

Seismic Analysis of Multi-Storey Building on Sloping Ground

Yugandhara S. Sontakke, V. G. Sayagavi, P. J. Salunke, N. G. Gore

Abstract— In most of the northern earthquake prone hilly part of the India, due to local topography constraint engineered construction is resulting in the adoption of either a step back or step back & set back configuration as a structural form for buildings. The adopted form is generally irregular, torsionally coupled & hence, susceptible to serve damage when affected by earthquake ground motion. Such buildings have mass & stiffness varying along the vertical & horizontal planes, resulting the centre of mass & centre of rigidity do not coincide on various floors, hence they demand torsional analysis, in addition to lateral forces under the action of earthquakes. In this paper seismic analysis performed on 48 RC buildings with three different configurations like, Step back building, Step back Set back building and Set back building are presented. 3-D response spectrum analysis including torsional effect has been carried out by considering the dynamic response properties i.e. fundamental time period, top storey displacement and, the base shear action induced in columns with reference to the suitability of a building configuration on sloping ground. It is observed that Step back Set back buildings are found to be more suitable on sloping ground.

Index Terms— Building, Etab, Response Spectrum Analysis, Seismic, Sloping ground.

I. INTRODUCTION

In some parts of world, hilly region is more prone to seismic activity; e.g. northeast region of India. In hilly regions, locally available traditional material like, the adobe, brunt brick, stone masonry and dressed stone masonry, timber reinforced concrete, bamboo, etc., is used for the construction of houses. The scarcity of plain ground in hilly areas compels construction activity on sloping ground resulting in various important buildings such as reinforced concrete framed hospitals, colleges, hotels and offices resting on hilly slopes. Since, the behavior of buildings during earthquake depends upon the distribution of mass and stiffness in both horizontal and vertical planes of the buildings, both of which vary in case of hilly buildings with irregularity and asymmetry due to step back frame and step back & set back frame configuration. Such constructions in seismically prone areas make them exposed to greater shears and torsion as compared to conventional construction.

Hill buildings constructed in masonry with mud mortar or cement mortar without conforming to seismic codal

provisions have proved unsafe and resulted in loss of life and property when subjected to earthquake ground motions. The economic growth and rapid urbanization in hilly region has accelerated the real estate development. Due to this, population density in the hilly region has increased enormously. Therefore, there is popular and pressing demand for the construction of multistorey buildings on hill slope in and around the cities.

II. SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

It is observed during the past earthquakes, buildings in hilly regions have experienced high degree of damage leading to collapse though they have been designed for safety of the occupants against natural hazards. Hence, while adopting practice of multistorey buildings in these hilly and seismically active areas, utmost care should be taken for making these buildings earthquake resistant to meet codal provisions.

III. SCOPE OF STUDY

Three dimensional space frame analysis is carried out for three different configurations of buildings ranging from 4 to 19 storey (15.75 m to 68.25 m height) resting on sloping and plain ground under the action of seismic load. Dynamic response of these buildings, in terms of base shear, fundamental time period and top floor displacement is presented, and compared within the considered configuration as well as with other configurations. At the end, a suitable configuration of building to be used in hilly area is suggested.

IV. BUILDING CONFIGURATION

Three different configurations are considered,

- 1) Step back (Resting on sloping ground)
- 2) Step back –Setback (Resting on sloping ground)
- 3) Setback. (Resting on plain ground)

The height & length of building in a particular pattern are, in multiple blocks, the size of block is being maintained at 7x5x3.5m. The depth of footing below ground level is taken as 1.75 m, where hard strata available.

The buildings shown in figure 4.1 having step back configuration are labeled STEP4 to STEP19. Step back Setback configuration of buildings is shown in fig 4.2, are designed as STPSET4 to STPSET19. Setback buildings resting on plain ground & labeled SET4toSET19, as shown in fig 4.3

Revised Version Manuscript Received on December 19, 2015.

Miss. Yugandhara S. Sontakke, (PG Student) Department of Civil Engineering, MGM's College of Engineering and Technology, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra, India.

Prof. V. G. Sayagavi, (Guide) Department of Civil Engineering, MGM's College of Engineering and Technology, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra, India.

Prof. P. J. Salunke, (Guide) Department of Civil Engineering, MGM's College of Engineering and Technology, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra, India.

Prof. N. G. Gore, (Guide) Department of Civil Engineering, MGM's College of Engineering and Technology, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra, India.




Fig.1 Step back building




Fig. 2 Step back-setback building




Fig. 3 Setback Building

Table 4.1: Geometrical properties of members for different configurations of building.

Building Configuration	Size of column	Size
Step back Buildings	STEP 4 & STEP - 300 mm x 500 mm STEP 6 & STEP 7 - 300 mm x 650 mm STEP 8 & STEP 9 - 300 mm x 650 mm STEP 10 & STEP 11 - 350 mm x 850 mm STEP 12 & STEP 15 - 350 mm x 900 mm STEP 16 & STEP 19 - 350 mm x 1000 mm	300 mm x 750 mm
Step back & Set back Buildings	STEPSET 4 to19 300 x 500 mm	300 mm x 750 mm
Setback Buildings	SET 4to19 300 x 500 mm	300 mm x 750 mm

V. METHOD OF ANALYSIS

The analysis is based on following assumptions

1. Material is homogenous, isotropic and elastic.
2. The values of modulus of elasticity and Poisson’s ratio are 25000 N/mm² and 0.20, respectively.
3. Secondary effect P-Δ, shrinkage and creep are not considered.
4. The floor diaphragms are rigid in their plane.
5. Axial deformation in column is considered.
6. Each nodal point in the frame has six degrees of freedom, three translations and three rotations.
7. Torsional effect is considered as per IS: 1893 (I) –2002.

RESPONSE SPECTRUM ANALYSIS (RSA):

The seismic analysis of all buildings are carried out by response spectrum method by using IS : 1893 (I) –2002, The other parameters used in seismic analysis are, moderate seismic zone (IV), zone factor 0.24, importance factor 1.0, 5 % damping and response reduction factor 5.0, presuming special moment resistant frame for all configurations and height of buildings. For each building case, adequate modes (minimum six) were considered, in which, the sum of modal masses of all modes was at least 90 % of the total seismic mass. The member forces for each contributing mode due to dynamic loading were computed and the modal responses were combined using SRSS method Only selected results are presented in this paper due to space restrictions. As per codal provision,

dynamic results were normalized by multiplying with a base shear ratio, $\lambda = V_b / V_B$, where V_b is the base shear evaluation based on time period given by empirical equation and, V_B is the base shear from dynamic analysis, if V_b / V_B ratio is more than one. The following design spectrum was utilized in response



spectrum analysis.

$$1+1.5 \quad \text{when } 0.00 \leq T \leq 0.10 \text{ seconds}$$

$$Sa/g = \quad 2.50 \quad \quad \quad 0.10 \leq T \leq 0.40 \text{ seconds}$$

$$\quad \quad \quad 1/T \quad \quad \quad 0.40 \leq T \leq 4.00 \text{ seconds}$$

VI. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

In all, forty eight buildings have been analyzed for seismic load. The seismic force was applied in X direction and Y direction independently. Important results are presented in the subsequent sections.

Table 6.1: Dynamic response properties of STEP BACK building due to earthquake force in X & Y direction

STEP	TIME PERIOD BY RSA (SEC)		TOP STOREY DISPLACEMENT (MM)		DYNAMIC BASE SHEAR AT EXTREME LEFT COLUMN (KN)	
	SPECX	SPECY	SPECX	SPECY	SPECX	SPECY
4	0.86	0.65	11.35	9.83	228.04	213.16
5	1.08	0.68	15.25	13.19	250.28	215.56
6	1.18	0.70	16.07	11.41	277.50	261.32
7	1.38	0.72	19.76	14.03	294.10	265.60
8	1.59	0.73	23.65	16.71	308.40	264.38
9	1.80	0.74	27.81	19.45	321.36	257.68
10	1.83	0.74	26.86	17.38	346.16	298.78
11	2.02	0.75	30.47	19.65	356.88	291.20
12	1.89	0.75	25.36	19.26	394.96	268.22
13	2.06	0.76	28.29	21.28	405.06	263.44
14	2.23	0.76	31.39	23.35	414.26	258.40
15	2.40	0.76	34.61	25.50	423.22	256.16
16	2.50	0.77	35.92	26.21	442.08	265.02
17	2.67	0.77	39.19	28.42	450.26	265.68
18	2.84	0.77	42.58	30.58	458.32	268.04
19	3.01	0.77	46.05	32.83	465.58	271.10

Table 6.2: Dynamic response properties of STEP- SET BACK building due to earthquake Force in X & Y direction.

STEP	TIME PERIOD BY RSA (SEC)		TOP STOREY DISPLACEMENT (MM)		DYNAMIC BASE SHEAR AT EXTREME LEFT COLUMN (KN)	
	SPECX	SPECY	SPECX	SPECY	SPECX	SPECY
4	0.66	0.54	7.80	5.84	196.30	145.74
5	0.72	0.59	6.68	6.43	204.86	139.90
6	0.72	0.61	6.41	5.69	191.56	102.56
7	0.75	0.64	6.69	5.40	197.83	96.32
8	0.76	0.65	6.60	5.33	199.94	107.14
9	0.76	0.66	6.47	5.22	208.14	111.22
10	0.76	0.67	6.32	5.12	215.38	103.96
11	0.77	0.68	6.55	5.03	221.82	95.76
12	0.77	0.68	6.72	4.94	227.60	93.82
13	0.77	0.69	6.88	4.83	232.96	91.42
14	0.77	0.69	7.02	4.74	237.76	86.66
15	0.77	0.69	7.15	4.65	242.04	85.32
16	0.77	0.70	7.26	4.55	245.78	87.86
17	0.77	0.70	7.35	4.46	249.06	88.02
18	0.77	0.70	8.94	3.60	251.92	79.32
19	0.77	0.70	9.02	3.53	254.40	75.74

Table 6.3: Dynamic response properties of SET BACK building due to earthquake force in X & Y direction.

STEP	TIME PERIOD BY RSA (SEC)		TOP STOREY DISPLACEMENT (MM)		DYNAMIC BASE SHEAR AT EXTREME LEFT COLUMN (KN)	
	SPEC X	SPEC Y	SPEC X	SPEC Y	SPECX	SPECY
4	0.65	0.48	12.44	8.19	119.80	129.20
5	0.68	0.50	13.04	8.80	127.34	135.48
6	0.70	0.51	13.43	9.19	132.60	141.28
7	0.72	0.52	13.71	9.48	136.44	147.04
8	0.73	0.52	13.92	9.69	139.42	151.62
9	0.74	0.53	14.08	9.86	141.78	154.36
10	0.74	0.53	14.21	9.98	143.56	156.60
11	0.75	0.53	14.32	10.10	145.32	158.90
12	0.75	0.54	14.41	10.19	146.58	160.78
13	0.76	0.54	14.48	10.27	147.60	162.56
14	0.76	0.54	14.55	10.34	148.70	164.08
15	0.76	0.54	14.61	10.39	149.50	165.48
16	0.77	0.54	14.66	10.45	150.30	166.74
17	0.77	0.54	14.70	11.16	150.90	178.50
18	0.77	0.54	14.80	10.48	152.20	169.44
19	0.77	0.55	14.84	10.65	152.80	174.04




Fig. 6.1: Relation between time period by RSA in X direction and storey.




Fig. 6.2: Relation between time period by RSA in Y direction and storey.




Fig. 6.3: Relation between top storey displacement in X direction and storey.




Fig. 6.4: Relation between top storey displacement in Y direction and storey.




Fig. 6.5: Relation between shear force at extreme left column in X direction and storey.




Fig. 6.5: Relation between shear force at extreme left column in Y direction and storey.

VII. COMPARISON OF THREE CONFIGURATIONS

7.1 Step back building Vs. Step back-Set Back Building:

It is observed that there is increase in the value of top storey displacement and time period as the height of step back building increases. The uneven distribution of shear force in the various frames suggests development of torsional moment due to static eccentricity, which has caused profound effect in Step back buildings.

An uneven distribution of base shear in various frames was also observed in Step back-set back buildings. However, this uneven distribution of shear forces is very low as compared to step back buildings indicating torsional moments of lesser magnitude under the action of seismic forces.

Based on the above observations, it can be stated that Step back buildings are subjected to higher amount of torsional moments as compared to Step back-set back buildings and may prove more vulnerable during the seismic excitation. The configuration of Step back Set back building has an advantage in neutralizing the torsional effect, resulting into better performance than the Step back building during the earthquake ground motion, provided the short columns are taken care of in design and detailing.

7.2 Step back-set back buildings Vs. Set back buildings:

Shear reaction induced in Step back Set back buildings is moderately higher as compared to set back buildings on plain ground.

If, cost component of cutting the sloping ground and other related issues, is within the acceptable limits, set back buildings on plain ground may be preferred than the step back- Set back buildings. In addition to this, issues viz. stability of slopes and vulnerability during the earthquake ground motion are less concerned in setback building.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

1. During earthquake STEP back buildings are more vulnerable than other building configuration.
2. Extreme left short column at ground level are damaged most during earthquake in case of Step back and Step back-Set back buildings.
3. Less damage occurs in case of Setback building in flat soil.
4. Detailed study of economic cost for leveling sloping soil and other issues need to be studied.
5. Base shear is higher for Step back-Setback building and lower for Setback building.
6. Lateral displacement of top storey is maximum for Step back building. on sloping soil Setback- Step back building is favoured.

REFERENCES

1. "Seismic performance of multi-storeyed building on sloping ground" by S. M.Nagargoje and K.S.Sable Elixir Elec. Engg.
2. "Seismic Analysis of Buildings Resting on Sloping Ground." by Birajdar, B G., and S. S. Nalawade.
3. "Earthquake Behaviour of Reinforced Concrete Framed Buildings On Hill Slopes." By Ajay Kumar Sreerama & Pradeep Kumar Ramancharla.
4. "Seismic Behaviour of Buildings Located on Slopes – An Analytical Study and Some Observations From Sikkim Earthquake of September 18, 2011" by Y. Singh & Phani Gade and D.H. Lang & E. Erduran.



5. "Seismic Analysis of Buildings Resting on Sloping Ground with Varying Number of Bays and Hill Slopes" by Dr. S. A. Halkude, Mr. M. G. Kalyanshetti,.
6. "Effect of Sloping Ground on Step- Back and Setback Configurations of R.C.C. Frame Building" by Chaitrali Arvind Deshpande & Prof. P. M. Mohite.
7. "A Review on Seismic Analysis Of a Building on sloping ground" by Sanjaya Kumar Patro, Susanta Banerjee, Debasana Jena, Sourav Kumar Das.
8. "Seismic performance of buildings resting on sloping ground-A review" by Hemal Dr. R. B. Khadiranaikar and Arif Masali.
9. "Earthquake Building Vulnerability and Damage Assessment with Reference to Sikkim Earthquake 2011" thesis by Venkata Purna Teja Malladi.
10. "Dynamics of Structures" by A.K.Chopra
11. "Earthquake Resistant Design of Structures' by Shashikant K Duggal"
12. "Some Concepts in Earthquake Behaviour of Buildings" by C. V. R. Murty, Rupen Goswami, A. R. Vijaynarayanan, Vipul V. Mehta
13. IS 1893 (Part I) 2002 "Criteria for Earthquake Resistant Design of Structures".
14. Explanatory Examples on Indian Seismic Code IS 1893 (Part I) by Dr. Sudhir K Jain (IITK-GSDMA)

AUTHOR PROFILE

Miss Yugandhara S. Sontakke, (PG Student) Department of Civil Engineering, Mahatma Gandhi Mission's College of Engineering and Technology, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra. India.

Prof. V. G. Sayagavi, (Guide) Department of Civil Engineering, Mahatma Gandhi Mission's College of Engineering and Technology, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra. India.

Prof. P. J. Salunke, (Guide) Department of Civil Engineering, Mahatma Gandhi Mission's College of Engineering and Technology, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra. India.

Prof. N. G. Gore, (Guide) Department of Civil Engineering, Mahatma Gandhi Mission's College of Engineering and Technology, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra. India.