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## STABILITY - FIG. 1



## THE EXTENT OF DAMAGE SHOULD NOT BE DISPROPORTIONATE TO ITS CAUSE

BS 5628 specifies the minimum lateral load at $1.5 \%$ of the total characteristic DL above that level.
EC6 gives this at $1 \%$ of the combined vertical characteristic dead and imposed load at the particular floor divided by $\sqrt{ } \mathrm{h}_{\text {tot }}$
Their effect may be ignored, if less onerous than other horizontal actions eg. wind

Table 1 - Wind Pressure for the Maltese Islands in $\mathbf{K N} / \mathbf{m}^{2}$ for various building heights \& terrains for a basic wind speed of $47 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$, where the greater horizontal or vertical dimension does not exceed 50 m , as per CP3:ChV.

| $\boldsymbol{H}-\boldsymbol{m}$ | Sea front with a long fetch | Countryside with scattered wind breaks | Outskirts of towns and villages | Town centers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | cladding | cladding | cladding | cladding |
| 3 or less | 1.051 .12 | 0.90 0.97 | 0.81 0.86 | $0.70 \quad 0.76$ |
| 5 | $1.12 \quad 1.19$ | $1.00 \quad 1.07$ | 0.88 | $0.74 \quad 0.81$ |
| 10 | 1.28 1.35 | 1.191 .26 | 1.00 1.05 | 0.84 |
| 15 | $1.34-1.39$ | 1.28 1.35 | $1.12 \quad 1.19$ | 0.931 .00 |
| 20 | 1.361 .43 | 1.321 .39 | 1.221 .28 | 1.01 |
| 30 | 1.421 .47 | 1.391 .44 | 1.31 | 1.151 .21 |
| 40 | 1.46 | $1.43-1.48$ | 1.36 | 1.26 1.31 |
| 50 | 1.491 .54 | 1.461 .49 | $1.40 \quad 1.46$ | 1.321 .38 |

For Structural Eurocodes, $90 \%$ of the above values to be used

## ACCIDENTAL DAMAGE

For buildings with 5 storeys or more \& clear spans exceeding 9.00m:
BS 5628 pt 1-Table 12-3 options given:

* option 1 based on members being able to withstand a pressure of $34 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ in any direction
option 3 prescribes horizontal \& vertical ties as in BS 8110
option 2 is a hybrid between options $1 \& 3$ where in masonry construction it may be difficult to provide vertical tying. Unless member defined as protected (can withstand pressure up to $34 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) the effect of removing one vertical member at a time is to be considered.


## TIEING PROVISIONS TO BS5628 pt 1

* Vertical Tie the greater of :
$T=(34 \mathrm{~A} / 8000)(\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{t})^{2} \mathrm{~N}$ or $100 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}$ length where $A$ is the area in $\mathrm{mm}^{2}$
* Horizontal Tile - in KN, is the lesser of:
$F_{t}=20+4 N_{s}$ (where $N_{s}$ is the no of storeys)
or 60 KN
* Internal Ties in KN/m

$$
f_{t}^{\prime}=F_{t}\left\{\left(G_{k}+Q_{k}\right) / 7.5\right\} X L_{a} / 5
$$

* External Wall or Column Tie in KN for columns \& $\mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}$ for walls is the lesser of $2 F_{t}$ or (L/2.5) $F_{t}$
The tie force is based on shear strength or friction


# INSTRUMENTAL SEISMICITY SICILY CHANNEL 1900-2000 - FIG. 2 

Instrumental Seismicity Sicily Channel


Source: ISC Bulletin, INGV, EMCS

## SEISMIC INTENSITY HISTORY FOR THE MALTESE ISLANDS - FIG. 3

## Seismic Intensity History for the Maltese Islands



Source: Pauline Galea

# LOCATIONS OF EARTHQUAKES THAT PRODUCED A FELT INTENSITY ON MALTA - FIG. 4 

Location of earthquakes that produced a felt intensity on Malta


Source: Pauline Galea

## GSHAP - (Global Seismic Hazard

 Assessment project) map for Europe - FIG. 5Peak horizontal acceleration map
with a 10\% probability of exceedance in 50 years


Malta is a green colour corresponding to 0.05 g 0.06 g . But the data on which this was complied was probably very sparse for Malta

## Malta’s Seismic Zoning - EC8

- Design grd. Acceleration for a return period of [475] yrs (EC8) taken at 0.06 g (being the ground motion level which is not going to be exceeded in the 50 years design life in $90 \%$ of cases
TADE2

| MM - Earthquake <br> Intensity | Return Period (years) | Base Shear Design <br> $\%$ of $g$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VI | 125 | $2-5$ |
| VII | 1000 | $5-10$ |
| VIII | 10,000 | $10-20$ |

- Defined as a low seismicity zone as $<0.10 \mathrm{~g}$ but $>0.04 \mathrm{~g}$ EC2 concrete provisions to be catered for not EC8


## MASONRY DESIGN CRITERIA FOR ZONES OF LOW SEISMICITY (EC8)

1. Shear walls in manufactured stones units $t \geq[175] \mathrm{mm}$

$$
\mathbf{h}_{\mathrm{ef}} / \mathrm{t} \leq[15]
$$

2. A min of 2 parallel walls is placed in 2 orthogonal directions. The cumulative length of each shear wall $>\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ of the length of the building. The length of wall resisting shear is taken for the part that is in compression.
3. For a design ground acceleration $<0.2 \mathrm{~g}$ the allowed no of storeys above ground allowed is [3] for unreinforced masonry and [5] for reinforced masonry, however for low seismieity a greater no allowed.
4. Mortar Grade (III), (M5) although lower resistance may be allowed. Reinforced masonry type IV (M10). No need to fill perp. Joints.

## Table 3 - Classification of Building according to anticipated Earthquake Intensity Damage

| Type | Description | Base shear <br> design \% of <br> gravity |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| A | Building of fieldstones, rubble masonry, adobe and <br> clay | $0.5 \%$ |
| B | Ordinary unreinforced brick buildings, buildings of <br> concrete blocks, simple stone masonry and such <br> buildings incorporating structural members of wood; | $0.7 \%$ |
|  | Buildings with structural members of low-quality <br> concrete and simple reinforcements with no allowance <br> for earthquake forces, and wooden buildings, the <br> strength of which has been noticeable affected by <br> deterioration; | $0.9 \%$ |
| $D_{1}$ | Buildings with a frame (structural members) of <br> reinforced concrete | $2-3$ |

Buildings found in Malta are mostly found in types $\boldsymbol{C}$ \& $D$, buildings deteriorated at $\boldsymbol{B}$. Further buildings classified as $D_{2}$ up to $D_{5}$ with a $D_{5}$ building frame able to withstand a $20 \%$ gravity base shear.

## Table 4 - Mean Damage Ratio (MDR) \& Death Rates for building types B \& C founded on rock

| Building <br> Type | B |  |  | C |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Earthquake <br> Intensity <br> MM | MDR | Death <br> Rate | Mean damage <br> costs as \% of <br> re-building <br> costs | MDR | Death <br> Rate | Mean damage <br> costs as \% of <br> re-building <br> costs |
| 5 | $2 \%$ | - | $2.5 \%$ | - | - | - |
| 6 | $4 \%$ | - | $6 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | - | $1.25 \%$ |
| 7 | $20 \%$ | $0.03 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | - | $15 \%$ |
| 8 | $45 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $135 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ | $0.4 \%$ | $62.5 \%$ |

Source: Swiss Re (1992)
For a type ' B ' building non structural damage would amount to $50 \%$ of MDR, increasing to $70 \%$ for a type 'C' building
As the quality of a building goes up, the contribution of nonstructural damage increasing, the death rate reduces, but a higher number of injuries occur

Table 5 - Amended damage Ratio Matrix for Higher Irregularity \& Asymmetry founded on rock

| Building Type | C | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHQUAKE <br> INTENSITY |  |  |
| V | $10 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| VI | $30 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| VII | $60 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| VIII | $100 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
| IX | $100 \%$ | $95 \%$ |

If founded on clay move up to higher intensity if on fill material to a further higher intensity

## TABLE 6 - DAMAGE PROBABILITY MATRIX FOR BUILDING [DPM]

| Damage class \% of value |  |  | Mean Damage Ratio (\%) |  |  | 10 | 25 | 37.5 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 85 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1.5 | 3 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | - 1.5 | (A) | 83 | 73 | 60 | 36 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 1.5 | - 3 | (B) | 17 | 25 | 26 | 23 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | - 6 | (C) |  | 2 | 10 | 18 | 11 | 5 | 2 |  |  |  |
| 6 | - 12.5 | (D) |  |  | 3 | 12 | 18 | 12 | 6 | 2 | 1 |  |
| 12. | - 25 | (E) |  |  | 1 | 8 | 24 | 24 | 15 | 7 | 3 |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | - 50 | (F) |  |  |  | 3 | 19 | 28 | 29 | 23 | 18 | 10 |
| 50 | - 100 | (G) |  |  |  | 1 | 10 | 29 | 48 | 68 | 78 | 90 |

Source : Swiss Re (1992)

# TABLE 7 - PERCENTAGE OF BUILDINGS WIH 80-100\% DAMAGE DEPENEDING ON MDR 

| MDR | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Percentage | 0.25 | 3.5 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 45 | 56 | 70 | 85 |

Source : Swiss Re (1992)
As a rule of thumb about 1/4-1/8 of the population in the $80 \%-100 \%$ damage class will be killed

Masonry Improved Sturdiness for Aseismic Design - FIG. 6


# Example of overcoming unsymmetrical requirements when large opening required on one side FIG. 7 

Forming stiffening piers at [7] m centres


## Table 8 - Crack width Classification

| Category | Damage Extension | Action |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 No Damage | Hairline crack widths 0.1mm | No action needed |
| 1 Light non-structural damage | Fine cracks on plaster. Typical crack <br> widths up to 1 mm | Not necessary to evacuate <br> the building. |
| 2 Moderate structural damage | Small cracks on masonry walls. <br> Generalized failures in non- <br> structural elements such as cornices <br> and chimneys. Typical crack widths <br> up to 5mm. | Not necessary to evacuate <br> the building. Ensure <br> conservation, such as <br> external re-pointing to and <br> erasing/adjusting of sticky <br> doors |
| 3 Severe structural damage | Large and deep cracks, in masonry <br> wall, chimneys, tanks, stair. The <br> structure resistance capacity is <br> partially reduced. Typical cracked <br> widths exceed 15mm. | The building must be <br> evacuated and shored. It can <br> be re-occupied after <br> retrofitting. |
| 4 Heavy structural damage | Wall pieces fall down, interior and <br> exterior walls break and lean out of <br> plumb. Typical crack widths exceed <br> 25mm. | The building must be <br> evacuated and shored. It <br> must be demolished or <br> major retrofitting work is <br> needed before being re- <br> occupied. |

# Accounting for Torsional Diaphragm effects - FIG. 8 



Calculated Torsion $\mathrm{M}_{1}=\mathbf{W}_{\mathrm{e}}$ distributed into 3 walls according to angular rotation and displacement. action)

The distribution of the total base shear may be modified where the shear is neither reduced more than $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ or increased more than $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ (EC8)

EC6 states that due to reduced stiffness due to cracking 15\% redistribution permissible.

## OPEN FRONTED BUILDINGS:

(frequently employed on the grd. Flr. with large shop windows)


The relatively thin columns at front are of little use in resisting horizontal load.

The total horizontal force $\mathbf{W}$, is resisted by back wall if strong enough - where $W_{1}=\mathbf{W}$
then by couple action
$\mathbf{W}_{\mathrm{a}}=\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{b}$
$\mathbf{W}_{2}=W_{\mathrm{a}} / \mathrm{b}$


Because of bending $\&$ shear the walls deform as contilevers, with equal deflections at slab level.
The shear deflection is normally neglected if height: width The Shear Centre is the centroid of MI's
In a symmetrical distribution
$\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{A}}=\mathrm{WI}_{\mathbf{A}} / \boldsymbol{\Sigma I}$
$\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{B}}=\mathbf{W I}_{\mathbf{B}} / \Sigma \mathbf{\Sigma I}$
$\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{C}}=\mathbf{W I}_{\mathbf{C}} / \Sigma \mathbf{\Sigma}$
However, due to wisting moment We due to varying deflections as shown

The adjusted loading works out at:

(Ref: An Introduction to laoding bearing brick design A. W Hendry)

## FIG 11



## FIG 12



