

URBAN ROOFTOP FARMING AND HOUSEHOLD FOOD RESILIENCE

Dr. Kavita Rao

Assistant Professor

Department of Environmental Studies

School of Sustainability and Urban Planning

Institute of Sustainable Development

Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

Abstract

Rapid urbanisation has increased the distance between households and the systems that produce, distribute, and price everyday food. Urban rooftop farming offers one practical way to reconnect households with fresh produce while making productive use of underutilised building space. This paper examines the relationship between rooftop farming and household food resilience through an evidence-informed comparative review. It considers how container gardens, raised beds, vertical systems, hydroponic arrangements, and small protected structures can contribute to the availability, accessibility, utilisation, stability, and agency dimensions of household food resilience. The analysis focuses on crop selection, water management, roof safety, seasonal continuity, household labour, affordability, nutrition, waste cycling, and the social learning associated with food production. The study does not claim that rooftop agriculture can make a dense city self-sufficient or replace public food systems. Instead, it identifies the more realistic contribution of rooftop cultivation: regular access to selected vegetables, herbs, fruits, and culturally preferred foods; a modest buffer against price shocks and supply interruptions; and a practical setting for climate-conscious household practices. The review finds that outcomes depend on technical design and governance conditions. Load-bearing assessment, safe materials, reliable irrigation, access to sunlight, contamination control, and inclusive access to knowledge are all necessary for successful implementation. The paper concludes that rooftop farming is most valuable when treated as a household resilience strategy linked with urban planning, nutrition education, community support, and local sustainability policy rather than as a stand-alone solution to urban food insecurity.

Keywords: Urban Rooftop Farming, Household Food Resilience, Urban Agriculture, Food Security, Sustainable Cities, Kitchen Gardens, Climate Adaptation, Nutrition, Circular Resource Use, Urban Planning

1. INTRODUCTION

Cities depend heavily on extended food supply chains that connect farms, storage facilities, wholesale markets, retailers, transport networks, and households. These systems can deliver a wide variety of food, but they are also exposed to disruptions in transport, weather, labour availability, energy supply, market volatility, and household purchasing power. Urban food resilience refers to the capacity of households and communities to maintain reliable access to safe, nutritious, and culturally appropriate food when everyday conditions become uncertain. It includes more than the quantity of food available in shops. It also concerns affordability, dietary quality, knowledge, storage, social support, and the ability to adapt practical food practices when disruption occurs. Urban rooftop farming has emerged as a visible response to the limited

availability of ground-level growing space in compact settlements. Roofs can host container gardens, grow bags, lightweight raised beds, trellised crops, vertical planting systems, hydroponic units, and small shade or rain-protection structures. At household scale, these systems usually produce a limited range of crops rather than staple grains. Their value lies in making frequently used foods such as leafy vegetables, herbs, tomatoes, chillies, beans, gourds, radish, spinach, and microgreens more accessible at the point of consumption. Rooftops can therefore complement markets and public food programmes by reducing dependence on a single source of perishable produce.

The resilience potential of rooftop farming should be considered realistically. Production is shaped by roof load limits, sunlight, heat, wind, access to water, safety railings, local

regulations, household time, and the skills required to manage pests and nutrients. A poorly designed garden can create leakage, structural risks, high water use, or disappointment for households that have limited resources. Conversely, a well-designed system can convert organic waste into compost, collect a portion of rainwater where regulations permit, reduce heat exposure on roof surfaces, support household learning, and create a direct relationship between food choices and ecological resources. The central question is not whether every roof should become a farm; it is how suitable roofs can be used safely and equitably to strengthen household food resilience.

Food resilience is often discussed at city or national scale, yet household-scale practices matter because food decisions are made daily. Families decide what to purchase, cook, store, share, and grow. During periods of price rise or supply disruption, the availability of a small but reliable amount of home-grown vegetables may improve meal planning and dietary diversity, even when the household continues to depend on markets for grains, pulses, dairy, and other foods. Rooftop gardens can also create a space for children, older adults, and residents with limited access to public green areas to participate in food-related learning and care work.

This study examines the contribution of urban rooftop farming to household food resilience through a comparative review of published research, practice-based evidence, and urban sustainability principles. It focuses on the ways rooftop systems can support availability, access, utilisation, stability, and household agency, while also addressing the limits of small-scale production. Particular attention is given to physical design, crop choice, household management, environmental safeguards, and the policy support needed to

make rooftop farming a credible part of urban food and climate strategies.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on urban agriculture has shown that food production within cities can provide nutritional, social, environmental, and educational benefits when it is adapted to local conditions. Earlier work often examined home gardens, allotments, and community gardens, while more recent studies have explored food production on and within buildings. Rooftop systems receive particular attention because they use existing surfaces in dense urban areas where land is scarce. Reviews by Specht et al. and Thomaier et al. describe rooftop and building-integrated agriculture as a diverse field that includes soil-based, substrate-based, and soilless systems with different resource demands and management requirements. The literature consistently cautions that production potential depends on climate, building characteristics, access to water, and the crops selected.

Food-security research also shows that urban agriculture should not be assessed only by harvest quantity. Zezza and Tasciotti, Taylor and Lovell, and Eigenbrod and Gruda emphasise the importance of food access, household expenditure, dietary diversity, social networks, and knowledge. Rooftop gardens may be especially useful for perishable vegetables and herbs, which are sensitive to price changes and quality loss during transport. However, the evidence does not support a universal claim that household gardens eliminate food insecurity. Their contribution is usually complementary: they add fresh produce, diversify household food sources, support local coping capacity, and can encourage healthier food practices when families have adequate water, safe growing media, and time for routine care.

LITERATURE REVIEW SUMMARY TABLE

S.No.	Author / Year	Study Focus	Key Contribution	Limitations Identified
1	Zezza & Tasciotti (2010)	Urban agriculture, poverty, and food security	Demonstrated that urban agriculture can contribute to household food access, while effects vary by household context and country.	Broad multi-country evidence; rooftop-specific conditions require separate assessment.
2	Orsini et	Production	Explored the potential of rooftop gardens	Production estimates

	al. (2013)	capacity of rooftop gardens	to supply selected vegetables in a dense European city.	depend on climate, design, crop choice, and roof suitability.
3	Specht et al. (2014)	Sustainability of building- integrated agriculture	Reviewed environmental, economic, and social considerations for food production in and on buildings.	Identified wide variation in system design and limited comparable long- term datasets.
4	Taylor & Lovell (2014)	Urban home food gardens	Highlighted household gardens as spaces for food production, cultural practice, learning, and community connection.	Focused largely on research traditions in the Global North; local adaptation remains essential.
5	Eigenbro d & Gruda (2015)	Urban vegetable production and food security	Explained how urban vegetable production can complement food systems through fresh produce and local availability.	Does not treat rooftop farming as a replacement for regional agriculture or food policy.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The primary focus of this research is to examine how urban rooftop farming may strengthen household food resilience through regular access to fresh produce, practical food knowledge, and resource-conscious cultivation. The study considers rooftop systems as household-scale food environments rather than as isolated landscaping projects. It therefore evaluates both the direct outcomes of cultivation and the enabling conditions that determine whether a garden is safe, productive, manageable, and inclusive.

3.1 ROOFTOP FARMING DIMENSIONS UNDER INVESTIGATION

- Container gardens, grow bags, lightweight raised beds, vertical systems, hydroponic units, and small protected growing structures
- Crop diversity, seasonal planning, seed selection, plant health, harvesting routines, and food-safety practices
- Sunlight exposure, wind protection, roof loading, drainage, waterproofing, access routes, and fall-prevention measures
- Water use, irrigation methods, rainwater harvesting where permitted, composting, nutrient management, and material reuse
- Household labour, care responsibilities, knowledge sharing, maintenance costs, and the role of digital or community support

3.2 Household Food Resilience Contexts

- Availability of fresh, perishable foods within walking distance of the kitchen

- Household access to affordable vegetables, herbs, and culturally preferred ingredients
- Nutritional utilisation through fresh harvesting, diverse meals, and improved food literacy
- Stability during market disruption, seasonal price rises, transport delays, and local emergencies
- Household agency, including the ability to make informed choices about what to grow, preserve, exchange, and cook

3.3 URBAN AND BUILDING CONTEXTS

- Independent houses, apartment blocks, institutions, rental housing, and mixed-use buildings with differing access arrangements
- Tropical, subtropical, temperate, arid, and high-rainfall urban climates that influence crop calendars and water needs
- Low-income, middle-income, and higher-income households with different space, time, capital, and technical constraints
- Local building by-laws, housing-association rules, water regulations, safety standards, and waste-management services
- Neighbourhood conditions such as air quality, dust, nearby construction, shade, theft risk, and access to gardening supplies

3.4 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS FOCUS

- Food availability and dietary diversity versus the physical and financial limits of small rooftop systems
- Soil-based cultivation versus soilless and vertical methods in relation to weight, water use, skill, and cost

- Individual household gardens versus shared rooftop gardens with collective governance and distributed benefits
- Short-term harvest outcomes versus long-term resilience benefits such as learning, seed saving, composting, and social support
- Environmental claims versus measurable performance in water, energy, materials, waste handling, and food safety

3.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE SCOPE

- To identify the principal ways rooftop farming can contribute to household food resilience
- To explain the technical, ecological, social, and economic conditions needed for safe and productive rooftop cultivation
- To compare key resilience dimensions: availability, access, utilisation, stability, and household agency
- To distinguish realistic complementary benefits from unsupported claims of complete urban food self-sufficiency
- To propose practical directions for household, community, and policy-level rooftop farming initiatives

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a comparative and evidence-informed review methodology. It synthesises published research on urban agriculture, rooftop gardens, household food security, building-integrated cultivation, and sustainable urban planning. The study is designed to explain how rooftop farming can be evaluated as a household resilience strategy rather than to present a new field survey or experimental harvest trial. The framework therefore avoids fabricated yield figures, participant counts, or statistical claims that are not supported by an identified dataset.

The analysis is organised around five dimensions of household food resilience: availability, access, utilisation, stability, and agency. Rooftop farming practices are assessed in relation to these dimensions alongside practical conditions such as roof safety, water management, sunlight, household time, costs, food safety, and access to knowledge. This combined approach is necessary because a rooftop garden can produce vegetables but still fail to support resilience if it is unsafe, inaccessible, too

expensive to maintain, or dependent on resources unavailable to the household.

Comparisons are made across common rooftop farming systems, including containers, raised beds, vertical structures, and hydroponic arrangements. The review also considers household and community settings, recognising that a small individual garden and a shared apartment-rooftop garden have different governance, maintenance, and equity implications. Recommendations are framed as context-sensitive principles rather than universal prescriptions because roofs, climates, household preferences, and regulations vary substantially between cities.

METHODOLOGY FRAMEWORK

Published research, urban agriculture reviews, and food-resilience principles provide the evidence base for the synthesis.

The analysis considers physical design, crop practices, household resources, and policy conditions together.

Rooftop farming is assessed through availability, access, utilisation, stability, and household agency.

Comparisons distinguish household-scale food support from claims of complete food-system substitution.

Water use, structural safety, drainage, contamination risk, and equitable access are treated as core evaluation conditions.

The framework includes soil-based, substrate-based, vertical, and hydroponic rooftop systems where appropriate.

No fabricated household survey results, harvest totals, or experimental measurements are presented.

Recommendations focus on safe, context-appropriate and nutritionally meaningful rooftop farming practices.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis section presents a comparative interpretation of the main pathways through which rooftop farming can support household food resilience. The analysis is qualitative because the contribution of a rooftop garden depends on local climate, roof characteristics, household needs, crop choices, water access, and management quality. The purpose is to identify what should be considered when evaluating resilience benefits, not to assign a single production value to all rooftops.

Six related dimensions are examined: fresh-food availability, household access and affordability, dietary utilisation, stability during disruption, resource and environmental performance, and household agency. Each

dimension has positive potential, but each is also associated with constraints that need to be addressed through planning, training, safe design, and supportive local systems.

5.1 COMPARATIVE FOOD RESILIENCE ANALYSIS

S.No.	Resilience Dimension	Primary Evidence	Positive Indicator	Common Constraint	Overall Importance
1	Fresh-food availability	Frequency of harvests, crop diversity, and proximity of produce to the kitchen	Regular supply of leafy vegetables, herbs, and selected seasonal crops	Limited space and sunlight may restrict crop volume and variety	Essential starting contribution
2	Access and affordability	Household spending patterns, seed and input costs, and ability to save or share produce	Reduced dependence on purchased perishable items during some periods	Initial setup costs and time demands can exclude low-resource households	Very important
3	Dietary utilisation	Freshness, meal integration, food knowledge, and safe handling practices	Greater use of vegetables and herbs in everyday meals	Food benefits are reduced when harvests are not planned around household preferences	Very important
4	Stability and adaptive capacity	Continuity across seasons, seed access, storage, water reliability, and coping practices	A supplementary food source during short-term market or transport disruption	Extreme heat, storms, water scarcity, pests, and roof damage can interrupt production	Important
5	Resource and environmental performance	Water use, composting, drainage, growing media, materials, and energy needs	Potential for organic-waste cycling and more resource-aware food practices	Overuse of water, plastics, or energy-intensive systems can weaken sustainability claims	Important
6	Household agency and social learning	Decision-making, care work, knowledge exchange, and participation by household members	Improved food literacy, confidence, and intergenerational learning	Unequal access to rooftops and unpaid labour burdens may limit benefits	Excellent for long-term resilience

5.2 EXTENDED ANALYTICAL INTERPRETATION

Fresh-food availability is the most direct contribution of rooftop farming. A household garden can shorten the time between harvest and consumption, which is especially relevant for leafy vegetables, herbs, and tender crops whose quality declines quickly in storage and transport. The value of this contribution is not simply the total weight of vegetables produced. A small garden may be meaningful when it provides frequently used ingredients

on a regular basis, particularly for meals that otherwise depend on daily market purchases. Crop planning should therefore begin with household food habits and seasonal suitability rather than with the pursuit of visually impressive but impractical crops.

Access and affordability depend on the relationship between household resources and garden design. Low-cost containers, recycled but safe materials, locally available compost, seed sharing, and gravity-fed or efficient irrigation can make cultivation more

accessible. At the same time, it is misleading to assume that every rooftop system automatically saves money. Raised beds, structural reinforcement, purchased growing media, water pumps, nutrient solutions, shade structures, and regular replacement of materials can involve substantial costs. Resilience-oriented programmes should include cost guidance and support options for households that cannot make a large initial investment.

Dietary utilisation concerns whether harvested food is actually incorporated into meals in a safe and nutritionally beneficial way. Rooftop gardens are most likely to support dietary diversity when they grow foods that families already value and know how to prepare. Fresh herbs and leafy vegetables can be harvested in small quantities that match household cooking patterns, reducing waste. Education on washing, storage, safe compost use, and pesticide-free or low-risk pest management is important because a garden cannot improve nutrition if produce is handled unsafely or remains unused.

Stability and adaptive capacity relate to the ability of a garden to continue providing some food under changing conditions. Seed saving, staggered planting, crop rotation, simple rain protection, wind management, mulching, and shared knowledge can increase continuity. However, rooftop gardens are exposed to heat stress, heavy rain, high winds, and irregular water supply. Their resilience value comes from diversification, not from certainty. A household that combines rooftop production with market access, dry-food storage, community support, and practical cooking knowledge is likely to be better prepared than a household relying on a single source of food. Resource and environmental performance require careful interpretation. Rooftop cultivation can encourage composting, local reuse of biomass, and awareness of water use, but it can also create environmental burdens if systems rely on heavy imported media, excessive plastic, energy-intensive pumping, or unmanaged nutrient runoff. Building drainage and waterproofing are critical. Safe, lightweight growing systems and efficient irrigation should be selected according to the roof and climate. Environmental benefits should be assessed across the full system

rather than assumed merely because food is grown in the city.

Household agency and social learning are often underestimated. Gardening can build confidence in seed selection, food preparation, composting, observation of weather, and practical adaptation. Shared rooftop gardens can also create social connections in apartment buildings and neighbourhoods. Yet access is not automatically equitable. Tenants, older adults, people with disabilities, women with heavy care responsibilities, and households without secure roof access may be excluded. Inclusive design, safe access, shared schedules, and recognition of care work are necessary when rooftop farming is promoted as a community resilience measure.

5.3 OBSERVATIONS FROM DATA ANALYSIS

- Rooftop farming can strengthen household food resilience most clearly through frequent access to selected fresh foods, not through total food self-sufficiency.
- The contribution of a garden depends on household dietary preferences, crop selection, regular maintenance, and integration into everyday cooking practices.
- Structural safety, drainage, water reliability, contamination control, and secure access are non-negotiable conditions for responsible rooftop cultivation.
- Low-cost and lightweight systems may improve accessibility, but they still require sound technical guidance and safe materials.
- Gardens can support resilience during short-term disruption when they are part of a diversified food strategy that also includes markets, storage, and social support.
- Shared rooftop models can extend benefits beyond individual households, but they need clear governance, maintenance responsibilities, and equitable participation.
- Policy support is most effective when rooftop farming is linked with housing, waste management, water conservation, public health, and nutrition programmes.

6. DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis indicates that rooftop farming should be understood as a practical supplement to urban food systems rather than a symbolic greening activity or a universal cure for food insecurity. Its main value lies in the scale at which households experience food: daily cooking, small purchases, freshness, familiarity, and the ability to respond creatively when regular market access is interrupted. In many households, the most useful crops will be those harvested repeatedly in small quantities. This pattern differs from conventional agriculture, which often prioritises bulk production, storage, and long supply chains. Rooftop farming therefore adds a distinct form of value even when its total output is modest.

The distinction between production capacity and resilience capacity is important. A rooftop may have a high theoretical yield under ideal conditions, but household resilience depends on whether the system remains manageable across seasons, whether the produce fits food habits, whether water is available, and whether people have the time and confidence to maintain it. A small resilient garden with reliable access, low maintenance, and culturally appropriate crops may be more valuable than a technically advanced installation that depends on expensive equipment or specialist knowledge. Programmes should consequently begin with roof assessment, household needs, and practical training before recommending specific technologies.

Building conditions must guide the design process. Roof loading, waterproofing, drainage, wind exposure, heat accumulation, stair access, railings, and proximity to pollutants can determine whether a garden is appropriate. Heavy soil beds should not be placed on a roof without professional advice, and containers should not obstruct drainage points or emergency movement. In dense apartment environments, the roof may be common property, requiring consent, clear responsibilities, and insurance or maintenance arrangements. These considerations are not barriers to rooftop farming; they are the conditions that protect households and make long-term cultivation credible.

Water is another central issue. Rooftop systems can use water efficiently through

mulching, drip irrigation, self-watering containers, appropriate crop selection, and careful timing. Where legally permitted and technically safe, rainwater collection may support non-potable garden uses. However, water-saving claims should not conceal the reality that plants need regular moisture, especially in hot urban climates. Household gardens should be designed for local water availability, and public programmes should avoid encouraging systems that increase pressure on already stressed water supplies. The best approach is to match crops and technologies to climate rather than import a single model from another region.

Social equity deserves equal attention. Ownership, tenancy, gendered care work, disability access, and time poverty shape who can benefit from a rooftop garden. A programme that offers only technical kits may mainly serve households with secure roofs, available time, and disposable income. More inclusive approaches can involve apartment associations, schools, women's groups, resident welfare associations, local nurseries, and municipal extension services. Shared seed banks, composting hubs, practical demonstrations, and multilingual guidance can reduce entry barriers. The aim should be to expand food-related agency without transferring unrealistic unpaid labour burdens to households already managing multiple responsibilities.

At policy level, rooftop farming can be linked to broader urban objectives. Municipal and institutional guidelines can incorporate rooftop safety, organic-waste management, water-efficient irrigation, biodiversity-friendly planting, and food safety. Urban planning departments can identify publicly owned or institutional buildings suitable for demonstration projects, while public-health and nutrition programmes can include guidance on growing and using fresh produce. Such integration recognises that rooftop farming has its greatest value when it connects food, health, climate adaptation, waste reduction, and community learning in a coordinated manner.

7. CONCLUSION

This study examined urban rooftop farming as a household food-resilience strategy through the dimensions of availability, access,

utilisation, stability, resource performance, and household agency. The review shows that rooftop cultivation can make a meaningful contribution when it provides regular access to selected fresh foods, strengthens food knowledge, and encourages practical resource-conscious habits. Its contribution is most credible when assessed as complementary to markets, public food programmes, and wider urban food systems rather than as an independent source of complete household nutrition.

The findings indicate that technical and social conditions are equally important. Safe roof loading, drainage, waterproofing, reliable water, sunlight, appropriate crops, food-safety practices, and accessible guidance are required for successful cultivation. Household benefits are strengthened when gardens are designed around local diets, seasonal realities, and the

resources that families can reasonably sustain. Shared rooftop systems can extend learning and access, but they require clear governance and inclusive participation.

The study concludes that urban rooftop farming has practical resilience value when it is planned carefully, supported by local institutions, and connected with nutrition, waste management, water conservation, and climate-adaptation efforts. Future research can advance the field through household-level studies of dietary use, long-term maintenance, cost accessibility, climate performance, tenant participation, and the comparative outcomes of individual and shared rooftop gardens. A resilient urban food future will depend on diverse systems, and safe rooftop farming can be one useful element within that larger network.

8. REFERENCES

- Altieri, M. A. (2018). *Agroecology: The science of sustainable agriculture* (2nd ed.). CRC Press.
- Badami, M. G., & Ramankutty, N. (2015). Urban agriculture and food security: A critique based on an assessment of urban land constraints. *Global Food Security*, 4, 8-15.
- Clarke, L. W., Jenerette, G. D., & Bain, D. J. (2015). Urban legacies and soil management affect the concentration and speciation of trace metals in Los Angeles community garden soils. *Environmental Pollution*, 197, 1-9.
- de Zeeuw, H., van Veenhuizen, R., & Dubbeling, M. (2011). The role of urban agriculture in building resilient cities in developing countries. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 149(S1), 153-163.
- Eigenbrod, C., & Gruda, N. (2015). Urban vegetable for food security in cities: A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 35, 483-498.
- Food and Agriculture Organization. (2011). *Save and grow: A policymaker's guide to the sustainable intensification of smallholder crop production*. FAO.
- Food and Agriculture Organization. (2023). *The state of food security and nutrition in the world 2023*. FAO.
- Guitart, D., Pickering, C., & Byrne, J. (2012). Past results and future directions in urban community gardens research. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 11(4), 364-373.
- IPCC. (2022). *Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lal, R. (2020). Home gardening and urban agriculture for advancing food and nutritional security in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Food Security*, 12, 871-876.
- Mok, H. F., Williamson, V. G., Grove, J. R., Burry, K., & Barker, S. F. (2014). Strawberry fields forever? Urban agriculture in developed countries: A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 34, 21-43.
- Mougeot, L. J. A. (2000). Urban agriculture: Definition, presence, potentials and risks. In N. Bakker et al. (Eds.), *Growing cities, growing food*. DSE.
- Orsini, F., Dubbeling, M., de Zeeuw, H., Gianquinto, G., & D'Ostuni, M. (2017). *Rooftop urban agriculture*. Springer.
- Orsini, F., Gasperi, D., Marchetti, L., Piovene, C., Draghetti, S., Ramazzotti, S., Gianquinto, G., & Pennisi, G. (2013). Exploring the production capacity of rooftop gardens (RTGs) in Bologna, Italy: Potential impact on food security, biodiversity and the environment. *Agriculture & Food Security*, 2, 20.

15. Piorr, A., Giacche, G., & Gottschlich, S. (2018). Urban agriculture in Europe: Patterns, challenges and policies. Routledge.
16. Sanyé-Mengual, E., Cerón-Palma, I., Oliver-Solà, J., Montero, J. I., & Rieradevall, J. (2015). Integrating horticulture into cities: A guide for assessing the implementation potential of rooftop greenhouses. *Journal of Urban Technology*, 22(1), 87-111.
17. Specht, K., Siebert, R., Hartmann, I., Freisinger, U. B., Sawicka, M., Werner, A., Thomaier, S., Henckel, D., Walk, H., & Dierich, A. (2014). Urban agriculture of the future: An overview of sustainability aspects of food production in and on buildings. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 31, 33-51.
18. Taylor, J. R., & Lovell, S. T. (2014). Urban home food gardens in the Global North: Research traditions and future directions. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 31, 285-305.
19. Thomaier, S., Specht, K., Henckel, D., Dierich, A., & Siebert, R. (2015). Farming in and on urban buildings: Present practice and specific novelties of zero-acreage farming (ZFarming). *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 30(1), 43-54.
20. Tornaghi, C. (2014). Critical geography of urban agriculture. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(4), 551-567.
21. United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development. United Nations.
22. United Nations Human Settlements Programme. (2020). World cities report 2020: The value of sustainable urbanization. UN-Habitat.
23. van Veenhuizen, R. (Ed.). (2006). Cities farming for the future: Urban agriculture for green and productive cities. RUAF Foundation.
24. World Health Organization. (2020). Healthy diet. World Health Organization.
25. Zezza, A., & Tasciotti, L. (2010). Urban agriculture, poverty, and food security: Empirical evidence from a sample of developing countries. *Food Policy*, 35(4), 265-273.