

R.C.C Framed High Rise Building Under Different Seismic Zones

Anurag Saraogi^{1*}, Rahul Sharma²

¹Student, Department of Civil Engineering, Prashanti Institute of Technologies and Sciences, Ujjain, India

²Assistant Professor, Dept. of Civil Engineering, Prashanti Institute of Technologies and Sciences, Ujjain, India

*Corresponding author: anurag.saraogi16@gmail.com

Abstract: The present project aims at comparing the cost of steel and concrete required for conventional strip foundation and Angle Shaped foundation. The effect of seismic zones, the effect of aspect ratio and the effect of height of structure are also the parameter to be studied on tall structure. Analytical study carried out for 48 numbers of cases. The foundation type considered for 48 cases are conventional strip foundation and T-Shaped foundations under different seismic zone (2,3,4 and 5) and the different aspect ratio (20mX40m, 20mX60m, 20mX60m, 20mX80m, 20mX100m) and different height of high rise buildings. The study also provides the percentage reduction of quantity of steel and concrete from conventional footing to Angle Shaped footing.

Keywords: RCC, High rise building, Seismic zones.

1. Introduction

The settlement of footing caused by the reduction in bearing capacity of soil, the bearing capacity of soil depends on different loading and soil strength parameters (cohesion, friction angle, and surface surcharge and self-weight). One of the reasons of reduction in bearing capacity of soil is due to eccentric loading in shallow footing. Many researchers concluded that the eccentrically loaded footing reduces bearing capacity of soil. No check for tilting has been discovered so far. Mahiyar H. K. has introduced angle shaped footing which gives zero tilt in eccentrically loaded condition. Edge column in most of the cases are subjected to moment along longitudinal axis. This bending develops the tilting of angle shape footing, also even if the footings are subjected to axial loads they may be located near the property line subjected to axial load in case of static nature of load.

The footing also may be subjected to dynamic loading in case of earthquake. The high rise structures are subjected to large amount of wind forces and are designed to sway under these forces, in such a case the loading which comes on the footing is considered to be inclined. The effect of the loading is such that it tends to tilt the footing in the direction of the loading. Mahiyar H. K. (2000) introduced the Angle Shaped footing in which the tilt due to eccentric was reduced to zero.

2. Design of 20X40 (G+10) 33 for Conventional Strip Footing

Size of column = 0.6*0.6m

Beam size = 0.5*0.3m
 Over all depth of raft (D) = 0.65 m
 Effective depth of raft (d) = 0.6 m
 Length of raft (l) = 21 m
 S.B.C of soil = 250 KN/m

Total axial load:

P1 P2 P3 P4 P5 P6

Factored load (W_u):

1740 2640 2700 2640 1740 11460

Unfactored load (F_u):

1160 1760 1800 1760 1160 7640

Footing size:

$$\text{Required size of footing} = (11460 \times 1.1) / (1.5 \times 250) = 33.61 \text{ m}^2$$

$$\text{Footing size required for P1} = (1740 \times 1.1) / (1.5 \times 250) = 5.104 \text{ m}^2$$

$$\text{Size of footing strip} = 33.616 / 21 = 1.6007 \text{ m}$$

$$\text{Size of Raft Strip} = 22 \times 1.46 = 33.616 \text{ m}^2$$

$$\text{Upward pressure} = 11460 / (1.5 \times 33.616) = 227.2727273 \text{ KN/m}^2$$

$$\text{Pressure Per Meter Run P1} = 227.27 \times 1.5 = 363.8095238 \text{ KN/m}$$

For 5 meter,

$$= 5 \times 227.27 = 1136.363636 \text{ KN/m}$$

$$M_u = 1.5 \times 363.80 \times 1.5 \times 1.5 / 10 = 139.8359392 \text{ KN-m}$$

$$V_u = 1.5 \times 6 \times 363.80 \times 1.5 = 524.1351837 \text{ KN}$$

$$\text{Net shear (V)} = 436.85 - (1.5 \times 363.80 \times (.64 + .2)) = 87.5637551 \text{KN}$$

$$= 30 \text{ ton/m}^2$$

$$V_u/BD = 524.13/1500/640 = 0.091168831 < .29 \text{N/mm}^2 \text{ (SAFE)}$$

Total axial load:

$$p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4 p_5$$

$$M_u/BD^2 = 98.824/(1.5 \times .64^2) = 0.388433164$$

Factored load (W_u):

$$1740 \ 2640 \ 2700 \ 2640 \ 1740$$

$$\text{From sp-16 for } .241 (M_u/bd^2) = 0.127$$

Unfactored load (F_u):

$$1160 \ 1760 \ 1800 \ 1760 \ 1160$$

But the minimum reinforcement provided for Fe-415 is .12%

$$\text{Steel for 1 m strip} = 127 \times 1000 \times 650/100 = 825.5 \text{ mm}^2$$

$$\text{Using bar dia} = 12 \text{mm}$$

$$\text{Area of bar} = 113.04 \text{ mm}^2$$

$$\text{Spacing} = 113.04 \times 1000/825.5 = 136.9351908 \text{ mm}$$

$$\text{Provide 12mm dia bar @ 134.57mm c/c}$$

$$\text{No. of bars} = 11.6899235 = 12 \text{ Bar}$$

$$p = q (bf - tw) * 1 + c (bw * 1) \times 2 - q * 1 * tw$$

$$11180/(1.5 \times 10) = (30 \times .9bf) \times 22 + 2 \times 0.4 * bf \times 22 \times 2 - 30 \times 0.1bf \times 22 = 764 = 521.22bf$$

$$764 = 356.40bf + 35.20bf + 39.60bf$$

$$764 = 521.22bf$$

Transverse steel also .12%

$$\text{Steel for 1m strip} = .127 \times 1000 \times 650/100 = 825.5 \text{mm}^2$$

$$\text{Spacing} = 113.04 \times 1000/825.5 = 136.9351908$$

$$\text{Provide 12mm dia bar @ 180mm c/c}$$

$$\text{No. of bars} = 128$$

$$bf = 1.465791796 \text{ m} = 1465.791796 \text{ mm}$$

$$\text{Raft size} = 21 \times 1.46 = 30.78162772 \text{ m}^2$$

$$\text{Upward pressure at corner} =$$

$$300 \times 1 \times 1046 + 2 \{ (0.4 \times 1.46 \times 1 \times 2) \} \times 10$$

Also in top both minimum steel .012%,

$$\text{Upward pressure at corner} = 463.1902076 \text{ KN}$$

$$\text{Upward pressure for 5m run} = 2315.951038 \text{ KN}$$

$$\text{Steel for 1m strip} = .127 \times 1000 \times 650/100 = 825.5$$

$$\text{Area of bar} = 113.04 \text{ mm}^2$$

$$\text{Spacing} = 113.04 \times 1000/825.5 = 136.9351908$$

$$M_u = 1.5 \times 463.19 \times 1.46^2$$

$$= 149.2777917 \text{ KN-m}$$

$$V_u = 1.5 \times 0.6 \times 463.19 \times 1.46$$

$$= 611.0463657 \text{ KN}$$

$$\text{Provide 12mm dia bar @ 134.57mm c/c}$$

$$\text{no. of bars} = 154$$

$$\text{no of bars in translational direction} = 171$$

$$\text{Net Shear} = 326.90 - (1.5 \times 463.19 \times \{ .54 + .2 \}) = 166.38 \text{ KN}$$

$$V_u/bd = 326.90 \times 10^3 / (1465 \times 540)$$

$$= 0.210205902 < .4 \text{ its ok}$$

$$M_u/bd^2 = 326.90 \times 10^3 / (1465 \times 540^2)$$

$$= 0.276440355$$

then M_u/bd^2 Required reinforcement is = .127%

$$\text{Total Wt. of steel required for construction} = 864.1191451 \text{ kg}$$

$$\text{Quantity of concrete required in 1 Raft Rtrip} = 21.8504 \text{ m}^3$$

3. Design of 20X40 (G+10) 33 for T-Shaped Footing

$$\text{Length of the span} = 21 \text{ m}$$

$$\text{Column size} = 600 \text{mm} \times 600 \text{mm}$$

$$\text{Beam size} = 500 \text{mm} \times 300 \text{mm}$$

$$\text{Overall depth of raft} = 600 \text{ mm}$$

$$\text{Effective depth of raft} = 540 \text{ mm}$$

$$\text{Length of raft } L = 21 \text{m}$$

$$\text{S.B.C of soil} = 250 \text{ KN/m}^2$$

But Minimum criteria for providing steel is .12% using 12 mm dia. bar.

$$\text{Area of bar} = 113.04 \text{mm}^2$$

$$\text{Steel for 1 m strip} = 1000 \times .12 \times 600/100 = 762 \text{mm}^2$$

$$\text{Spacing} = 113.04 \times 1000/720 = 148.3464567 \text{mm}$$

$$\text{Now providing 12mm dia bar @ 150mm c/c}$$

$$\text{No. of bars} = 9.880868265 = 10$$

$$\text{Transverse steel also .12\%} = .12 \times 1000 \times 600/100 = 762 \text{mm}^2$$

$$\text{Using bar dia.} = 12 \text{mm}$$

$$.12 \times 1000 \times 600/100 = 762 \text{ mm}^2$$

$$bf = \text{Width of flange} = 1.465791796$$

$$bw = \text{Width of web} = .4bf = 0.586316718$$

$$tw = \text{Thickness of web} = .1bf = 0.14657918$$

$$\text{S.B.C of soil increase by 20\%} = 250 \times 1.20 = 300 \text{ KN/m}^2$$

Provide 12mm dia bar @ 150mm c/c

Also in top both side minimum steel .12%, so
 Steel for 1 m strip = $.12 \times 1000 \times 600 / 100 = 762 \text{mm}^2$
 Provide 12mm dia bar @ 150mm/c
 Total number of bar required in transverse direction
 = 141.5605096 steel provide in shear key
 = $21 \times 7 \times .62 + 110 \times .2 \times .62 = 104.78$
 Total wt. of steel required for the construction = 835.1737822 kg
 Volume of concrete required for the shear key = 1.804778295
 Total wt. of concrete required for the construction
 = 18.48702441m^3

4. Conclusion

Analysis has been carried out for 48 number of cases. Based upon the structural analysis of forces using ready software STAAD.PRO following are the conclusions

- The percentage of reduction in steel at corner T-shape footing for G+10 storey building in all the seismic zones and all for the aspect ratio is 4%. While the percentage reduction of steel at middle footing is 8%.
- The percentage of reduction in steel at corner T-shape footing for G+15 storey building in all the seismic zones and all for the aspect ratio is 8%. While the percentage reduction of steel at middle footing is 10%.
- The percentage of reduction in steel at corner T-shape footing for G+26 storey building in all the seismic zones and all for the aspect ratio is 12%. While the percentage reduction of steel at middle footing is 13%.
- The percentage of reduction in concrete for T-shape footing for all building in all the seismic zones and all for the aspect ratio is 15%.

References

- [1] N. Manoharam, "Bearing Capacity of surface footing by finite element method, Assumed Mohr-Coulomb yield criterion for the soil," *Computers and structures*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 563-586, 1995.
- [2] H. K. Mahiyar, and A. N. Patel, "The effect of Lateral confinement on fully saturated sand", *Proceedings of Indian Geotechnical conference at Vadodra*, pp. 225-231, 1997.
- [3] D. Gupta, "Experiment Studies on angle shape rectangular footing under eccentric loading," M.E. thesis submitted to D.A.V.V. Indore, 2000.
- [4] H. K. Mahiyar, and A. N. Patel, "Analysis of angle shape footing under eccentric loading," *Journal of Geotechnical and Geo environmental division of ASCE*, vol. 126, no. 1, pp. 1151-1156, 2000.
- [5] H. K. Mahiyar, and A. N. Patel, "Moment –Tilt characteristics of angle shape footing under eccentric loading," *Proceedings of Indian Geotechnical Conference at Indore*, 2001.
- [6] A. A. Awadet, "An experimental study on seismic bearing capacity of shallow footing," *Fourth International conference on recent advanced in Geotechnical Earthquake engineering and soil dynamics at San Diego, California*, 2001.
- [7] G. T. Housby, "Behavior of rigid circular footing on sand when subjected to combined vertical and horizontal loading and moment," *Geotechnique*, vol. 52, no.2, pp. 117-129, 2002.
- [8] H. K. Mahiyar, and A. N. Patel, "Rectangle footing confined on two opposite sides", *Proceedings on Indian Geotechnical Conference at Roorkee*, 2003.
- [9] A. Kanungo, "Experimental Study of angle shaped footing on cohesive and cohesionless soil under eccentric loading," M.E. thesis submitted to R.G.P.V. Bhopal, 2004.
- [10] Lu Xilinet, "Experimental work on dynamic soil structure interaction" *13th world conference on Earthquake Engineering*, Vancouver. B.C., Canada, 2004.
- [11] H. K. Mahiyar, and A. N. Patel, "Effect of Shear parameters on bearing capacity of angle shaped footings," *Communicated for India Geotechnical conference held at Warangal*, 2004.
- [12] A. K. Narendra, "Optimization of angle shaped footing," M.E. thesis subjected to R.G.P.V. Bhopal, 2005.
- [13] G. F. Ahirwal, "Effect of water table on bearing capacity of angle shaped footing under eccentric loading," M.E. thesis submitted to R.G.P.V. Bhopal, 2005.
- [14] R. Deepali, "Angle shaped footing subjected to one-way eccentric loading under mixed soil condition," M.E. thesis subjected to R.G.P.V. Bhopal, 2006.
- [15] V. K. Puri et.al., "Shallow foundation subjected to dynamic loading by machine operation," 2006.