An Analysis of G+7 Irregular Building Using Non-Linear Static and Dynamic Analysis

Koyndrik Bhattacharjee Department of Civil Engineering, Dr. B. C. Roy Engineering College, Durgapur, India koyndrik.bhattacharjee@bcrec.ac.in

Arijit Kumar Banerji Department of Civil Engineering, Dr. B. C. Roy Engineering College, Durgapur, India arijit.banerji@bcrec.ac.in

Satabdi Saha Department of Civil Engineering, Elitte College of Engineering, Kolkata, India <u>satabdi.biet@gmail.com</u> Chanchal Das Department of Civil Engineering, Dr. B. C. Roy Engineering College, Durgapur, India <u>chanchal.das@bcrec.ac.in</u>

Md. Hamjala Alam Department of Civil Engineering, Dr. B. C. Roy Engineering College Durgapur, India <u>mdhamjala.alam@bcrec.ac.in</u>

ABSTRACT

Urbanization and industrialization have paved the way for the rise of towering multi-story buildings in uneven regions all over a developing country such as India because urbanization and industrialization have paved the way for the growth of towering multi-story structures. Due to their irregular and asymmetrical vertical and even plane architecture, structures formed in bumpy zones differ from those developed on level ground. These constructions are also far more susceptible to earthquake forces in uneven terrain. Thinking about how buildings behave on slanting terrain is the main objective of the current effort. Unlike buildings built on flat land, structures built on sloped terrain require special architectural considerations. The structures on slopes differ from those in fields. When affected by seismic earthquakes, they are torsional-linked, extremely unexpected, and asymmetrical in even and vertical planes. As a result, they are unable to separate injuries. This paper has made an effort to analyze how sporadic multi-story construction on an inclined ground of 60 degrees behaves while considering various earthquake zones, such as zone IV. The models are readied using STAAD Pro and REVIT. STAAD Pro offers advanced and adaptable analysis for specialized applications including gravity loads and earthquake analysis.

Keywords- skyscraper multi-story structures; unsymmetrical structure; STAAD Pro; REVIT

I. INTRODUCTION

The most awful and unpredictable act of nature is a seismic quake. When a structure is exposed to seismic pressures, it does not always endanger human life since the design damage causes the building to collapse, endangering the lives of its occupants and property. The continuous quakes' widespread devastation of both lowand high-rise buildings forces an evaluation, particularly in a developing nation like India. Design subjected to seismic/quake forces are always susceptible to damage, and if it happens on a skewed structure—such as an incline that tends to the ground—the chances of harm increase significantly because of extended sidelong powers on short segments on the extreme side, which encourages the use of plastic turns. Designs on slopes differ from those on fields because they are asymmetrical in both an upward and a level plane. India's northern and northeastern regions feature large slanting areas classified as seismic zones IV and V. The earthquakes in Nepal (2015), Doda (2013), and Sikkim (2011) all caused enormous damage. Due to the rapid urbanization, addition in financial turn of events, and consequent growth in population thickness, there is interest in the advancement of multi-story RC enclosed structures in this area. The progress of the buildings on the sloping ground is required due to the need for a plain region. The current work uses STAD Pro and REVIT to demonstrate a G+7-storeyed maintained design with a tendency of 30° to the ground subject to sinusoidal ground development. When a design is exposed to seismic pressures, it does not immediately affect living things. However, the building damage causes the design to fail, affecting the people living there and their property. The recurrent earthquakes that cause massive harm to low and towering structures call for an examination, particularly in a developing nation like India. Design subject to seismic/quake forces is always at risk of injury, and if it happens on a skewed structure, such as an incline that is inclined to the ground, the chances of injury increase noticeably because of prolonged equal forces on small portions on the intense side, which encourages the development of plastic turns. STAAD Pro features a cutting-edge user interface, visualization tools, and strong analysis and design engines with advanced finite element and dynamic analysis capabilities. Designing low and high-rise buildings, culverts, petrochemical plants, tunnels, bridges, piles, and other structures out of steel, concrete, wood, aluminium, and cold-formed steel is possible using STAAD Pro, the professional's choice. This covers the development, evaluation, design, visualization, and outcome validation of models.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

B. Gireesh [1] used the Staad Pro program to study the structural and seismic analyses of the G+7 construction. He used IS 1893 (Part 1) - 2007 as an Indian standard code for design base shear. According to IS 1893:2002, multiple analytical criteria depending on the building's height, zone of location, and importance were stated for the earthquake-resistant criterion. Various loads were applied after the project was launched, including dead loads, live loads, wind loads, snow loads, and earthquake loads, for which the analysis will be performed. The structure was created for the Hyderabad region under Zone II. V. Varalakshmi [2] a multi-story G+5 skyscraper in Kukatpally, Hyderabad, India, and its design and analysis. The design and analysis of columns, beams, footings, and slabs were performed using the renowned civil engineering tool STAAD Pro. The soil's capacity for safe bearing was evaluated. P. Jayachandran [3] G+4 building design and analysis in Salem, Tamil Nadu, India. The research analyzes and designs footings, columns, beams, and slabs using the STAAD Pro and RCC Design Suit software. L.G. Karulkar [4] G+5 building design and analysis in an earthquake zone employing composite structures. Three-dimensional modeling and analysis of structures are done using the SAP 2000 application. When studying composite and RCC structures, equivalent static methodologies and response spectrum analysis approaches are used. The composite structure is shown to be more economical after comparing the results. Using the most cost-effective column technique, M. Mallikarjun (2016 [5] researched the study and design of a multistory residential structure with ung-2+G+10. It was discovered that because the research was conducted using the most cost-effective column approach, this was done by lowering the size of columns on top floors because the load was more significant at the bottom level. The dead and live loads were applied to various structural components, including slabs and beams. Columns were oriented in a greater span in a longer direction to save money by reducing the amount of bending and steel area needed to support them. According to Mohit Sharma (2015) [6], the building has a G+30-story conventional reinforced concrete frame. Multi-story buildings underwent dynamic analysis. A selected building's overall height, including the depth of the foundation, is 114 m. These structures have a plan area of 25 m by 45 m, a height of 3.6 m per story, and a foundation depth of 2.4 m. STAAD-Pro software was used for static and dynamic analysis on a computer using the design parameters specified in IS:1893-2002 Part-1 for zones 2 and 3. The Axial Force values were determined to be comparable to those from static and dynamic analysis.

III. OBJECTIVE OF PRESENT STUDY

The purpose of this research is to study P-Delta and Pushover analysis which are very important in the designing and Analysis of multi-storeyed buildings.

1) The building should survive significant earthquakes that could be anticipated during its service life with damage that is within acceptable bounds.

2) Study of P-Delta effect on building.

- 3) Study of Push over analysis of building.
- 4) Check for stability of building in a hilly slope.

IV. METHODOLOGY

Proposed Tool and Methodology

STAAD Pro will analyse and design a multi-story residential structure from various angles in this project. A thorough structural analysis is necessary for structural designing so that the structure may be designed. However, manual calculations are not always feasible, which is why the necessity for programming tools was discovered.

For this purpose, several tools were developed, the most popular of which is STAAD Pro, which enables structural and seismic analysis prior to construction. STAAD Pro may be used to compute loads and their combinations, analyse structures, and design structures based on the analysis for high-rise buildings.

A. P-Delta Effect on Building

The structure may undergo greater lateral displacements as a result of gravity loading when a building is subjected to seismic lateral stress that causes it to deflect. The second-order influence of vertical loads operating onto a laterally displaced structure is known as the P- Δ effect, where P is the total vertical load and Δ is the lateral displacement with respect to the ground. The P- Δ effect illustrates how the mass of a structure moves under the influence of a weight P through a displacement Δ , creating a moment at the base of the structure.

B. Pushover analysis on Building

Pushover analysis is a static method that uses a streamlined nonlinear approach to calculate seismic structural deformations. After an earthquake, structures reconstruct on their own. As individual ones lose way or fail, the dynamic forces acting on the structure are transmitted to other components.

V. P-DELTA ANALYSIS OF G+7 BUILDING BY USING STAAD PRO

1. Building Parameters

Column	400mm x 500mm
Beam	500mm x 750mm
Material used	Reinforce cement concrete
Concrete Frame	SMRF
Main Wall	230mm
Reinforcement used	HYSD
Slab thickness	150mm
Unit weight of concrete	25KN/CUM
Concrete grade	M40
Steel Grade	Fe500
Floor to floor height	3.5m
Number of floors	G+7
No. of beam + column	220 + 142
Length of plan in x-direction	20m
Length of plan in z-direction	18m

Table 1: Structural Data and Parameters Adopted for Model

2. Plan of Residential Building on AUTO CAD and REVIT



Fig. 1: Column layout of Structure



Fig. 2: Isometric view of the irregular building

- 3. Loads acting and their calculation
 - a) Dead Load

Table 2: Dead Load Parameter

Dead load of different components	Load
Slab	3.75KN/m ²
Floor finish	1.575KN/m ²
Celling Plaster	0.168 KN/m ²
Wall	13.248 KN/m
Both side plaster wall	1.96 KN/m
Parapet wall	2.286 KN/m

b) Live load -For floor UDL = $3KN/m^2$ For roof UDL = 2.8KN/m² Point load = 1.8 KN c) Wind load - $P_z = 0.6 V_z^2$ $V_z = V_b x k_1 x k_2 x k_3 x k_4$ $V_b = 47 \text{m/s}$ (Darjeeling) $K_1 = Risk coefficient = 1$ K_2 = terrain coefficient = 0.93 $K_3 = topo \ coefficient = 1$ $K_4 = 1$ $V_z = 43.71 \text{ m/s}$ $P_z = 1.14633 KN/m^2$

Table 3: Wind loads at different height

Tuble of William found at antici che height						
height (m)	K ₁	K ₂	K ₃	K ₄	V _b	P_{z} (KN/m ²)
10	1	0.91	1	1	47	1.097
15	1	0.97	1	1	47	1.247
20	1	1.01	1	1	47	1.352
30	1	1.06	1	1	47	1.489
50	1	1.12	1	1	47	1.662
100	1	1.20	1	1	47	1.908
150	1	1.24	1	1	47	2.037

4. The P-Delta Analysis is carried out for the proposed unsymmetrical building resting on a hill slope.



Fig. 3: 3-D rendering view

Results obtained from P-Delta Analysis 5. **Table 4: Deflection obtained on Column**

Ground floor	0.756mm
1 st floor	1.489mm
2 nd floor	2.131mm
3 rd floor	2.709mm
4 th floor	3.218mm

5 th floor	3.661mm
6 th floor	4.040mm
7 th floor	4.360mm
8 th floor	4.627mm

 Table 5: Deflection obtained on Beams

Beam 1	2
Beam 2	2
Beam 3	1

VI. PUSHOVER ANALYSIS OF G+7 BUILDING BY USING STAAD PRO

Using the static-nonlinear analytical technique known as "pushover," a structure is subjected to gravity loading and a monotonic displacement-controlled lateral load pattern. The load is continuously increased through both elastic and inelastic behavior until an ultimate state is reached. Indicating the range of base shear brought on by earthquake loading, the configuration of the lateral load may be proportionate to the distribution of mass along the building height, mode forms, or another practical technique.

A structure with constant vertical loads and growing lateral loads is the subject of a static non-linear pushover analysis. The forces brought on by earthquakes are represented by equivalent static lateral loads. This method displays any early failure or weakness by plotting a structure's total base shear vs. top displacement. It is able to determine the collapse load and ductility capability because the study was conducted until failure. On a building frame, plastic rotation is observed, and analytically calculated lateral inelastic forces versus displacement. Finding structural faults is made possible by this type of research. It is possible to decide to retrofit after conducting such studies. There are two steps in the seismic design process. Developing an effective structural system is the first and frequently most important phase. It must be constructed carefully taking into account all significant seismic performance requirements, ranging from serviceability challenges. The seismic engineering process is currently complete. The general guidelines for the strength and stiffness objectives should be adequate to design and roughly size an effective structural system. These recommendations are predicated on a fundamental comprehension of ground motion and the features of elastic and inelastic dynamic response. Only when a structural framework has been created is it possible to build complex mathematical/physical models. It is necessary to use these models when evaluating the seismic performance of an existing system and when modifying component behavior parameters (strength, stiffness, and deformation capacity) in order to improve performance.

In the Pushover analysis, the strength and deformation demands of design earthquakes are identified using static inelastic analysis and compared to the available capacities at the desired performance levels. Through static inelastic analysis, structural systems are assessed to determine the anticipated performance levels. The assessment of key performance parameters, including global drift, inter-story drift, inelastic element deformations (either absolute or normalized concerning a yield value), deformations between elements, and element connection forces (for elements and connections that cannot sustain inelastic deformations), form the foundation of the evaluation. The inelastic static pushover analysis can be viewed as a tool for predicting seismic force and deformation needs after earthquakes based on analysing crucial performance. The pushover is expected to show a number of reaction qualities that cannot be discovered through an elastic static or dynamic analysis.

These are some instances of such response characteristics: Axial force requirements for columns, force requirements for brace connections, and moment requirements for possibly brittle parts are examples of realistic force requirements.

> Beam-to-column connections, shear force requirements for deep reinforced concrete spandrel beams, and shear force requirements for unreinforced masonry wall piers, among others.

 \succ Estimates of the deformations ask for components that must take an elastic form to release the energy applied to the structure.

 \succ How the behaviour of the structural system is affected by the weakening of specific parts.

 \succ It determines the crucial areas that must be the centre of attention via detailing and where significant deformation demands are anticipated.

 \succ The dynamic characteristics of the elastic range will change depending on how strong the discontinuities are in the plan elevation.

 \succ Understory drift can be estimated by considering strength discontinuities or stiffness discontinuities in order to reduce damages and assess P-Delta impacts.

Check the load path's accuracy and completeness while considering all the structural system's components, linkages, stiff non-structural elements, and foundation system.

Results of Pushover Analysis

Table 6: Displacement on noors (mm)				
	Ux	Uy	Uz	
Ground Floor	-0.789	-32.495	-0.016	
1 st Floor	-1.451	-58.913	-0.155	
2 nd Floor	-2.032	-81.277	-0.353	
3 rd Floor	-2.569	-100.415	-0.593	
4 th Floor	-2.946	-99.323	2.020	
5 th Floor	-3.476	-114.945	1.283	
6 th Floor	-3.856	-140.092	-1.315	
7 th Floor	-4.178	-147.587	-1.476	
8 th Floor	-4.686	-152.250	-1.559	

VII. **RESULTS AND CONCLUSION**

The P-Delta and Pushover Analysis has been carried out for a G+7 multistorey building and the following results have been found out using STAAD. Pro software. It has been observed that the maximum and minimum deflection in beam is 2.713mm and 1.728mm respectively. For the columns, the maximum and minimum deflection is 4.627mm and 0.756mm respectively. The maximum and minimum displacement is observed in pushover analysis with 152.250mm and 0.789mm the respective values.

REFERENCES

[1] Chung B.T., "Dynamic Behaviour of Multi-storey Buildings" Engineering Report, University of Auckland, No. 492, 1991.

[2] CSI Analysis Reference Manual for SAP2000, ETABS, SAFE, CSI Bridge.

[3] Dinar Yousuf, Karim Samiul, Barua Ayan, Uddin Ashraf, "P-Delta Effect in Reinforced Concrete structures of Rigid Joint", ISOR Journal of Mechanical and Civil Engineering, Vol. 10, December 2013.

[4] Dubey S. K., Sangamnerkar Prakash, Soni Deepak, "Dynamic Behavior of Reinforced Concrete Framed Buildings"

[5] E. L. Wilson and A. Habibullah, "Static and Dynamic Analysis of Multi-Story Buildings Including P-Delta Effects", 1987.
 [6] Konapure C. G., Dhanshetti P. V., "Effect of P-Delta Action on Multi-Storey Buildings", International Journal of Engineering

[7] Research & Technology (IJERT), Vol. 4, January 2015. D.N. Shinde, Nair Veena V, Pudale Yojana M, " PUSHOVER ANALYSIS

OF MULTY STORY BUILDING International Journal of Research in Engineering and Technology eISSN: 2319-1163.

APPENDIX

Proprietary Program of Bentley Systems, Inc.

1. STAAD SPACE

INPUT FILE: C:\SProV8i SS6\STAAD\Plugins\P DELTA OF DL+LL+WL.STD

2. START JOB INFORMATION

3. ENGINEER DATE 20-NOV-22

4. END JOB INFORMATION

5. INPUT WIDTH 79

6. UNIT METER KN

7. JOINT COORDINATES

8. 1 0 0 0; 2 0 0 6; 3 0 0 12; 4 0 0 18; 5 5 0 0; 6 5 0 6; 7 5 0 12; 8 5 0 18

9. 9 10 0 0; 10 10 0 6; 11 10 0 12; 12 10 0 18; 13 15 0 0; 14 15 0 6; 15 15 0 12

10. 16 15 0 18; 17 19 0 0; 18 19 0 6; 19 19 0 12; 20 19 0 18; 21 0 3.5 0

11. 22 0 3.5 6; 23 0 3.5 12; 24 0 3.5 18; 25 5 3.5 0; 26 5 3.5 6; 27 5 3.5 12

12. 28 5 3.5 18; 29 10 3.5 0; 30 10 3.5 6; 31 10 3.5 12; 32 10 3.5 18; 33 15 3.5 0

13. 34 15 3.5 6; 35 15 3.5 12; 36 15 3.5 18; 37 19 3.5 0; 38 19 3.5 6

14. 39 19 3.5 12; 40 19 3.5 18; 41 0 7 0; 42 0 7 6; 43 0 7 12; 44 0 7 18; 45 5 7 0 15. 46 5 7 6; 47 5 7 12; 48 5 7 18; 49 10 7 0; 50 10 7 6; 51 10 7 12; 52 10 7 18

166. ISOTROPIC CONCRETE 167. E 2.17185E+007 168. POISSON 0.17 169. DENSITY 23.5616 170. ALPHA 1E-005 171. DAMP 0.05 172. TYPE CONCRETE 173. STRENGTH FCU 27579 174. END DEFINE MATERIAL 175. MEMBER PROPERTY AMERICAN 176. 1 TO 41 72 TO 112 143 TO 183 214 TO 254 285 TO 325 PRIS YD 0.5 ZD 0.4 177. 42 TO 71 113 TO 142 184 TO 213 255 TO 284 326 TO 515 624 TO 626 -178. 627 PRIS YD 0.75 ZD 0.5 179. CONSTANTS 180. MATERIAL CONCRETE ALL 181. SUPPORTS 182. 206 TO 225 FIXED 183. DEFINE WIND LOAD *** NOTE: If any floor diaphragm is present in the model Wind Load definition should be defined after Floor Diaphragm definition. Otherwise wind load generation may be unsuccessful during analysis. 184. TYPE 1 WIND LOAD 185. INT 2.01 2.14 2.231 2.341 2.474 2.65 2.739 HEIG 10 15 20 30 50 100 150 186. EXP 1 JOINT 1 TO 225 187. LOAD 1 LOADTYPE DEAD TITLE DL 188. SELFWEIGHT Y -1 LIST 1 TO 515 624 TO 627 189. MEMBER LOAD 190. 42 TO 68 113 TO 139 184 TO 210 255 TO 281 326 TO 352 356 TO 483 500 TO 515 -191. 624 TO 627 UNI GY -15.21 192. FLOOR LOAD 193. YRANGE 3.5 28 FLOAD 5.5 XRANGE 0 19 ZRANGE 0 6 GY **NOTE** about Floor/OneWay Loads/Weights. Please note that depending on the shape of the floor you may have to break up the FLOOR/ONEWAY LOAD into multiple commands. For details please refer to Technical Reference Manual Section 5.32.4.2 Note d and/or "5.32.4.3 Note f. 194. YRANGE 0 28 FLOAD 5.5 XRANGE 0 19 ZRANGE 6 12 GY 195. YRANGE -3.5 28 FLOAD 5.5 XRANGE 0 19 ZRANGE 12 18 GY 196. LOAD 2 LOADTYPE LIVE TITLE LL 197. FLOOR LOAD 198. YRANGE 3.5 24.5 FLOAD 3 XRANGE 0 19 ZRANGE 0 6 GY 199. YRANGE 0 24.5 FLOAD 3 XRANGE 0 19 ZRANGE 6 12 GY 200. YRANGE -3.5 24.5 FLOAD 3 XRANGE 0 19 ZRANGE 12 18 GY 201. LOAD 3 LOADTYPE WIND TITLE WL X+ 202. WIND LOAD X 1 TYPE 1 XR 0 19 YR 0 28 ZR 0 6 203. WIND LOAD X 1 TYPE 1 XR 0 19 YR -3.5 28 ZR 6 12 204. WIND LOAD X 1 TYPE 1 XR 0 19 YR -7 28 ZR 12 18 205. LOAD 4 LOADTYPE WIND TITLE WL X -206. WIND LOAD X -1 TYPE 1 YR 0 28 ZR 0 6 207. WIND LOAD X -1 TYPE 1 YR 0 28 ZR 6 12 208. WIND LOAD X -1 TYPE 1 YR -7 28 ZR 12 18 209. LOAD 6 LOADTYPE WIND TITLE WL Z -210. WIND LOAD Z -1 TYPE 1 XR 0 19 YR -7 28 211. LOAD 7 GENERATED INDIAN CODE GENRAL STRUCTURES 1 212. REPEAT LOAD 213.11.521.5 214. LOAD 8 GENERATED INDIAN CODE GENRAL_STRUCTURES 2 215. REPEAT LOAD 216. 1 1.2 2 1.2 3 1.2 217. LOAD 9 GENERATED INDIAN CODE GENRAL STRUCTURES 3 218. REPEAT LOAD 219.11.221.241.2 PROBLEMSTATISTICS NUMBER OF JOINTS 225 NUMBER OF MEMBERS 519 NUMBER OF PLATES 108 NUMBER OF SOLIDS 0 NUMBER OF SURFACES 0 NUMBER OF SUPPORTS 20 SOLVER USED IS THE OUT-OF-CORE BASIC SOLVER ORIGINAL/FINAL BAND-WIDTH= 205/27/168 DOF TOTAL PRIMARY LOAD CASES = 25, TOTAL DEGREES OF FREEDOM = 1230

TOTAL LOAD COMBINATION CASES = 0 SO FAR.

SIZE OF STIFFNESS MATRIX = 207 DOUBLE KILO-WORDS REQRD/AVAIL. DISK SPACE = 16.4/165754.7 MB

MAXIMUM DISPLACEMENTS (CM /RADIANS) (LOADING 9) MAXIMUMS AT NODE

X = -2.68762E+00 180

Y = -5.26466E-01 164 Z = 5.69772E-01 180 RX= 7.20523E-04 17 RY= -3.87175E-04 1 RZ= 6.34454E-04 43 STATIC LOAD/REACTION/EQUILIBRIUM SUMMARY FOR CASE NO. 10 GENERATED INDIAN CODE GENRAL_STRUCTURES 4 CENTER OF FORCE BASED ON Y FORCES ONLY (METE). (FORCES IN NON-GLOBAL DIRECTIONS WILL INVALIDATE RESULTS) X = 0.994179849E+01 Y = 0.694526676E+01 Z = 0.952222938E+01 ** NOTE: MOMENT BALANCE DOES NOT CONSIDER SECONDARY EFFECTS OF P-Delta or Direct Analysis ** STATIC LOAD/REACTION/EQUILIBRIUM SUMMARY FOR CASE NO. 11 GENERATED INDIAN CODE GENRAL_STRUCTURES 5 CENTER OF FORCE BASED ON Y FORCES ONLY (METE). (FORCES IN NON-GLOBAL DIRECTIONS WILL INVALIDATE RESULTS) X = 0.994179849E + 01Y = 0.694526676E+01 Z = 0.952222938E+01 CENTER OF FORCE BASED ON Z FORCES ONLY (METE). STATIC LOAD/REACTION/EQUILIBRIUM SUMMARY FOR CASE NO. 12 GENERATED INDIAN CODE GENRAL_STRUCTURES 6 CENTER OF FORCE BASED ON X FORCES ONLY (METE). (FORCES IN NON-GLOBAL DIRECTIONS WILL INVALIDATE RESULTS) X = 0.00000000E + 00Y = 0.126780483E + 02Z = 0.941554729E+01 CENTER OF FORCE BASED ON Y FORCES ONLY (METE). (FORCES IN NON-GLOBAL DIRECTIONS WILL INVALIDATE RESULTS) X = 0.994179849E+01 Y = 0.694526676E+01

Z = 0.952222938E+01