



## **Assessment of an alternative housing reconstruction policy after the 1995 Grevena-Kozani (N.Greece) earthquake: Construction of standardized units in private lots**

K. Mousteraki (1), M. Dandoulaki (2), and S. Symeonidis (3)

(1) Vice Director, Earthquake Rehabilitation Service of N. Greece , Ministry for the Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works (cmous@tee.gr), (2) National Centre of Public Administration and Local Government, Greece (mdand@tee.gr), (3) Computer Science Department, University of Ioannina, Greece (cs071407@cs.uoi.gr)

In Greece, the reconstruction of earthquake damaged building stock is technically and financially supported by the state. Housing reconstruction typically comprises three subsequent phases that is emergency shelter, temporary housing and permanent housing in buildings after their reconstruction. The latter is based on financial support by the state to the owner for the repair or reconstruction of each individual building.

A different approach was tried after the 1995 Kozani-Grevena (N.Greece) earthquake. The earthquake ( $M=6.6$ ) affected mainly the countryside of the two prefectures and devastated a great number of small settlements with aged and decreasing population. The experience from the 1986 Kalamata earthquake had demonstrated that low income and elderly households had difficulties in using reconstruction loans and tended to remain longer in temporary housing. In an attempt to take in the Kalamata experience and the development features of the disaster area, certain categories of homeless households were offered the choice to select either the typical financial and technical support to reconstruct their damaged house under their own responsibility or a small standard house (50 to 60m<sup>2</sup>) constructed by the state in their lot. About 4,000 housing units were constructed in villages all over the disaster area.

The paper focuses on this new housing policy. It presents the institutional framework, the procedures for the selection of eligible households, the geography of the constructed housing units, issues of project management and involved costs. It also attempts to highlight strong and weak points of the new approach and to make some comparisons with the long-established approach to recovery of damaged building stock.

The overall conclusion is that despite huge complexities in project management and higher costs, this new policy contributed in retaining the population and enhancing development in the area.