

**SEISMIC RISK ASSESSMENT AS A BASIS FOR
SUSTAINABLE URBAN DEVELOPMENT**



Title: Seismic Risk Assessment as a Basis for Sustainable Urban Development

Author: Kefajet Edip

Edition: 1st Edition

No. of Publication: 43

Name of Book Series: Academic Research

Book Series Editors: Snezana Bilic; Emin Idrizi

No. of Publication in Book Series: 3

Print: Arberia Design

Circulation: 100

Design: Seyfullah Bayram

ISBN: 978-608-4868-41-5

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69648/YKET1326>

This edition is published by the Balkan University Press in Skopje, North Macedonia, 2024.

© 2024 International Balkan University

Balkan University Press

Makedonsko Kosovska Brigada, Skopje 1000

Balkan University Press is a brand of the International Balkan University.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced, or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

SEISMIC RISK ASSESSMENT AS A BASIS FOR SUSTAINABLE URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Kefajet Edip



*I dedicate this book
to my mother Bahtisha Edip, dipl. ing. architect
and to my father Jusuf Edip, dipl. ing. architect,
with love and respect.*

Contents

List of Abbreviations	viii
Figures and Tables	xii
Acknowledgments	xxi
Preface	xxiii

CHAPTER 1

Seismic Risk Assessment as a Basis for Sustainable Urban Development	1
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. The Aim and Scope of the Research	2
1.3. The Content of the Book	6

CHAPTER 2

Urban Planning in Earthquake-Prone Regions	9
2.1. Urban Planning as a Basis for Sustainable Development	9
2.2. Overview of Urban Planning in Earthquake-Prone Countries	12
2.2. Conclusion Remarks About Urban Planning in Countries Exposed to Seismic Hazard	35

CHAPTER 3

Seismic Risk Assessment of Urban Region - Pilot Study Karposh	39
3.1. Introduction to the Concept of Seismic Risk	39
3.2. The Seismic Risk Assessment of Pilot Study	41
3.3. Hazard – Seismicity of the Pilot Study Location	42
3.4. Exposure	57
3.5. Vulnerability	91
3.6. Assessment of Seismic Risk with Open Quake Engine	101

CHAPTER 4

Review of the Results	121
4.1. Review of the Results Obtained from the Assessment of Seismic Risk for Pilot Study Karposh - Scenario 1 and 2	121
4.2. Assessment of Seismic Risk with Scenario Earthquake Calculator with Earthquakes Mw 6.6 at 10 km and Mw 7.1 at 100 km Distance – Scenarios 1 and 2	123
4.3. Assessment of Seismic Risk with Classical PSHA Calculator for Return Periods of 475 and 95 Years - Scenario 1 and 2	138
4.4. Comparative Analysis of the Obtained Results	168

CHAPTER 5

Urban Planning and Seismic Risk	177
5.1. Analysis of the Effect of the Existing Urban Planning Parameters on Seismic Risk	177
5.2. Analysis of Set of Urban Planning Parameters and Detailed Urban Plan Through Seismic Risk Assessment of Pilot Study in Karposh	187
5.3. Measures and Guidelines for Improving the Actual Seismic Condition from the Urban Planning Aspect	203

CHAPTER 6

Conclusions	205
6.1. Conclusions from the Seismic Risk Assessment of the Pilot Study in Karposh	209
6.2. Suggestions for Future Research	212
References	215
Annex 1: Exposure Model for Scenario 1	227
Annex 2: Exposure Model for Scenario 2	245

List of Abbreviations

GIS	Geographic Information System
GUP	General Urban Plan
DUP	Detailed Urban Plan
LUP	Local Urban Plan
PIOVS 81	Technical Regulations for Design and Construction of Buildings in Seismic regions, 1981
SUP	Special Urban Plan
AL	Alluvial ingredients
BSHAP	Harmonized Seismic Hazard Maps for the Western Balkan Countries
csv	Comma separated value
DAF	Dynamic Amplification Factor
DS	Damage State
ESHM20	European Seismic Hazard Model 2020
ESRM20	European Seismic Risk Model 2020
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
GEM	Global Earthquake Model

GPS	Global Positioning System
GSIM	Ground motion prediction equation
Lat	Latitude
Lon	Longitude
MPI	Mio-Pliocene sediments
Mw	Magnitude
NEHRP	National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program
NRML	Natural Hazard Risk Markup Language
PGA	Peak Ground Acceleration
poes	Probabilities of exceedance
PSHA	Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis
Sa	Spectral acceleration
SHMA	Seismic Hazards Mapping Act
VMTK	Vulnerability Modelers' Toolkit
Vp	Velocity of primary seismic waves
Vs	Velocity of shear seismic waves
XML	Extensible Markup Language

Figures and Tables

Figures

Figure 1: Tectonic plates. Source: USGS-a	12
Figure 2: Republic of North Macedonia – maps of seismic zoning with elements of seismic hazard. Left image: return period of 95 years, right image: return period of 475 years. Source: Milutinovic et al., 2016.	43
Figure 3: Layout of the survey profiles on-site. Source: Dojcinovski et al., 2013.	44
Figure 4: Seismic refraction profile Rp 1-1. Source: Dojcinovski et al., 2013.	45
Figure 5: Fault lines of ESHM20 in QGIS: scenario earthquakes within a radius of 10 km and 100 km.	47
Figure 6: Logic tree scheme for seismic sources of shallow earthquakes. Source: Danciu et al., 2021.	53
Figure 7: Urban territory of the Municipality of Karposh and the pilot study area. Map prepared by the author on basis of the General Urban Plan for Skopje with plan period 2011-2022, source: SPA, 2011a.	58
Figure 8: Damages to masonry load-bearing wall structure. Source: United Nations, 1970.	60
Figure 9: Damages to reinforced concrete structures. Source: United Nations, 1970.	60
Figure 10: Municipality of Karposh, buildings damaged after the 1963 earthquake. Source: United Nations, 1970.	61
Figure 11: Skopje July the 26 th 1963, map showing land uses and damaged areas. Source: United Nations, 1970.	61
Figure 12: Pilot study Karposh, mapping of the buildings and their annexes in scenario 1	65
Figure 13: Pilot study Karposh, mapping of the buildings and changes in scenario 2.	66

Figure 14: Mapping of the structural systems of the buildings and annexes in scenario 1.	70
Figure 15: Mapping of the structural systems of the buildings and annexes in scenario 2.	71
Figure 16: Period of construction of the buildings in scenario 1.	76
Figure 17: Period of construction of the buildings in scenario 2.	76
Figure 18: Structural systems and period of construction in scenario 1.	77
Figure 19: Structural systems and period of construction in scenario 2.	77
Figure 20: Height of the buildings in scenarios 1 and 2.	78
Figure 21: Structural system and height of the buildings in scenario 1.	79
Figure 22: Structural system and height of buildings in scenario 2	79
Figure 23: Occupancy type of the buildings in pilot study Karposh	80
Figure 24: Structural system and occupancy type of buildings in scenario 1.	81
Figure 25: Structural system and occupancy type of buildings in scenario 2.	81
Figure 26: Plan shapes of buildings in scenario 1.	84
Figure 27: Plan shapes of buildings in scenario 2.	84
Figure 28: Plan shape of buildings and structural systems in scenario 1.	85
Figure 29: Plan shape of buildings and structural systems in scenario 2.	85
Figure 30: Placement of buildings in an urban block in scenario 1	86
Figure 31: Placement of buildings in an urban block in scenario 2	86
Figure 32: Structural system and placement of buildings in urban block in scenario 1	87
Figure 33: Structural system and placement of buildings in urban block in scenario 2	88
Figure 34: Fragility curves. Source: Silva et al., 2017, pp. 145	93
Figure 35: Vulnerability curve. Source: Silva et al., 2017, pp. 145	93
Figure 36: The damage levels defined in developing the fragility functions in ESRM20. Source: Crowley et al., 2021.	96

Figure 37: Presence of different fragility and vulnerability functions in the pilot study expressed in percentages for scenarios 1 and 2	97
Figure 38: Annexed buildings with application of expansion joints. Source: photos from terrain made by the author.	98
Figure 39: Annexed buildings without application of expansion joints. Source: photos from terrain made by the author.	98
Figure 40: OQ Webui, module with graphical user interface	104
Figure 41: OQ Console, module with command line	105
Figure 42: Open Quake engine – Scenario earthquake calculator, assessment of earthquake damage. Source: GEM, 2022	110
Figure 43: Open Quake engine – Scenario earthquake, seismic risk assessment. Source: GEM, 2022	111
Figure 44: Configuration file – Scenario earthquake calculator, assessment of damages	113
Figure 45: Configuration file – Scenario Earthquake calculator, seismic risk assessment	114
Figure 46: Open Quake engine – Classical PSHA calculator, assessment of damages. Source: GEM, 2022.	115
Figure 47: Open Quake engine – Classical PSHA calculator, seismic risk assessment. Source: GEM, 2022.	116
Figure 48: Configuration file – assessment of seismic hazard with classical PSHA calculator	118
Figure 49: Configuration file – Classical PSHA calculator, assessment of damage	119
Figure 50: Configuration file – Classical PSHA calculator, risk assessment	120
Figure 51: Ground motion fields generated with scenario earthquake calculator for Mw 6.6 (left image) and Mw 7.1 (right image).	123
Figure 52: Average number of structures in damage states calculated with scenario earthquakes with Mw 6.6 at 10 km and Mw 7.1 at 100 km distance for urban scenarios 1 and 2	128
Figure 53: Damage levels according to period of construction and taxonomies in scenario 1 and 2.	130
Figure 54: Damage levels according to height of buildings and taxonomies for scenarios 1 and 2.	131

Figure 55: Damage levels according to the placement of buildings in the urban block and taxonomies in scenarios 1 and 2	133
Figure 56: Damage levels according to plan shape of buildings and taxonomies in scenarios 1 and 2.	134
Figure 57: Distribution of average damages mapped for damage level “slight” with scenario earthquake calculator for Mw 6.6 at 10 km distance (realization nr. 0; AkkarEtAlRhyp2014)	136
Figure 58: Distribution of average damages mapped for damage level “moderate” with scenario earthquake calculator for Mw 6.6 at 10 km distance (realization nr. 0; AkkarEtAlRhyp2014)	136
Figure 59: Distribution of average damages mapped for damage level “extensive” with scenario earthquake calculator for Mw 6.6 at 10 km distance (realization nr. 0; AkkarEtAlRhyp2014)	137
Figure 60: Distribution of average damages mapped for damage level “complete” with scenario earthquake calculator for Mw 6.6 at 10 km distance (realization nr. 0; AkkarEtAlRhyp2014)	137
Figure 61: Seismic hazard maps according to classical PSHA calculator for return periods of 475 and 95 years.	138
Figure 62: Hazard curves for return periods of 475 and 95 years	139
Figure 63: The damage states and the average number of structures in scenarios 1 and 2 were calculated with classical PSHA for return periods of 475 and 95 years.	142
Figure 64: The probability of exceeding the economic losses for entity 5_10 in scenario 1 calculated with classical PSHA for return period of 475 years.	143
Figure 65: Damage levels according to period of construction and taxonomies in scenario 1 and 2.	145
Figure 66: Damage levels according to height of buildings and taxonomies for scenario 1 and 2.	147
Figure 67: Damage levels according to the placement of buildings in the urban blocks and taxonomies in scenarios 1 and 2.	148
Figure 68: Damage levels according to plan shape of buildings in urban block and taxonomies in scenario 1 and 2	150
Figure 69: Distribution of average damages mapped for damage level “slight” with classical PSHA calculator for return period of 475 years (realization nr. 402; KothaEtAl2020ESHMSlopeGeology)	151

Figure 70: Distribution of average damages mapped for damage level “moderate” with classical PSHA calculator for return period of 475 years (realization nr. 402; KothaEtAl2020ESHMSlopeGeology)	152
Figure 71: Distribution of average damages mapped for damage level “extensive” with classical PSHA calculator for return period of 475 years (realization nr. 402; KothaEtAl2020ESHMSlopeGeology)	152
Figure 72: Distribution of average damages mapped for damage level “complete” with classical PSHA calculator for return period of 475 years (realization nr. 402; KothaEtAl2020ESHMSlopeGeology)	153
Figure 73: Damage levels according to period of construction and taxonomies in scenario 1 and 2.	155
Figure 74: Damage levels according to height of buildings and taxonomies for scenarios 1 and 2.	156
Figure 75: Damage levels according to the placement of buildings in the urban blocks and taxonomies in scenarios 1 and 2.	157
Figure 76: Damage levels according to plan shape of buildings in an urban block and taxonomies in scenarios 1 and 2	158
Figure 77: Distribution of average damages mapped for damage level “slight” with classical PSHA calculator for return period of 95 years (realization nr. 402; KothaEtAl2020ESHMSlopeGeology)	160
Figure 78: Economic losses according to taxonomy calculated with classical PSHA for return period of 475 years in scenario 1	162
Figure 79: Economic losses according to taxonomy calculated with classical PSHA for a return period of 475 years in scenario 2.	163
Figure 80: Economic losses per taxonomy calculated with classical PSHA for return period of 95 years in scenario 1	164
Figure 81: Economic losses per taxonomy calculated with classical PSHA for return period of 95 years in scenario 2	165
Figure 82: Average number of life losses calculated with classical PSHA for a return period of 475 years in scenarios 1 and 2.	167
Figure 83: Average number of life losses calculated with classical PSHA for a return period of 95 years in scenarios 1 and 2	167
Figure 84: Comparison of slight damage according to period of construction in scenarios 1 and 2 calculated with classical PSHA for return periods of 475 and 95 years.	170
Figure 85: Comparison of the slight damages according to height of buildings in scenarios 1 and 2 calculated with classical PSHA for return periods of 475 and 95 years.	170

Figure 86: Comparison of the slight damages and placement of buildings in scenarios 1 and 2 according to calculations with classical PSHA for return periods of 475 and 95 years.	171
Figure 87: Comparison of the damages and building plan shapes in scenarios 1 and 2 according to calculations with classical PSHA for return periods of 475 and 95 years	172
Figure 88: Urban planning parameters that have influence on the seismic risk	178
Figure 89: Plan irregularities – polygonal shape with and without seismic expansion joints. Source: Charleson, 2008	179
Figure 90: Placement of a building in an urban context. Source: Charleson, 2008.	180
Figure 91: Vertical irregularities, examples of soft story. Source: Charleson, 2008.	181
Figure 92: Vertical irregularity – examples of columns with regular length and short columns. Source: Charleson, 2008.	182
Figure 93: Vertical irregularity – examples of structural solutions to setbacks in height. Source: Charleson, 2008.	182
Figure 94: Buildings with the same taxonomy and different heights in scenario 1 and with the same heights in scenario 2	191
Figure 95: Structures with the same taxonomy but different heights in scenario 1, a preview of the damages calculated with classical PSHA for a return period of 475 years	192
Figure 96: Buildings with different taxonomies in scenario 1 and buildings with improved taxonomy in scenario 2.	194
Figure 97: Comparison of damages of the buildings according to their placement in urban blocks in scenarios 1 and 2 according to results obtained from the assessment of seismic risk with classical PSHA for a return period of 475 years.	194
Figure 98: Placement of the structures where there are annexes to the original structure. Example, entity 7_15.	195
Figure 99: Comparison of the damages to the building with the annex	196
Figure 100: Analysis of the damages according to plan shape and taxonomy for buildings with annexes applied without the use of expansion joints in scenario 1 calculated with classical PSHA for a return period of 475 years.	198

Tables

Table 1: Planning levels in the urban planning system of the USA (OECD, 2017, pp. 220-225).	15
Table 2: Planning levels in the urban planning system of Chile (OECD, 2017, pp. 71-74)	18
Table 3: Planning levels in the urban planning system of New Zealand (OECD, 2017, 158-160)	20
Table 4: Planning levels in the urban planning system of Italy (OECD, 2017, pp. 134-139).	22
Table 5: Planning levels in the urban planning system of Greece (OECD, 2017, pp. 111-117).	26
Table 6: Planning levels in the urban planning system of Turkey (OECD, 2017, pp. 209-213).	31
Table 7: Planning levels in the urban planning system of North Macedonia (Official Gazette, nr. 78/2006).	34
Table 8: Review of the legal framework and measures for mitigating seismic risk applied in urban planning.	36
Table 9: Data about the fault lines within a radius of 100 km. Source: Danciu et al., 2021.	48
Table 10: Seismotectonic regions and attenuation models in ESHM20.	54
Table 11: Report obtained from the assessment of seismic risk with classical PSHA for a return period of 475 years, segment related to group 2	56
Table 12: The number of buildings at different damage states for classical PSHA with return period of 475 calculated for scenario 1.	56
Table 13: Comparison of urban parameters in scenario 1 and 2 of pilot study	67
Table 14: Description of the attributes present in taxonomies of exposure models of scenario 1 and 2	69
Table 15: Number of structures according to taxonomies of exposure models in scenario 1 and 2.	71
Table 16: Number of buildings according to period of construction and number of structures in scenario 1	73
Table 17: Number of buildings according to period of construction and number of structures in scenario 2	74

Table 18: Distribution of the number of residents in buildings based on the period of construction and area dedicated to housing in scenario 1	83
Table 19: Distribution of the number of residents in buildings based on the period of construction and area dedicated to housing in scenario 2	83
Table 20: The average replacement cost of the buildings according to their structural system in scenario 1	90
Table 21: The average replacement cost of the buildings according to their structural system in scenario 2	91
Table 22: Parameters of entrapment caused by earthquake. Source: Crowley et al., 2021	101
Table 23: Open Quake engine – seismic hazard and risk assessment calculators	106
Table 24: Ground motion fields’ realizations in the scenario earthquakes and the peak ground accelerations.	124
Table 25: Realizations and total damages, segment of the results calculated with scenario earthquake Mw 6.6 for scenario 1	125
Table 26: Realizations and total (economic and life) losses, a segment of the results calculated with scenario earthquake Mw 6.6 for scenario 1	125
Table 27: Average damages, segment of the results calculated with scenario earthquake with Mw 6.6 for scenario 1	126
Table 28: Average losses, a segment of the results calculated with scenario earthquake with Mw 6.6 for scenario 1	127
Table 29: Average damages – a segment from the results calculated with classical PSHA calculator for a return period of 475 years for scenario 1 of a pilot study.	140
Table 30: Damages in realization nr. 402 – segment from the classical PSHA results for return period of 475 years for scenario 1	141
Table 31: Average losses – a segment of the results obtained with a classical PSHA calculator for a return period of 475 years in scenario 1	143
Table 32: The number of structures in the damage states calculated with classical PSHA for a return period of 95 years for scenario 1	159
Table 33: Comparison of economic losses	174
Table 34: Comparison of the average number of life losses	175

Table 35: Urban planning modifiers defined in the study by Martinez-Cuevas et al. (2017).	184
Table 36: Urban planning parameters which are considered in the taxonomy of GEM.	186
Table 37: Segment of the results from classical PSHA for return period of 475 years in scenario 1 presenting the urban parameter height of building in correlation with taxonomy MUR-CL99_LWAL	190
Table 38: A group of entities and their taxonomies in scenarios 1 and 2 are analyzed from the aspect of placement in the urban block.	191
Table 39: Group of entities and their taxonomies in scenarios 1 and 2 analyzed from the aspect of placement in an urban block	193
Table 40: Buildings with structural interventions without application of expansion joints in scenario 1 – the probability of damage calculated with classical PSHA for a return period of 475 years.	197

Acknowledgments

Hereby I would like to acknowledge that this book is based on my doctoral dissertation titled “Seismic Risk Assessment as a Basis for Sustainable Urban Development” (Edip, 2023). I completed my doctoral dissertation under the supervision of Prof. d-r. Roberta Apostolska at the Institute of Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Seismology (IZIIS) at Ss. “Cyril and Methodius” University in Skopje. I am very grateful to my supervisor for her dedicated work and support throughout my doctoral studies. Also, I would like to extend my gratitude to all professors who did the evaluation of my doctoral dissertation. The committee members were: Prof. d-r. Roberta Apostolska (supervisor), prof. d-r. Veronika Shendova (member), assoc. prof. d-r. Radmila Salik-Makreska (president of the committee), assoc. prof. d-r. Julijana Bojadzieva (member), all four of them from IZIIS, and prof. d-r. Divna Pencic (member) from the Faculty of Architecture at Ss. Cyril and Methodius University.

Thank you,
Skopje, October, 2024
Kefajet Edip, PhD.

Preface

Contemporary urban planning aims to achieve the goals of sustainable development, among which the main goal is the mitigation of risks from natural disasters. However, rapid urbanization is pressurizing urban planning, which makes it difficult to implement the principles of sustainable development in urban planning. Many human settlements have developed in territories exposed to one or multiple natural hazards. Earthquakes are considered to be the most devastating natural phenomena especially when they happen in densely populated and vulnerable urban environments.

The research topic of this book, which is based on the author's doctoral dissertation, is the assessment of seismic risk in urban environments as a basis for sustainable urban development. The seismic safety of the built environment relies on the buildings designed and constructed according to valid seismic design codes. However, the urban tissue of cities also consists of buildings built in different periods, before and after the introduction of seismic design codes, and as a result of different types of

reconstructions and adaptations, it has a dynamic character. Buildings constructed before the introduction of seismic design codes have unknown levels of seismic safety, which implies that urban environments are vulnerable to seismic risk.

Also, in this book, through a review of the urban planning practices in some earthquake-prone countries, an introductory analysis was done to define the existing role of urban planning in the mitigation of seismic risk.

A pilot study in the Municipality of Karposh in Skopje was selected with the purpose of defining the level of seismic risk and identifying the urban parameters that have an influence on the seismic risk. Skopje is a territory with relatively high seismicity. The earthquake in 1963 was the greatest natural catastrophe in the history of the city and, at the same time, was the beginning of the construction of modern Skopje.

For the seismic risk assessment of the pilot study in the first place, the components of risk, hazard, exposure, and vulnerability, were defined. The seismic hazard was defined using both deterministic and probabilistic approaches. Seismic hazard information was based on ESHM20 (Danciu et al., 2021). In the deterministic approach, two scenario earthquakes were selected: a Mw 6.6 earthquake at 10 km and an earthquake with Mw 7.1 at a 100 km radius distance from the pilot study area. Within the probabilistic seismic hazard analysis approaches, the intensity of ground shaking was defined for two return periods, 95 and 475 years. The local site conditions of the pilot study area were defined in accordance with data from the soil study

carried out by IZIIS (Dojcinovski et al., 2013) and regional site parameters available in ESRM20 (Crowley et al., 2021).

The exposure model was prepared for two urban scenarios: the existing (scenario 1) and the planned site (scenario 2). The existing site building stock information was based on previous studies carried out by IZIIS (Necavska-Cvetanovska et al., 2013; Apostolska et al., 2018). The planned site was based on the Detailed Urban Plan (Tajfa Plan, 2015). Taxonomy consisting of attributes such as construction period (seismic design code level), material and type of structural systems, the height of the building, plan shape of the building, and position of the building in the urban block was defined for each entity from the exposure models of scenarios 1 and 2.

According to the construction period, the building stock was classified into three periods: prior to 1964 (no seismic design codes were applied), between 1964 and 1981 (designed according to the first seismic design code), and after 1981 (designed according to the current seismic design code). Regarding the material and type of structural systems, there are buildings with reinforced concrete moment frame structures, reinforced concrete infilled frame structures, reinforced concrete dual frame-wall system structures, confined masonry structures, and unreinforced masonry structures. In both scenarios, there are buildings with mixed structural systems, which are the result of structural interventions made on existing buildings, such as expanding the floor area and adding stories. The structural interventions in some buildings were made by using expansion joints, while in others, the

structural interventions were applied directly to the original structure.

The vulnerability model was formulated by selecting existing vulnerability curves from the ESRM20 (Crowley et al., 2021) in accordance with the taxonomy of the entities present in the exposure models for scenarios 1 and 2.

The seismic risk assessment for the two urban scenarios of the pilot study was done by using the program Open Quake Engine 3.13 (GEM, 2022). Based on the approach of analyzing seismic hazard, deterministic and probabilistic, the Scenario earthquake and Classical Probabilistic calculators were used. The results obtained from seismic risk assessment were presented for different damage levels in correlation with taxonomy, construction period, and selected urban planning parameters. Also, damage distribution maps were generated in QGIS 3.14 (QGIS team, 2020). The probability of economic and life losses obtained from the Classical Probabilistic calculator was analyzed as well. As was expected, in general terms, the greatest damage appears at buildings with masonry structures constructed before the introduction of the first seismic design codes of 1964, and this type of structure is mostly present in the exposure model of urban scenario 1.

Based on the conducted research, the following general conclusions can be made:

- In urban planning, seismic hazards are taken into account, but seismic risks are not considered.
- Some urban planning parameters, such as the height of the building, position in the urban block, plan

shape, and occupancy type, create a base for the formulation of irregular architectural configurations. If the seismic risk is not considered the noncritical use of these urban parameters can give way to increased damage when an earthquake hits.

- In urban plans aiming at the existing urban settlements, urban parameters that control the growth of the built environment do not clearly define the status of the existing buildings from the construction aspect. Whether the increased floor area means demolishing the existing and rebuilding a new building, or the existing building remains as it is and additional floor area and stories are added to is not stated in the urban plan. Allowing the addition of floor areas and stories to existing buildings creates mixed structures with unknown levels of seismic safety.
- In the existing National practice and regulations of urban planning, there is no methodology that treats seismic risk in existing urban districts.
- In this research, based on the doctoral dissertation of the author, in accordance with the newest research in the world, a methodology for seismic risk assessment and defining the role and importance of selected urban parameters in the structural response of buildings was successfully implemented on the pilot study, the urban settlement in the Municipality of Karposh.

The methodology for seismic risk assessment and defining the role of selected urban parameters in the structural response of buildings conducted in the doctoral dissertation

can be used as an instrument for urban planners in the preparation of urban plans and at the same time support the city authorities in the processes of decision making and building seismically safe and sustainable urban environments.

Kefajet Edip

CHAPTER 1

Seismic Risk Assessment as a Basis for Sustainable Urban Development

Introduction

Although, in the last few decades, disaster prevention has become part of the spatial planning approaches, the integration of risk assessment into the process of spatial planning is not completely realized yet. The importance of spatial planning in reducing vulnerability of cities to different types of hazards, including seismic hazard, is highly emphasized.

In urban settlements where there is high density of population, seismically vulnerable buildings and infrastructure, an earthquake can cause a disaster. Seismically active regions are home to many cities, and the building stock of these cities consists of buildings constructed in different periods, before and after the adoption of the seismic design codes, which can cause an increase in seismic risk. In some of the European countries exposed to earthquakes, such as Greece, Italy, Poland, and Spain, the urban planning practice refers to the hazard factor while