tactical urbanism is transformed from a tool for local aesthetic and demonstrative interventions into an important mechanism of crisis management, ensuring security, supporting social infrastructure, and building urban resilience. At the same time, scientific discourse lacks a holistic conceptualization of tactical urbanism as a tool for urban functioning in wartime, which constitutes the scientific problem addressed in this study.

The aim of the article is to provide a scientific substantiation of the transformation of tactical urbanism in wartime into a tool for crisis adaptation and urban resilience, using Ukrainian cities as case studies. The methodological basis of the study includes qualitative case analysis, a comparative approach, and structural-functional analysis. The empirical basis consists of the cases of Kyiv, Kharkiv, and Lviv – cities with different socio-spatial models, levels of institutional resilience, and types of civic mobilization.

The study revealed a fundamental change in the functional logic of tactical urbanism – from the pre-war critical-demonstrative and aesthetic paradigm to a military, productive, security, and socio-infrastructure paradigm. In wartime conditions, tactical urbanism acquires the features of a survival tool for urban systems. This is manifested in the creation of shelters, safe hubs, volunteer spaces, temporary community support centres, and crisis infrastructure. A comparative analysis of the cases of Kyiv, Kharkiv, and Lviv allowed the identification of a typology of wartime models of tactical urbanism and their role in shaping the social, institutional, and spatial resilience of cities.

The scientific novelty of the research lies in the conceptualization of tactical urbanism as an element of the urban resilience system under war conditions, the development of a typology of its wartime transformations, and the formation of a generalized model of wartime tactical urbanism as a tool for crisis management in urban space. The practical significance of the results lies in their potential application in post-war recovery processes, the formation of urban security policies, integrated spatial planning, and the development of reconstruction strategies for Ukrainian cities, taking into account the principles of adaptability, rapid implementation, and civil society participation.

**Keywords:** *tactical urbanism, city resilience, military urbanism, urban activism, urban spaces, crisis planning, Kyiv, Kharkiv, Lviv.*

**In cites:** Sehida, K., Husieva, N., Suptelo, O., Batura, S. (2025). Tactical urbanism in wartime (case studies: Kyiv, Lviv, Kharkiv). *Human Geography Journal*, 39, 161-172. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2076-1333-2025-39-14>

**Formulation of the problem.** The beginning of the full-scale invasion in Ukraine in 2022 has become an unprecedented factor of destruction in the urban environment. Numerous shelling and bombings have caused significant damage to infrastructure, housing stock and public spaces. This has predictably overloaded tradition-

al models of urban planning and spatial management. In such conditions, strategic planning, which is usually based on long-term forecasts, large-scale design procedures and significant resources, reveals its limitations. It is unable to respond promptly to rapid changes, the destruction of transport and social structures, and move



from destruction to the viability of territories in real time [10].

It is in this context that the concept of tactical urbanism emerges and becomes relevant as a model of low-cost, rapid, small-scale, and often citizen-initiated interventions in urban space. These solutions allow for rapid adaptation of the environment, restoration of public functions, and improvement of the quality of life of residents, even in times of crisis.

In the context of war, tactical urbanism ceases to be just an experimental tool for urban development or participatory practice, but becomes an adaptive mechanism for ensuring the functional viability of cities. On the ground, this manifests itself, for example, in the transformation of public spaces into shelters, the creation of temporary hubs for public life, small spaces to support social activity, as well as in projects that support the physical and psychosocial health of communities [4].

In view of this, a set of scientific and practical tasks arises. First, there is a need to systematically understand the role of tactical urbanism in wartime, since traditional concepts of urban planning and reconstruction do not take into account such extreme factors as continuous hostilities and significant disruption of the normal functioning of urban systems. Second, it is necessary to clearly clarify the mechanisms through which tactical interventions affect the resilience of the city – the ability not only to survive external shocks, but also to quickly restore the operational capacity of infrastructure, social ties, and security mechanisms [17].

Thus, war is not only a negative factor of destruction, but also an incentive for the development of new approaches to spatial planning, post-war reconstruction, the formation of urban resilience and a security environment, which require scientific understanding and practical modeling. These challenges lie at the heart of this study, since they not only describe the current state of cities, but also require new theoretical constructs and practical solutions for their sustainable functioning during and after the war.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** The formation of modern scientific discourse on the transformation of urban spaces in crisis conditions is based on the intersection of urban, socio-geographical and planning research. In the scientific literature, several interrelated areas can be distinguished: the study of urban conflicts and transformations, the theory of tactical urbanism, the study of urban resilience and the analysis of crisis urban practices.

Research by Ukrainian scientists has laid the foundation for the analysis of the conflict of urban spaces as a factor of urban transformations. The work of Niemets L., Suptelo O., Lohvynova M. and Sehida K. proves that post-industrial cities are characterized by the growth of spatial conflicts associated with competition for resources, transformation of territorial functions and changing socio-economic roles of urban spaces. The authors argue that such conflicts stimulate the emergence of alternative forms of spatial use, which creates the prerequisites for the development of tactical urban practices [15].

The monograph "Urban Ukraine: at the epicenter of spatial changes" forms a systemic vision of the transformation of Ukrainian cities in the context of globalization processes, where urban changes are considered as multi-level processes of interaction of social, economic and political factors. The researchers pay special attention to the role of local initiatives in the formation of new models of urban development [13].

Suptelo's works are devoted to the post-industrial transformations of old industrial areas of Kharkiv. The author proves that the degradation of industrial zones contributes to the emergence of alternative urban practices and new forms of space use. These processes demonstrate a gradual change in the logic of urban development from centralized planning to network forms of management [23].

Denysenko's research examines the transformation of urban space through the prism of spatial policy and the legacy of socialist urbanism. The author shows that the administrative centers of post-Soviet cities are characterized by institutional inertia, which often hinders adaptation to new socio-spatial challenges. At the same time, local initiatives are able to compensate for the limitations of formal planning [7].

Western researchers have made important contributions to theorizing tactical urbanism. In Webb's work, tactical urbanism is viewed as a critical planning practice that allows communities to influence urban development beyond traditional bureaucratic procedures. The author emphasizes its role as a tool for democratizing urban governance [34].

A classic work in the field of tactical urbanism is the study by Lydon and Garcia, who define tactical urbanism as a grassroots approach to transforming the urban environment through temporary, low-cost, and rapidly implemented interventions. The authors emphasize that such practices create experimental platforms for testing long-term urban development strategies.

A classic work in the field of tactical urbanism is the study by Lydon and Garcia, who define tactical urbanism as a grassroots approach to transforming the urban environment through temporary, low-cost, and rapidly implemented interventions. The authors emphasize that such practices create experimental platforms for testing long-term urban development strategies [12].

The theoretical foundations of the humanistic approach to urban planning are formulated in the work of Jan Gel, who substantiates the priority of human-centered design of urban space. His concept of creating a comfortable, safe and socially active environment has become the methodological basis for many modern urban practices [8].

A significant contribution to the development of the concept of urban resilience has been made by international organizations. In particular, UN-Habitat studies consider resilience as the ability of urban systems to adapt to crises while maintaining functionality and social stability [30, 31]. Similar provisions are confirmed by research by the Rockefeller Foundation within the framework of the "100 Resilient Cities" program, which emphasizes the need to integrate social, infrastructural

and management components into urban adaptation strategies [12].

Contemporary Ukrainian research on the resilience of urban areas emphasizes it as a multidimensional phenomenon that includes spatial adaptation, social mobilization, and institutional flexibility. In particular, Antonenko argues that the formation of spatial resilience is based on a combination of sustainable development, adaptive planning, and crisis management [1, 2].

Thus, the analysis of modern research shows that tactical urbanism is evolving from a tool for local experimental interventions to a comprehensive mechanism for adapting cities to crisis conditions. Its combination with the concepts of urban resilience, social mobilization, and network governance is especially relevant.

At the same time, the analysis of scientific literature demonstrates the presence of a research gap regarding the functioning of tactical urbanism in conditions of full-scale war. Existing research mainly focuses on social conflicts, post-industrial transformations and peacetime crises. The issues of the transformation of tactical urbanism in wartime, its role in ensuring the security of the population and maintaining the viability of cities remain insufficiently researched. It is this scientific gap that determines the relevance of further research into military tactical urbanism as a new direction in urban theory and practice.

#### **Identification of previously unsolved parts of the general problem and the purpose of the study.**

Despite the presence of a significant body of publications devoted to tactical urbanism, urban resilience, and crisis management of space, the current scientific discourse remains fragmented and conceptually incomplete in the context of military transformations of the urban environment. Most studies focus on peaceful conditions of implementation of tactical urban practices or consider crisis situations mainly through the prism of natural disasters, pandemics, or socio-economic crises, which does not reflect the specifics of full-scale war as a systemic factor of spatial changes [14].

First of all, there is no holistic theoretical and analytical model of military tactical urbanism as a separate phenomenon that is formed in conditions of armed conflict. Existing approaches do not take into account the transformation of the functions of tactical interventions - from tools for temporary improvement of the urban environment to mechanisms for survival, adaptation and ensuring the basic functionality of urban systems in crisis conditions.

The typology of transformations of tactical urbanism in wartime conditions also remains underdeveloped. Scientific sources lack a systematization of the forms, scales, and directions of changes in tactical practices – from public initiatives to semi-institutionalized forms of urban interventions that operate within the framework of a war economy, security constraints, and resource shortages.

A separate problem is the lack of comparative intercity studies that would reveal spatial, functional, and social differences in the manifestations of tactical urbanism in different urban contexts. Existing cases are usually local, descriptive in nature and do not form a

generalizing analytical framework for interpreting urban transformations in different types of cities (capital, border city, rear center).

Also, the scientific field is practically lacking in conceptualizing tactical urbanism as a systemic tool for building urban resilience. Tactical urbanism is mostly viewed as a local practice, rather than as an element of a comprehensive model of urban resilience that integrates spatial, social, institutional, and security components. In addition, the problem of integrating tactical urbanism into post-war spatial planning remains insufficiently studied. There are no scientifically sound approaches to transforming temporary tactical solutions into permanent elements of urban infrastructure and strategic development, which creates the risk of losing the accumulated adaptive potential in the process of post-war reconstruction.

In this context, the research niche of the article consists in forming an analytical model of military tactical urbanism, developing approaches to developing a typology of its transformations, conducting a comparative analysis of cases of tactical urbanism in Kyiv, Lviv, and Kharkiv. As well as in conceptualizing tactical urbanism as a tool of urban resilience and post-war spatial development, which allows integrating empirical observations into a holistic scientific framework.

**The purpose of this study** is to scientifically substantiate the transformation of tactical urbanism in wartime as a tool for crisis resilience of urban space using the examples of Kyiv, Lviv, and Kharkiv. To achieve the goal, the following tasks were formulated:

- to analyze the evolution of tactical urbanism before the war;
- to investigate the transformation of tactical urbanism practices in war conditions;
- to carry out a comparative analysis of cases;
- to develop approaches to forming a typology of military tactical urbanism;
- to determine the role of tactical urbanism in the formation of urban resilience.

**Presenting main material.** In academic discourse, tactical urbanism is defined as low-cost, temporary, and often small-scale interventions in the urban environment aimed at rapidly improving living conditions, experimentally testing new solutions, and enhancing community participation in spatial change. These interventions can be initiated by both community initiatives and municipal authorities, and aim to stimulate long-term positive change through short-term actions and prototyping of spaces [6, 11].

In the context of wartime crisis conditions, traditional approaches to spatial planning and urban change implementation show significant limitations. They are resource-intensive, time-consuming to implement, and insufficiently flexible to respond to rapid changes in external circumstances. In such situations, tactical urbanism becomes not only a means of improvement, but an adaptive system that allows cities to maintain basic functions, mobilize local resources, and quickly adapt space to new requirements for security, mobility, and social interaction.

Tactical urbanism as an adaptive system in crisis

conditions means that urban interventions are not only temporary, but also able to be integrated into the processes of self-regulation of the urban environment. As a system, tactical urbanism connects different subjects (public, volunteers, local administrations) and procedurally supports the rapid exchange of information, resources and innovations in response to external shocks. This corresponds to the understanding of the city as a complex adaptive system, where local actions can have a significant effect on the macro-level functioning of urban structures [21].

In a crisis, tactical urbanism acts as a crisis management tool. Since its principles: operationality, low resource intensity and experimentalism, meet the requirements of emergency conditions. It allows cities to implement operational solutions (for example, the organization of temporary shelters, aid hubs, safe communication routes), without waiting for full-fledged strategic plans, which in wartime may not be achievable within a reasonable time.

Expanding its function, tactical urbanism in such conditions becomes a tool for the survival of urban systems. That is, it not only temporarily improves individual aspects of urban life, but also helps maintain the overall viability of cities in times of extreme pressure. In this sense, tactical urbanism helps to solve basic tasks: ensuring functional routes for movement, supporting access to social services, organizing space for evacuation or meetings of citizens, temporary use of emergency or empty spaces for important needs of the population.

Finally, tactical urbanism in crisis plays the role of social infrastructure. It helps to strengthen social ties, activate civic participation, and create a sense of community and solidarity during a crisis. Such interventions often involve residents participating in decision-making, creating spatial elements, or volunteering to support projects, which strengthens social capital and community resilience. This theoretical model of tactical urbanism in wartime, as an integrative adaptive system, a crisis management mechanism, a survival tool, and social infrastructure, forms the basis of further empirical analysis in the article, where its components will be compared with specific cases of Ukrainian cities: Kyiv, Lviv, and Kharkiv.

Before the full-scale invasion of 2022, tactical urbanism in Kyiv had isolated manifestations, mostly associated with public initiatives to improve local spaces. These were small installations, temporary street reconstructions, and measures to revitalize public spaces. However, these initiatives were built without clear systemic support or integration into urban planning. In widespread use, the concept of “tactical urbanism” was little known to ordinary residents, and practical projects often remained local experiments by designers or activists without further scaling.

One manifestation of more formalized tactical urbanism in Kyiv before and at the beginning of the war was parklets [32] – small temporary spatial interventions along streets or in place of parking spaces that reimagine transportation space for the benefit of pedestrians and local communities. Such elements were usually initiated by public initiatives with the participation of city authorities, which demonstrates the potential integration of

tactical practices into formal procedures of the urban environment. They did not require significant resources, were mobile and could be quickly implemented according to specific local needs. At the same time, they served as an example of small-scale transformations for testing innovative solutions in everyday life.

The full-scale war of 2022 radically changed the functional logic of Kyiv’s urban space. A key vital element was the repurposing of the underground spaces of the metro and other critical infrastructure facilities into shelters for the population during air raids. Although the metro itself was not designed as a tactical urban tool, it became a critical part of the city’s security infrastructure and a tool for citizens’ survival during active hostilities. Zones for long-term stay of people during periods of threat were organized in the underground passages, which actually transformed the traditional transport space into a space of adaptive life [33].

At the same time, practices of digitalization of urban services appeared: online shelter maps, mobile applications for tracking air alerts, integration of data on safe travel routes, etc. These solutions not only allowed residents to quickly navigate the city in conditions of uncertainty, but also introduced elements of digital tactical urbanism, such as operational planning and access to urban information in real time to increase life safety and adaptability. Such digital tools integrated the technological space into practical mechanisms of rapid response and communication during military alerts.

The war has radically transformed the role of tactical urbanism in Kyiv: from local experimental projects to vital spatial and information solutions that support everyday life in crisis conditions. One of the most striking examples is the TORV Kyiv project in Podil - a large-scale tactical urban experiment to transform large abandoned spaces into public places for gatherings, recreation and social activity even under war conditions. This project demonstrates how the tools of tactical urbanism can serve as spatial prototyping that shapes the conditions for life and community even in the context of combat risks [5]. The TORV Kyiv project (11,000 m<sup>2</sup>) was implemented using temporary, rapidly implemented interventions (modular seating, shadows, small architectural forms) in conditions of active threats and mobilized volunteer participation of residents and designers, which became an example of a new urban habitual form of spatial life – temporary, but functional and socially attractive.

Tactical urbanism in Kyiv during wartime plays a key role in increasing urban resilience, i.e. the city's ability to adapt, survive, and partially restore its functionality under the pressure of external shocks. Repurposing underground metro spaces as shelters, digital services for navigation in crisis situations, adapting public spaces for social functions and community initiatives, all this indicates an expansion of the functional spectrum of tactical urbanism: from a tool for improvement to a mechanism for resilient adaptation and support for the social and physical security of residents.

The case of Kyiv demonstrates that tactical urbanism in wartime conditions:

- transforms from local landscaping practices to critical life decisions;

- integrates with security infrastructure (metro, shelters), digital services, and volunteer networks;
- promotes the adaptability of space and supports social, communication, and information functions in crisis conditions;
- strengthens urban resilience as the system's ability to survive and partially restore everyday life.

While Kharkiv until 2022 was characterized by the active development of grassroots urban initiatives related to public activism, self-organization of residents and local projects of revitalization of spaces. These practices formed the social capital of the city and networks of trust, which did not have a clear institutionalized form, but ensured the ability of the community to quickly mobilize in crisis conditions. In the pre-war period, they manifested themselves in the format of public initiatives, cultural spaces, educational platforms, local urban projects, which were mainly socio-cultural, rather than security in nature [16].

With the outbreak of full-scale war, a structural transformation of grassroots activism into volunteer networks took place. Urban initiatives, public organizations, local communities, and informal groups of residents reoriented their activities from cultural and urban practices to providing basic needs of the population: assistance in evacuation, humanitarian support, logistics, resource coordination, and information support. This transition did not have a formalized management structure, but functioned as a network model of self-organization typical of crisis societies, where horizontal connections replace traditional institutional mechanisms of governance [35].

The Kharkiv model of “existential resilience” is unique because it emerged in the context of a systemic collapse of the traditional economy: the city lost 40% of the municipal budget and about 70% of big business [3]. In a situation where large strategic investments are practically impossible due to constant shelling, tactical urbanism becomes not just a method of improvement, but a radical tool of physical and mental survival. The “Parking” project (Zaparkannya) in the Zalopani district is the most vivid example of “pure” tactical urbanism. Its founder, architect Olga Golubova, began it as a study of “urban voids” — neglected urban spaces that have become even more isolated due to the war. The implementation of the project is based on the “toloka” method, where residents and activists personally clear the banks of the Lopan River and install improvised infrastructure. Such a physical process helps to mentally consolidate and restore a sense of control over the environment [22]. An important aspect is local energy independence: streetlights powered by solar panels were made in a week and powered by residents of neighboring houses. This embodies the philosophy of “right to the river”, where the embankment becomes a place of peace (“solitude in storming times”), critically necessary for the psycho-emotional recovery of Kharkiv residents.

In addition to grassroots initiatives, the Kharkiv model includes “survival hubs” in schools and basements, as well as the transformation of the metro into an “underground city” with makeshift classrooms and sleeping areas. Unlike Kyiv, the Kharkiv model relies mainly on horizontal connections and volunteer

networks, which makes it extremely grassroots and adaptive. “Survival hubs” are temporary multifunctional spaces that combine the functions of humanitarian centers, aid points, logistical hubs and social support spaces. They arose in schools, libraries, cultural centers, basements, underground passages, administrative buildings and often had an adaptive, temporary character, which is a typical feature of tactical urbanism. These hubs were not part of formal urban planning programs, but performed a critically important function of supporting the vital activity of the population in conditions of infrastructural instability and the constant threat of shelling [12, 30, 31]

A feature of Kharkiv was the massive transformation of shelters into full-fledged social spaces. Basements, metro stations, underground passages and other protective facilities ceased to perform exclusively the function of physical protection and acquired a multifunctional character: places of temporary residence, education of children, organization of everyday life, communication and mutual support. In this context, shelters function as tactical urban spaces that arise spontaneously, quickly adapt to people's needs and are formed without centralized planning, but with high social efficiency. The Kharkiv metro actually took on the role of adaptive social infrastructure, ensuring the continuity of basic functions of urban life in conditions of constant shelling [9, 18, 26].

The case of Kharkiv demonstrates a unique level of social mobilization of the urban population. City residents, regardless of professional affiliation, social status or age, were involved in the processes of self-organization, assistance and support. Social networks, local chats, digital platforms became tools for operational coordination of actions, which allowed to create a decentralized system of crisis management. In this sense, tactical urbanism in Kharkiv goes beyond spatial interventions and takes the form of socio-spatial practice, where the key resource becomes not infrastructure, but the community.

Taken together, these processes form a model of crisis adaptation of Kharkiv as an urban system. The city functions not as a hierarchically managed structure, but as a networked adaptive organism in which tactical practices, volunteer networks, temporary spaces, and social mobilization interact in a mode of constant response to threats. Tactical urbanism in this context is not a separate direction of urban policy, but acts as an integrated survival mechanism that ensures the support of vital activity, social stability, and functional resilience of the city under prolonged military pressure.

The Kharkiv case demonstrates the transformation of tactical urbanism from a spatial practice into a system of crisis socio-spatial adaptation, where the key components are:

- grassroots self-organization;
- volunteer networks;
- temporary multifunctional spaces;
- social mobilization;
- adaptive use of urban infrastructure.

Thus, Kharkiv serves as an example of an extreme form of military tactical urbanism, in which tactical urbanism becomes the basic mechanism for preserving

urban viability.

Before the outbreak of the full-scale war, Lviv was a city with a relatively high level of strategic spatial management: urban development plans, numerous public consultations and formal decision-making mechanisms created a stable, but sometimes inflexible, governance model. This institutional inertia was typical of city administrations oriented towards long-term programs and formal procedures, which made it difficult to quickly implement new, non-traditional practices in crisis conditions. This context led to a limited role for tactical urbanism as an autonomous phenomenon until 2022, and instead focused attention on planned mechanisms of urban spatial development [27].

One of the instruments of residents' participation in the life of the city is the public budget (participatory budgeting). It played a significant role in Lviv in involving residents in local decisions even before the war. This mechanism allowed initiating projects for improvement, safe spaces and public facilities at the expense of part of municipal funds, which partly corresponds to the logic of tactical urbanism as local, low-resource interventions. However, unlike tactical practices in crisis situations, these projects usually involved lengthy procedures for submission, approval and implementation, which limited their efficiency during the war. Therefore, the public budget served as a mechanism of institutional participation, but did not become an independent tool for adaptive response to the crisis [11].

The onset of the full-scale invasion activated Lviv's cultural institutions as spaces of support, humanitarian coordination and mobilization, which became an important sign of local adaptation. An example is the UNESCO Lviv Culture Hub initiative, which opened in 2025 as a platform for training, exchange and support for cultural professionals to strengthen social resilience. It is designed to promote both the restoration of the cultural sector and the strengthening of the social and psychological resources of the community during the war, which demonstrates the integration of cultural infrastructure into a wider range of vital needs of the city. This development is a manifestation of cultural-defense activism, where cultural practices become an element of resilience and reconstruction of social ties in crisis conditions [29].

In Lviv, as in other Ukrainian cities, the creation and use of safe spaces and shelters became part of everyday urban practice after the outbreak of the war. Official bomb shelters, spacious shelters in the basements of schools, cultural centers, and even businesses provided not only physical protection from air threats, but also functioned as temporary shelters for displaced persons and volunteer groups. Some of these spaces operated according to the logic of tactical interventions, ensuring rapid adaptation to security and social support needs without lengthy planning procedures. Such spatial solutions often arose spontaneously, responding to the immediate needs of local communities and performing functions inherent in adaptive tactical urbanism [28].

In conclusion, the Lviv case demonstrates that tactical urbanism in wartime was not the dominant mechanism in shaping urban practices, but was integrated into a broader system of urban resilience through the interaction of formal institutions, civic initiatives, and cultural

platforms. Local participatory tools (public budget), cultural spaces (UNESCO Culture Hub) [29], rapid adaptation of shelters, and mobilization of security resources became parts of Lviv's hybrid adaptation model. In this model, tactical urban elements enhance overall urban resilience—the ability not only to resist external threats but also to maintain social cohesion, information networks, and cultural identity in crisis. Such a model corresponds to contemporary interpretations of urban resilience, where the integration of different types of spatial and social practices is key to the adaptive capacity of cities in wartime [28].

In all three cities, tactical urbanism has transformed from a tool for urban development into a mechanism for crisis adaptation of the urban environment, which corresponds to modern theories of urban resilience. The following characteristics are common:

- adaptability – rapid reconfiguration of spaces in accordance with new threats;
- temporality – the use of unstable, mobile solutions as the basic logic of spatial change;
- social mobilization – the key resource is no longer infrastructure, but the community;
- hybridity of management – a combination of formal and informal mechanisms;
- functional transformation of spaces – shelters, metro, cultural centers, hubs cease to be monofunctional.

Thus, tactical urbanism in all cases acquires a systemic character and ceases to be a purely spatial practice, transforming into a socio-spatial adaptive mechanism. Tactical urbanism in wartime functions not as a single practice, but as a spectrum of models ranging from existential survival to institutional stabilization (tabl. 1).

The differences between the Kyiv, Kharkiv, and Lviv models of tactical urbanism in wartime conditions form fundamentally different trajectories of its evolution and functioning as an adaptive urban mechanism. In Kyiv, tactical urbanism acquires the features of an institutionally integrated system that combines spatial transformations with digital forms of management and security. The formation of shelter maps, the development of digital navigation services, the integration of information platforms into urban management and crisis infrastructure form a model in which tactical urbanism becomes a tool not only for rapid adaptation, but also for stabilizing the functioning of urban processes. In this context, the Kyiv model can be interpreted as productive, since it is aimed not at the existential survival of the city, but at restoring its functional integrity, manageability, and institutional continuity. Tactical solutions here play the role of an intermediate link between crisis response and long-term management, integrating into the system of urban management and strategic planning [24].

The Kharkiv case demonstrates a fundamentally different logic of the development of tactical urbanism. This model is dominated by an extreme form of its implementation, due to the high intensity of hostilities and systemic destruction of urban infrastructure. In the Kharkiv model, tactical urbanism loses the character of a tool for improvement or adaptive management and is transformed into a mechanism for the basic survival of the urban system. Shelter spaces, underground passages, the metro, and improvised hubs for life support cease to

be temporary solutions and acquire the status of full-fledged living spaces. Tactical urbanism in this case is not integrated into the institutional framework of management and functions mainly through grassroots practices of self-organization, volunteer networks, and horizontal social ties, which corresponds to the concepts of

existential resilience of urban systems. In this model, tactical urbanism performs a critical function — ensuring the basic viability of the city, which allows us to define the Kharkiv trajectory as a critical model of military tactical urbanism, in which adaptation is not of a stabilizing, but of an existential nature.

Table 1

*Comparison of the characteristic features of the development of tactical urbanism in Kyiv, Kharkiv, Lviv*

Criteria	Kyiv	Kharkiv	Lviv
The dominant type of tactical urbanism	Institutionalized, digital	Grassroots, existential	Hybrid, institutional-cultural
Subjects	City government, communities, digital platforms	Communities, volunteer networks, self-organization	Institutions, cultural organizations, communities
Level of institutionalization	Medium–high	Low	Medium
Main spaces	Public spaces, metro, digital services	Shelters, basements, subways, hubs	Cultural spaces, shelters, institutional buildings
Main function	Adaptation, stabilization	Survival	Stability, stabilization
Resilience type	Functional	Existential	Institutional and social
The nature of tactical urbanism	Productive	Critical	Socio-infrastructurel

The Lviv case forms a distinctive logic of the development of tactical urbanism, combining institutional stability with a high level of public activity and cultural mobilization. Here, tactical urbanism does not acquire extreme forms of survival, but it is not reduced to a purely institutional management tool. Its transformation occurs through integration into cultural spaces, educational environments, institutional structures of local government and public budget mechanisms. In this context, tactical urbanism performs the function of stabilizing social processes, supporting community solidarity and forming social stability of the urban environment, which corresponds to the approaches of institutional and social resilience. The Lviv model can be defined as socio-infrastructurel, since its key resource is not only spatial solutions, but also social institutions, cultural practices and mechanisms of collective action.

The generalization of these differences allows us to lay the foundations for the formation of a theoretical typology of military tactical urbanism as a system of adaptive models that function in different regimes of urban reality. The Kharkiv case represents a critical model within which tactical urbanism is a mechanism of existential adaptation and support for the basic viability of the city. The Kyiv case appears as a productive form of tactical urbanism, focused on stabilization, restoration of functions and institutional controllability of urban processes. The inter-case security logic is formed around shelters, protective infrastructure and spatial solutions for minimizing risks, transforming tactical urbanism into a tool for spatial protection of urban life. The Lviv case, in turn, represents a socio-infrastructurel type in which tactical urbanism is integrated into cultural and institutional structures, performing the function of consolidating the urban community and supporting social stability.

Thus, tactical urbanism in wartime is not a single universal practice, but a spectrum of adaptive models ranging from existential survival to institutional stabilization. In this dimension, tactical urbanism

appears simultaneously as an adaptive system, a crisis management mechanism, a tool for urban resilience, and a structural element of postwar planning. Thus, tactical urbanism goes beyond the practices of spatial design and acquires the status of a full-fledged urban theory of crisis adaptation of urban systems, which forms a new scientific paradigm for understanding the city in wartime and deep systemic instability [24].

Accordingly, the logic of urban interventions is changing. In pre-war models of tactical urbanism, the principle of experimentalism, temporality and aesthetic transformation of space dominates. In the military model, this logic is transformed into the logic of functional necessity, existential expediency and crisis rationality. Interventions no longer have a demonstrative or symbolic character, they acquire a utilitarian, protective and life-supporting function. Spatial solutions are formed not from the position of design, but from the position of safety, accessibility, adaptability and speed of implementation. Thus, tacticality ceases to mean “temporaryness” in the classical sense and begins to mean a rapid response of the system to a threat, which brings tactical urbanism closer to the logic of crisis management of urban systems.

The key shift is the transition from aesthetics to survival as the basic principle of spatial transformation. In the military context, space loses its representative function and acquires the function of a protective environment. Aesthetic parameters give way to functional ones: the availability of shelters, safe routes, the possibility of autonomous existence, the provision of basic needs. This transition changes the very philosophy of urban planning, where the categories of “beauty”, “comfort” and “identity” are temporarily replaced by the categories of “safety”, “resilience”, “security” and “adaptability”. In this sense, military tactical urbanism forms a new anthropocentric logic of space, where a person is considered not as a consumer of the urban environment, but as a subject who is in conditions of constant risk [20,

25].

The integration of tactical urbanism with the concept of resilience is a system-forming element of the conceptual model. Tactical urbanism ceases to be a separate tool of spatial policy and becomes a mechanism for the formation of urban resilience, capable of ensuring the adaptation, restoration and transformation of urban systems. In this model, resilience is not considered as a static property of the city, but as a dynamic process of constant adaptation to threats. Tactical urbanism in wartime conditions acts as the operational level of this resilience. That is, it becomes the mechanism through which the urban system carries out a rapid restructuring of its spatial, social and infrastructural structures. It provides not only physical adaptation of the environment, but also social, institutional and cultural transformation of the city as a complex socio-spatial system.

An integral component of the conceptual model is the connection of military tactical urbanism with civil society. In all the studied cases, it is horizontal social ties, self-organization, volunteer networks and public initiative that form the basic infrastructure of tactical urbanism. This means that military tactical urbanism functions not only as a spatial, but also as a social phenomenon. It is embedded in the structures of civil society, transforming them into spatial practices, and at the same time forms new types of interaction between the community and the urban environment. Thus, tactical urbanism becomes a form of spatial realization of civic subjectivity, where the city acts not as an object of management, but as an environment of joint responsibility and collective action [19].

In conclusion, the conceptual model of military tactical urbanism can be defined as a system of crisis transformation of urban space, combining functional adaptation, resilience, social mobilization and institutional hybridity. It captures the transition of tactical urbanism from aesthetically oriented practices to existentially oriented mechanisms, from temporary interventions to systemic transformations, from local experiments to structural restructuring of urban systems. In this sense, military tactical urbanism appears not as a direction of urban design, but as a new theoretical framework for understanding the city in conditions of radical instability, which forms the basis for post-war spatial planning, restoration and long-term development of Ukrainian cities.

**Conclusions.** The conducted research shows that tactical urbanism in war conditions undergoes a fundamental transformation, which changes not only its functional purpose, but also its theoretical status in modern urban science. From a tool of temporary spatial interventions focused on the activation of public spaces, improvement of the urban environment and local experiments with urban design, tactical urbanism turns into a systemic mechanism of crisis adaptation of urban systems. In the military context, it moves into the plane of existential functions, where the main categories are not comfort and aesthetics, but security, viability, stability and the ability of the city to self-reproduce in conditions of constant threat.

Empirical analysis of the cases of Kyiv, Kharkiv and Lviv allowed us to record different trajectories of

transformation of tactical urbanism, which form a spectrum of adaptive models of military tactical urbanism. The Kyiv model demonstrates the institutional integration of tactical urbanism into urban management systems and digital security infrastructure, forming a productive type of adaptation focused on stabilizing and restoring the functionality of urban processes. The Kharkiv case represents a critical model within which tactical urbanism acquires an existential character and functions as a survival mechanism for the urban system in conditions of radical destruction of infrastructure. The Lviv trajectory forms a socio-infrastructure model, where tactical urbanism is integrated into institutional, cultural and public structures, performing the function of stabilizing social processes and consolidating the urban community. Collectively, these cases demonstrate that military tactical urbanism is not a unified practice, but rather emerges as a multiple system of models adapted to different types of risks, threat levels, and structures of the urban environment.

The scientific results of the study are, firstly, the conceptualization of military tactical urbanism as a separate analytical category of urban theory, secondly, the formation of a typology of models of tactical urbanism in war conditions, thirdly, the development of a conceptual model of military tactical urbanism as a system that combines spatial adaptation, social mobilization, resilience and crisis management. The theoretical contribution of the study is to transfer tactical urbanism from the plane of applied spatial practices to the plane of the theory of crisis transformation of urban systems, where tactical urbanism is considered as a structural component of the functioning of the city in conditions of systemic instability. This allows us to expand traditional approaches to the analysis of urban development, integrating the categories of war, risk, danger and existential vulnerability into them as full-fledged analytical variables.

The practical significance of the study lies in the possibility of using the developed conceptual model of military tactical urbanism in spatial planning systems, crisis management and development of urban resilience strategies. The results obtained can be applied in the formation of post-war recovery programs, where tactical urbanism can act as an intermediate tool between crisis adaptation and strategic development. Military tactical urbanism in this context becomes a transitional mechanism that allows ensuring the continuity of the functioning of urban systems in the period between military instability and the phase of sustainable development. It can be integrated into policies for infrastructure reconstruction, the formation of security spaces, the development of public environments and the creation of adaptive urban structures capable of functioning in conditions of high uncertainty. Since tactical urbanism in this process can serve as a tool for soft reconstruction, ensuring a gradual transformation of the environment without sharp breaks in social ties and urban practices. It can become a platform for combining the interests of the state, local government and civil society in the reconstruction processes, forming a new culture of spatial co-responsibility.

Prospects for further research are primarily related

to expanding the empirical base beyond large cities and studying the transformations of tactical urbanism in regional centers and small towns, where the social structure, institutional capacity, and resources differ significantly from megacities. A separate direction is the analysis of deoccupied territories, where tactical urbanism can play a key role in the primary reconstruction of space, the restoration of basic functions of urban life, and the reintegration of the population. An important scientific task is also the study of the integration of military tactical urbanism into state reconstruction policies, where it can be conceptualized as an official tool of spatial adap-

tation, resilience, and post-crisis development.

As a result, military tactical urbanism appears not as a situational response to a crisis, but as a new paradigm of urban thinking, within which the city is viewed as an adaptive system capable of transforming under the pressure of threats, while maintaining its social integrity, functional capacity, and potential for recovery. It is in this logic that tactical urbanism acquires the status not of a design tool, but of a fundamental element of the theory of the city in wartime, which forms the basis for a new type of post-war spatial development and strategic planning of Ukrainian cities.

#### References:

1. Antonenko, N., & Malchykova, D. (2025). Dynamic model of urban resilience for spatial policy development. *Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Geography*, 14-21. <https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-2721.2025.92-93.2> [in Ukrainian].
2. Antonenko, N. (2025). Spatial resilience of urban territories. *Scientific Bulletin of Kherson State University. Series «Geographical Sciences»*, 22, 7-16. <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2413-7391/2025-22-1> [in Ukrainian].
3. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (2025). Ukraine's regional realignments: Wartime and postwar reconstruction. Retrieved from <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2025/12/ukraine-regional-realignments-wartime-postwar-reconstruction>
4. Cities for Better Health (2023). From warzone to wellness: How Kyiv's new pop-up space is reimagining health and resilience. Retrieved from <https://www.citiesforbetterhealth.com/latest-news/from-warzone-to-wellness-how-kyivs-new-pop-up-space-is-reimagining-health-and-resilience.html>
5. Colville-Andersen, M. (2025, November 7). The unexpected story of the world's largest tactical urbanism project in a warzone. *Il Foglio*. Retrieved from <https://foglio.europeo.ilfoglio.it/en/the-unexpected-story-of-the-worlds-largest-tactical-urbanism-project-in-a-warzone/>
6. Dell'Ovo, E. (2023). Tactical urbanism and real estate dynamics (Critique). *Land*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land12071457>
7. Denysenko, O. (2023). Politics of space, socialist urbanism and transformations: Analysis of transformations of the administrative center of Kryvyi Rih. *Ekonomichna ta Sotsialna Geografiya*, 89, 6-20. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2413-7154/2023.89.6-20> [in Ukrainian].
8. Gehl, J. (2010). *Cities for People*. Island Press.
9. Hlushko, D. (2023, April 5). Kharkiv subway to become a home: Stories of people still living in a metro station. *Gwara Media*. Retrieved from <https://gwaramedia.com/en/kharkiv-subway-to-become-a-home-stories-of-people-living-in-a-metro-station/>
10. Khmarochos (2023, October 12). What is tactical urbanism and how it will help Ukrainian cities. Retrieved from <https://hmarochos.kiev.ua/2023/10/12/shho-take-taktychnyj-urbanizm-i-yak-vin-dopomozhe-ukrayinskym-mistam/> [in Ukrainian].
11. Lviv City Council (2020–2023). Public budget of Lviv: Official reports and projects. Retrieved from <https://lviv.pb.org.ua/> [in Ukrainian].
12. Lydon, M., & Garcia, A. (2015). *Tactical urbanism: Short-term action for long-term change*. Island Press.
13. Mezentsev, K., Oliinyk, Ya., & Mezentseva, N. (Eds.). (2017). *Urban Ukraine: In the epicenter of spatial changes*. Feniks [in Ukrainian].
14. Mohankumar, V. (2023). *A tactical urbanism guidebook*. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH. Retrieved from [https://www.transformative-mobility.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/ Training-Material\\_A\\_Tactical\\_Urbanism\\_Guidebook-5zZpKb.pdf](https://www.transformative-mobility.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Training-Material_A_Tactical_Urbanism_Guidebook-5zZpKb.pdf)
15. Niemets, L., Suptelo, O., Lohvynova, M., & Sehida, K. (2021). Conflicts in urban spaces and post-industrial urban transformations. *Ekonomichna ta Sotsialna Geografiya*, 85, 62-71. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2413-7154/2021.85.62-71> [in Ukrainian].
16. OECD (2023). *Rebuilding Ukraine: Urban recovery and resilience framework*. OECD Publishing.
17. Pankova, L.I., Uzbek, D.A., & Pankov, M.O. (2024). Resilience as a factor of urban security in conditions of the information economy [Manuscript]. eKMAIR Institutional Repository. Retrieved from <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/server/api/core/bitstreams/b7c0ffbe-e37c-4a12-9500-f71863875e42/content>
18. Reuters (2022, March 11). Kharkiv metro is a 'city' where hundreds shelter from bombardment. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/world/kharkiv-metro-is-city-where-hundreds-shelter-bombardment-2022-03-11/>
19. RRR4U (2025). Resilience and solidarity: Urban responses to war. Retrieved from [https://rrr4u.org/en/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2025/04/resilience.and\\_solidarity\\_report\\_eng.pdf](https://rrr4u.org/en/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2025/04/resilience.and_solidarity_report_eng.pdf)
20. Shulha, O.V. (2025). Legal and organizational foundations of urban resilience in Ukraine. *Uzhhorod National University Herald. Series: Law*, 2(90), 245-252. <https://doi.org/10.24144/2307-3322.2025.90.2.35>
21. Silva, P. (2016). Tactical urbanism: Towards an evolutionary cities approach? *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 43(6). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265813516657340>

22. Suminov, M. (2023, July 19). Letting city meet rivers: Local urbanism in Kharkiv. Gwara Media. Retrieved from <https://gwaramedia.com/en/letting-city-meet-rivers-local-urbanism-in-kharkiv/>
23. Suptelo, O.S. (2020). Post-industrial transformations of old industrial districts of Kharkiv. *Ekonomichna ta Sotsialna Geografiya*, 83, 53-62. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2413-7154/2020.83.53-62> [in Ukrainian].
24. Transformative Mobility. (2023b). Training material: A tactical urbanism guidebook. Retrieved from [https://www.transformative-mobility.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/TrainingMaterial\\_A\\_Tactical\\_Urbanism\\_Guidebook-5zZpKb.pdf](https://www.transformative-mobility.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/TrainingMaterial_A_Tactical_Urbanism_Guidebook-5zZpKb.pdf)
25. Tsarynnyk, Y. (2024). Spatial reactions to war: Urban insights from rear and frontline cities [Master's thesis, TU Wien]. Repositum. Retrieved from <https://repositum.tuwien.at/bitstream/20.500.12708/197152/1/Tsarynnyk%20Yana%20-%202024%20-%20Spatial%20reactions%20to%20war%20Urban%20insights%20from%20rear%20and...pdf>
26. UN Human Rights Monitoring Mission in Ukraine (2024). Attacks on Ukraine's Energy Infrastructure: Harm to the Civilian Population. Retrieved from <https://ukraine.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/2024-09/ENG%20Attacks%20on%20Ukraine%E2%80%99s%20Energy%20Infrastructure-%20Harm%20to%20the%20Civilian%20Population.pdf>
27. UNDP Ukraine (2022–2024). Urban resilience and community mobilisation in Ukrainian cities during war. United Nations Development Programme.
28. United Nations Development Programme (2023, May 24). Lviv: A city embraces innovation, even amidst war. Retrieved from <https://stories.undp.org/lviv-a-city-embraces-innovation-even-amidst-war>
29. UNESCO (2022). Culture in times of war: Safeguarding urban cultural infrastructure in Ukraine. UNESCO.
30. UN-Habitat & ICRC (2022–2024). War-time urban resilience and humanitarian urbanism in Ukraine.
31. UN-Habitat (2022). War-time urban resilience in Ukrainian cities. United Nations Human Settlements Programme.
32. Village Ukraine, The. (2023). Here are four parklets from utilities in Kyiv... Retrieved from <https://www.village.com.ua/village/city/public-space/354003-os-chotiri-parkleti-vid-komunalnikiv-u-kievi-y-odin-vid-aktivistiv-u-chernivtsyah-znaydit-spravzhniy> [in Ukrainian].
33. Visit Ukraine (2023). In 2023 more than 300 thousand people used metro stations as shelters. Retrieved from <https://visitukraine.today/blog/3161/in-2023-more-than-300-thousand-people-used-metro-stations-as-shelters>
34. Webb, D. (2017a). Tactical urbanism: Delineating a critical praxis (Davidoff context). *Planning Theory & Practice*, 18(4).
35. World Bank Group (2022–2023). Ukraine Rapid Damage and Needs Assessment (RDNA). World Bank.

**Authors Contribution:** All authors have contributed equally to this work

**Conflict of Interest:** The author certifies that although the author of the article is a member of the editorial board of this journal, the peer review process, the decision regarding publication, and the editing were carried out independently, without their participation or influence. Any potential conflicts of interest were fully mitigated through external oversight of the process.

### **Катерина Сегіда**

д. геогр. н., професор, завідувач кафедри соціально-економічної географії і регіонознавства імені Костянтина Немця, Харківський національний університет імені В.Н. Каразіна, майдан Свободи, 4, м. Харків, 61022, Україна  
e-mail: [kateryna.sehida@karazin.ua](mailto:kateryna.sehida@karazin.ua), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1122-8460>

### **Наталія Гусєва**

к. геогр. н., доцент кафедри соціально-економічної географії і регіонознавства імені Костянтина Немця, Харківський національний університет імені В.Н. Каразіна, майдан Свободи, 4, м. Харків, 61022, Україна  
e-mail: [nataliya.guseva@karazin.ua](mailto:nataliya.guseva@karazin.ua), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3620-1213>

### **Ольга Сунтелю**

доктор філософії (науки про Землю), доцент кафедри соціально-економічної географії і регіонознавства імені Костянтина Немця, Харківський національний університет імені В.Н. Каразіна, майдан Свободи, 4, м. Харків, 61022, Україна  
e-mail: [olha.suptelo@karazin.ua](mailto:olha.suptelo@karazin.ua), <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2901-8565>

### **Сергій Батура**

здобувач другого (магістерського) рівня вищої освіти кафедри соціально-економічної географії і регіонознавства імені Костянтина Немця, Харківський національний університет імені В.Н. Каразіна, майдан Свободи, 4, м. Харків, 61022, Україна  
e-mail: [serhii.batura@student.karazin.ua](mailto:serhii.batura@student.karazin.ua), <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1227-1374>

## ТАКТИЧНИЙ УРБАНІЗМ В УМОВАХ ВІЙНИ (КЕЙСИ: КИЇВ, ЛЬВІВ, ХАРКІВ)

Повномасштабна війна в Україні спричинила радикальні трансформації міських систем, поставивши під сумнів ефективність традиційних моделей стратегічного та просторового планування й актуалізувавши потребу в адаптивних, швидких та малоресурсних формах реагування на кризові виклики. У цих умовах тактичний урбанізм із інструменту локальних естетичних і демонстраційних інтервенцій трансформується у важливий механізм кризового менеджменту, забезпечення безпеки, підтримки соціальної інфраструктури та формування міської резильєнтності. Водночас у науковому дискурсі відсутня цілісна концептуалізація тактичного урбанізму як інструменту функціонування міста в умовах війни, що зумовлює наукову проблему даного дослідження.

Метою статті є наукове обґрунтування трансформації тактичного урбанізму в умовах війни як інструменту кризової адаптації та резильєнтності міського простору на прикладі українських міст. Методологічну основу дослідження становлять якісний кейс-аналіз, порівняльний підхід, структурно-функціональний аналіз та концептуальне узагальнення емпіричних матеріалів. Емпіричну базу формують кейси Києва, Харкова та Львова як міст із різними соціально-просторовими моделями, рівнем інституційної стійкості та типами громадянської мобілізації.

У результаті дослідження виявлено принципову зміну функціональної логіки тактичного урбанізму: від довосенної критично-демонстраційної та естетичної парадигми — до воєнної продуктивної, безпекової та соціально-інфраструктурної. Тактичний урбанізм у воєнних умовах набуває ознак інструменту виживання міських систем, проявляючись у створенні укриттів, безпечних хабів, волонтерських просторів, тимчасових центрів підтримки спільнот і кризових інфраструктур. Порівняльний аналіз кейсів Києва, Харкова та Львова дозволив виокремити типологію воєнних моделей тактичного урбанізму та їхню роль у формуванні соціальної, інституційної й просторової резильєнтності міста.

Наукова новизна дослідження полягає у концептуалізації тактичного урбанізму як елементу системи міської резильєнтності в умовах війни, формуванні типології його воєнних трансформацій та розробці узагальненої моделі воєнного тактичного урбанізму як інструменту кризового управління міським простором. Практична значущість результатів полягає у можливості їх використання в процесах післявоєнного відновлення, формуванні політик міської безпеки, інтегрованого просторового планування та розробці стратегій відбудови українських міст з урахуванням принципів адаптивності, швидкої реалізації та участі громадянського суспільства.

**Ключові слова:** тактичний урбанізм, резильєнтність міста, воєнна урбаністика, міський активізм, урбаністичні простори, кризове планування, Київ, Харків, Львів.

## Список використаної літератури:

1. Антоненко Н., Мальчикова Д. Динамічна модель міської резильєнтності для формування просторової політики. *Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка, Географія*. 2025. С. 14-21. Р. 14-21. URL: <https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-2721.2025.92-93.2>
2. Антоненко Н. Принципи формування просторової резильєнтності міських територій. *Науковий вісник Херсонського державного університету. Серія «Географічні науки»*. 2025. № 22. С. 7-16. <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2413-7391/2025-22-1>
3. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Ukraine's regional realignments: Wartime and postwar reconstruction. 2025. URL: <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2025/12/ukraine-regional-realignments-wartime-postwar-reconstruction>
4. Cities for Better Health. From warzone to wellness: How Kyiv's new pop-up space is reimagining health and resilience. 2023. URL: <https://www.citiesforbetterhealth.com/latest-news/from-warzone-to-wellness-how-kyivs-new-pop-up-space-is-reimagining-health-and-resilience.html>
5. Colville-Andersen M. The unexpected story of the world's largest tactical urbanism project in a warzone. II Foglio. 2025. Nov. 7. URL: <https://foglioeuropa.ilfoglio.it/en/the-unexpected-story-of-the-worlds-largest-tactical-urbanism-project-in-a-warzone/>
6. Dell'Ovo E. Tactical urbanism and real estate dynamics (Critique). Land. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land12071457>
7. Денисенко О. Політика простору, соціалістичний урбанізм і трансформації: Аналіз перетворень адміністративного центру Кривого Рогу. *Економічна та соціальна географія*. 2023. Вип. 89. С. 6-20. URL: <https://doi.org/10.17721/2413-7154/2023.89.6-20>
8. Gehl J. *Cities for People*. Island Press, 2010. 288 p.
9. Hlushko D. Kharkiv subway to become a home: Stories of people still living in a metro station. Gwara Media. 2023. April 5. URL: <https://gwaramedia.com/en/kharkiv-subway-to-become-a-home-stories-of-people-living-in-a-metro-station/>
10. Хмарочос. Що таке тактичний урбанізм і як він допоможе українським містам. 2023. 12 жовт. URL: <https://hmarochos.kiev.ua/2023/10/12/shho-take-taktychnyj-urbanizm-i-yak-vin-dopomozhe-ukrayinskym-mistam/>
11. Львівська міська рада. Громадський бюджет м. Lvova: Ofitsiini zvity ta proieky. 2020–2023. URL: <https://lviv.pb.org.ua/>
12. Lydon M., Garcia A. *Tactical urbanism: Short-term action for long-term change*. Island Press, 2015. 256 p.
13. Урбаністична Україна: в епіцентрі просторових змін: монографія / за ред. К. Мезенцева, Я. Олійника, Н. Мезенцевої. Київ: Фенікс, 2017. 438 с.
14. Mohankumar V. *A tactical urbanism guidebook*. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH. 2023. URL: [https://www.transformative-mobility.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/TrainingMaterial\\_A\\_Tactical\\_Urbanism\\_Guidebook-5zZpKb.pdf](https://www.transformative-mobility.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/TrainingMaterial_A_Tactical_Urbanism_Guidebook-5zZpKb.pdf)
15. Немець Л., Суптело О., Логвинова М., Сегіда К. Конфлікти в міських просторах та постіндустріальні міські трансформації. *Економічна та соціальна географія*. 2021. Вип. 85. С. 62-71. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2413-7154/2021.85.62-71>
16. OECD. *Rebuilding Ukraine: Urban recovery and resilience framework*. OECD Publishing, 2023.
17. Pankova L.I., Uzbek D.A., Pankov M.O. Resilience as a factor of urban security in conditions of the information economy [Manuscript]. eKMAIR Institutional Repository. 2024. URL: <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/server/api/core/bitstreams/b7c0ffbe-e37c-4a12-9500-f71863875e42/content>
18. Reuters. Kharkiv metro is a 'city' where hundreds shelter from bombardment. 2022. March 11. URL: <https://www.reuters.com/world/kharkiv-metro-is-city-where-hundreds-shelter-bombardment-2022-03-11/>
19. RRR4U. Resilience and solidarity: Urban responses to war. 2025. URL: [https://rrr4u.org/en/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2025/04/resilience.and\\_solidarity\\_report\\_eng.pdf](https://rrr4u.org/en/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2025/04/resilience.and_solidarity_report_eng.pdf)

20. Шульга О.В. Правові та організаційні засади резильєнтності міст України. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського національного університету. Серія: Право*. 2025. Т. 2. № 90. С. 245-252. <https://doi.org/10.24144/2307-3322.2025.90.2.35>
21. Silva P. Tactical urbanism: Towards an evolutionary cities approach? *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*. 2016. Vol. 43, № 6. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265813516657340>
22. Suminov M. Letting city meet rivers: Local urbanism in Kharkiv. Gwara Media. 2023. July 19. URL: <https://gwaramedia.com/en/letting-city-meet-rivers-local-urbanism-in-kharkiv/>
23. Суптелю О.С. Постіндустріальні трансформації старопромислових районів міста Харкова. *Економічна та соціальна географія*. 2020. Вип. 83. С. 53-62. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2413-7154/2020.83.53-62>
24. Transformative Mobility. Training material: A tactical urbanism guidebook. 2023. URL: [https://www.transformative-mobility.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/TrainingMaterial\\_A\\_Tactical\\_Urbanism\\_Guidebook-5zZpKb.pdf](https://www.transformative-mobility.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/TrainingMaterial_A_Tactical_Urbanism_Guidebook-5zZpKb.pdf)
25. Tsarynnyk Y. Spatial reactions to war: Urban insights from rear and frontline cities: Master's thesis. TU Wien, 2024. URL: <https://repositum.tuwien.at/bitstream/20.500.12708/197152/1/Tsarynnyk%20Yana%20-%202024%20%20Spatial%20reactions%20to%20war.pdf>
26. UN Human Rights Monitoring Mission in Ukraine. Attacks on Ukraine's Energy Infrastructure: Harm to the Civilian Population. 2024. URL: <https://ukraine.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/2024-09/ENG%20Attacks%20on%20Ukraine%E2%80%99s%20Energy%20Infrastructure-%20%20Harm%20to%20the%20Civilian%20Population.pdf>
27. UNDP Ukraine. Urban resilience and community mobilisation in Ukrainian cities during war. United Nations Development Programme, 2022–2024.
28. United Nations Development Programme. Lviv: A city embraces innovation, even amidst war. 2023. May 24. URL: <https://stories.undp.org/lviv-a-city-embraces-innovation-even-amidst-war>
29. UNESCO. Culture in times of war: Safeguarding urban cultural infrastructure in Ukraine. UNESCO, 2022.
30. UN-Habitat & ICRC. War-time urban resilience and humanitarian urbanism in Ukraine. 2022–2024.
31. UN-Habitat. War-time urban resilience in Ukrainian cities. United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2022.
32. Village Ukraine, The. Ось чотири парклети від комунальників у Києві... 2023. URL: <https://www.village.com.ua/village/city/public-space/354003-os-chotiri-parkleti-vid-komunalnikiv-u-kievi-y-odin-vid-aktivistiv-u-chernivtsyah-znaydit-spravzhniy>
33. Visit Ukraine. In 2023 more than 300 thousand people used metro stations as shelters. 2023. URL: <https://visitukraine.today/blog/3161/in-2023-more-than-300-thousand-people-used-metro-stations-as-shelters>
34. Webb D. Tactical urbanism: Delineating a critical praxis (Davidoff context). *Planning Theory & Practice*. 2017. Vol. 18, № 4.
35. World Bank Group. Ukraine Rapid Damage and Needs Assessment (RDNA). World Bank, 2022–2023.

**Внесок авторів:** всі автори зробили рівний внесок у цю роботу.

**Конфлікт інтересів:** автор засвідчує, що, незважаючи на те, що автор статті є членом редакційної колегії цього журналу, процес рецензування, прийняття рішення щодо публікації та редагування проводилися незалежно, без його участі чи впливу. Будь-які потенційні конфлікти інтересів були повністю усунені шляхом зовнішнього контролю процесу.

Надійшла 12 вересня 2025 р.  
Прийнята 03 листопада 2025 р.  
Опублікована 30 грудня 2025 р.