

***Interactive comment on* “Landslide risk management analysis on expansive residential areas. Case study of La Marina (Alicante, Spain)” by Isidro Cantarino et al.**

Eleftheria Poyiadji (Referee)

kynpo@igme.gr

Received and published: 14 December 2020

The paper discusses the landslide risk and its relation to urban expansion, with or without planning rules related to geohazards. For this reason, a pilot area has been chosen and a quite complicated methodology has been applied, involving landslide inventories, landslide temporal series, susceptibility maps, exposure data, cadastral parcel data, annual data on buildings. The main aim of the study is the identification of objective criteria to find how suitable a specific local entity’s risk management is, by looking at the evolution of its urban development procedures. As an idea, “to document that urban expansion without planning (including geological hazards), lead

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



to an increase of landslide risk” is interesting and if succeed it would be a useful tool in our effort to convince policy makers to take preventive measures by introducing geohazards into urban planning and management. However, the methodology is complicated, as this has been aforementioned, and too many assumptions have been made: For instance, (1) climate change has not been taken into account, a factor that is of the most important for the manifestation of landslides. (2) Although the authors understand that the exposure is different for the various types of landslides it is not clear if they have the data (does the inventory gives details on landslide types) and what type did they finally chose (debris flows?) and why? Moreover, the authors believe that following the proposed methodology would be able to determine what causes the incidence of landslide risk (geomorphology, chance, land management, etc.), and would finally be able to suggest control tools for the public bodies tasked with monitoring such matters. In my opinion the methodology described has many unclear points and many gaps. Finally, I would suggest a major revision of the paper. It is a text not easy to follow, there are many up and downs (see comments on pdf) and points that must be clarified. Also some of the references are not listed at the end of the document.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://nhess.copernicus.org/preprints/nhess-2020-216/nhess-2020-216-RC2-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2020-216>, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

