

# Social Infrastructure and Urban Resilience in Post-pandemic Cities

Michle Anson\*

*Department of Social Welfare, University of California-Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA*

## Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic reshaped urban life globally, revealing critical weaknesses in the way cities function and care for their residents. It exposed deep social inequalities and brought attention to the importance of “social infrastructure” the systems, services, spaces, and networks that support everyday life and social connection, such as public transportation, healthcare, education, housing, and community spaces. Traditionally overlooked in favor of physical or digital infrastructure, social infrastructure became vital during the crisis for ensuring not just public health but social well-being. This paper begins by framing urban resilience through the lens of social infrastructure, arguing that cities can no longer rely solely on technological solutions or economic models for survival and must instead prioritize inclusive, equitable systems of support that strengthen community ties, promote social justice, and provide access to essential services for all [1].

## Description

During the pandemic, cities around the world faced varying degrees of success and failure depending on the strength and reach of their social infrastructure. In areas where healthcare systems were fragmented, housing was overcrowded, and internet access was limited, vulnerable populations bore the brunt of the crisis. The closure of schools, public libraries, and community centers cut off critical lifelines, especially for low-income families, the elderly, and marginalized communities. However, many cities also witnessed powerful grassroots responses: mutual aid groups formed, public spaces were repurposed for emergency use, and informal networks of care emerged where formal systems failed. Cities like Seoul, Milan, and Cape Town responded in different ways some adapting their urban design to promote safer public movement, others mobilizing local clinics or digital platforms for rapid communication and service delivery. These case studies show that resilience is not only about physical infrastructure or data systems but about the presence of community trust, accessible services, and responsive governance. The digital divide, too, highlighted how technology can either enable or exclude access to online education, remote healthcare, or even COVID-19 updates depended on connectivity, digital literacy, and language access, all of which were unevenly distributed. Feminist and decolonial perspectives further emphasize that resilience is a political issue care work, disproportionately done by women and minorities, was central to pandemic survival, yet remains underpaid and unrecognized [2].

Urban planners must therefore consider not only where infrastructure is built but who it serves, who maintains it, and who is left out. A resilient city is one

**\*Address for Correspondence:** Michle Anson, Department of Social Welfare, University of California-Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA; E-mail: [michle@anson.edu](mailto:michle@anson.edu)

**Copyright:** © 2025 Anson M. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**Received:** 01 March, 2025, Manuscript No. assj-25-165566; **Editor Assigned:** 03 March, 2025, PreQC No. P-165566; **Reviewed:** 17 March, 2025, QC No. Q-165566; **Revised:** 22 March, 2025, Manuscript No. R-165566; **Published:** 31 March, 2025, DOI: 10.37421/2151-6200.2025.16.660

where public spaces are inclusive, services are fairly distributed, and communities are empowered to participate in decision-making. The COVID-19 pandemic starkly illuminated the unevenness and fragility of social infrastructure across global cities, demonstrating how its presence or absence directly shaped urban resilience. In many cities, healthcare facilities, public transportation, educational institutions, and community centers functioned not just as service providers but as vital social lifelines that sustained communities during lockdowns and social distancing mandates. For example, public health clinics and neighborhood hospitals became frontline nodes in testing, treating, and educating the public, but their capacity was often limited by decades of underfunding and privatization, especially in marginalized neighborhoods. In places like New York City's boroughs and Mumbai's informal settlements, overcrowding and lack of accessible healthcare contributed to disproportionately high infection and mortality rates among low-income and minority populations. Similarly, schools and libraries, traditionally spaces for learning and social connection, became sites of inequality when closures forced reliance on digital technologies that many families could not access or afford, highlighting the persistent digital divide in urban settings [3].

This divide extended beyond education; telemedicine, remote work, and online government services all depended on internet access and digital literacy, often leaving behind elderly residents, recent migrants, or economically disadvantaged groups. Beyond physical and digital infrastructure, informal social networks neighbors checking on each other, local volunteer groups distributing food and medicines, faith-based organizations organizing mutual aid became crucial for survival, revealing the importance of social ties and trust as components of resilience. These grassroots efforts, however, also exposed gendered and racialized dimensions of care labor, with women and minority communities bearing the burden of unpaid work and emotional support. Urban planners' responses varied widely: Seoul's integrated public health and digital tracing infrastructure helped contain outbreaks effectively, while Milan's swift pedestrianization of streets and repurposing of public spaces allowed safer social interactions and economic activity. Cape Town's experience exposed how spatial segregation and infrastructural neglect deepen vulnerability, with many residents lacking clean water and adequate sanitation, making even basic preventive measures difficult [4].

The pandemic also led to creative reimaginations of urban space and services temporary outdoor classrooms, open-air markets, mobile health units, and increased bicycle lanes all aiming to balance health safety with community needs. These adaptations highlighted the need for flexibility and multipurpose design in social infrastructure, enabling rapid reconfiguration during crises. The paper further explores how policy responses sometimes failed to acknowledge or support the informal care economy that sustains many communities, reinforcing systemic inequalities. This gap points to a broader issue: resilience is deeply political, reflecting whose needs are prioritized and whose labor is recognized in city governance. Feminist urbanism and critical race theory provide critical frameworks for understanding these dynamics, emphasizing that social infrastructure is not neutral but shaped by histories of exclusion, colonialism, and capitalist development. Therefore, equitable resilience must involve not only building or improving infrastructure but transforming power relations, engaging communities in decision-making, and ensuring

accountability. The integration of digital tools must be paired with efforts to democratize access and protect privacy, avoiding techno-utopian assumptions that technology alone can solve social problems. Ultimately, this detailed analysis of diverse urban responses and lived experiences during the pandemic reveals that social infrastructure's quality, accessibility, and inclusiveness are foundational to a city's capacity to absorb shocks, adapt, and recover [5].

---

## Conclusion

The pandemic has offered cities an opportunity not just to recover but to rethink what it means to be resilient. True urban resilience must go beyond emergency response and be built on everyday systems of care, equity, and inclusion. Investing in social infrastructure is not merely a policy choice but a social and ethical commitment to the well-being of all urban residents. As cities prepare for future crises whether from climate change, economic shocks, or new pandemics they must focus on building strong, adaptable, and equitable systems that center human relationships, public trust, and access to care. This includes reimagining public space, valuing care labor, closing the digital divide, and ensuring that infrastructure decisions are made with input from those most affected. By placing social infrastructure at the heart of urban planning and recovery, cities can move beyond resilience as a technical goal and embrace it as a collective, inclusive process that shapes a more just urban future for everyone.

---

## Acknowledgment

None.

---

## Conflict of Interest

None.

---

## References

1. Pihlanto, Anne, Sari Akkanen and Hannu J. Korhonen. "ACE-inhibitory and antioxidant properties of potato (*Solanum tuberosum*).*" Food Chem* 109 (2008): 104-112.
2. Ghanbari, Raheleh, Afshin Ebrahimpour, Azizah Abdul-Hamid and Amin Ismail, et al. "Actinopyga lecanora hydrolysates as natural antibacterial agents." *Int J Molecul Sci* 13 (2012): 16796-16811.
3. Sowmya, R., K. Rathinaraj and N. M. Sachindra. "An autolytic process for recovery of antioxidant activity rich carotenoprotein from shrimp heads." *Marine biotechnol* 13 (2011): 918-927.
4. Jia, Jianping, Yangang Zhou, Jianzhang Lu and Aiying Chen, et al. "Enzymatic hydrolysis of Alaska pollack (*Theragra chalcogramma*) skin and antioxidant activity of the resulting hydrolysate." *J Sci Food Agricul* 90 (2010): 635-640.
5. Lewis, Glyn, Anthony J. Pelosi, Ricardo Araya and Graham Dunn. "Measuring psychiatric disorder in the community: A standardized assessment for use by lay interviewers." *Psychol Med* 22 (1992): 465-486.

**How to cite this article:** Anson, Michle. "Social Infrastructure and Urban Resilience in Post-pandemic Cities." *Arts Social Sci J* 16 (2025): 660.