



# **COMPARATIVE STUDY OF 30 STOREY BUILDING WITH AND WITHOUT SEISMIC & WIND LOAD COMBINATION BY USING STAAD PRO.**

**KUSAMAKAR SHUKLA<sup>1</sup>, DR. MAROOF KHAN<sup>2</sup>, RAJESH SINGH GHOSHEE<sup>3</sup>, RAM S. SAHU<sup>4</sup>, HARSH KHARE<sup>5</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Assistant professor, Department of Civil Engineering, B.I.S.T, BHOPAL, M.P, INDIA

<sup>2</sup>Associate professor, Department of Civil Engineering, B.I.S.T, BHOPAL, M.P, INDIA

<sup>3</sup>Assistant professor, Department of Civil Engineering, B.I.S.T, BHOPAL, M.P, INDIA

<sup>4</sup>Assistant professor, Department of Civil Engineering, B.I.S.T, BHOPAL, M.P, INDIA

<sup>5</sup>Research Scholar, UIT RGPV, BHOPAL, M.P, INDIA

**Abstract :** This comparative study aims to evaluate the structural behavior of a 30-storey building using STAAD Pro under two scenarios: with and without seismic load combinations. By comparing the results obtained from both cases, the study seeks to determine the significance of seismic design provisions and the impact they have on the structural performance of the building. The findings of this research will contribute to the understanding of the importance of incorporating seismic load combinations in the design process of high-rise buildings and aid in improving their safety and resilience. Seismic design provisions and load combinations are essential in ensuring the structural integrity of high-rise buildings. These provisions consider the effects of lateral forces generated by seismic activity and aim to minimize structural damage and protect human life during an earthquake. It is crucial to evaluate the performance of buildings under different loading conditions, including seismic load combinations, to ensure they meet safety standards and codes.

**Index Terms - Seismic design, load combinations, Seismic load, wind load, dead load, Displacement.**

**I.**

## INTRODUCTION

High-rise buildings are becoming increasingly common in urban areas, providing efficient use of limited space and accommodating growing populations. However, their structural design and performance become critical factors to ensure the safety of occupants, particularly under seismic events. Earthquakes can exert significant forces on buildings, causing structural damage and compromising their stability. The problem addressed in this study is the lack of comprehensive understanding regarding the impact of seismic load combinations on the structural behaviour of 30-storey buildings. While seismic design provisions are essential for ensuring the safety of high-rise structures, there is a need to evaluate their effectiveness and quantify their influence on the building's stability and performance. The use of STAAD Pro software provides a powerful platform for analyzing and designing structures, including the ability to incorporate seismic loads. However, there is a gap in the research literature regarding a direct comparative study of a 30-storey building with and without seismic load combinations, using STAAD Pro as the analysis tool.

A. *Objectives:*

- The primary objectives of this comparative study of a 30-storey building with and without seismic load combination, using STAAD Pro, are as follows:
- To analyze and model a 30-storey building using STAAD Pro software, considering its geometrical specifications, material properties, and structural components.
- To simulate and analyze the structural behavior of the building under non-seismic load combinations, such as dead loads and live loads, using STAAD Pro.
- To simulate and analyze the structural behavior of the building under seismic load combinations, incorporating lateral forces generated by seismic activity, using STAAD Pro.
- To compare and evaluate the structural response of the building under non-seismic load combinations and seismic load combinations, focusing on parameters such as displacements, member forces, and stresses.
- To identify and analyze the critical areas within the building that are most affected by seismic load combinations, assessing their vulnerability and potential structural weaknesses.

**II.****LITERATURE REVIEW**

[Mohammed Uvaish Mansoori, Rajesh Misra (2023)] this study is related to the how to design the pre-engineered building instead of Conventional Steel Building (CSB) design by using of Staad pro, software. Research shows that PEB structures are easy to design. These designs are effective and result in rapid construction.

[Abhiyank Joshi, Mr. RahulSharma (2022)] this study is related to the comparison between two different grade of concrete used in the structure. The comparison result shows that using different type of grade of concrete does not affect the volume of concrete but is severely affect the amount of steel used (mainly in the columns/vertical members). The building is planned as per IS 456 2000. The checks performed are according to the procedure defined by the Indian standards. In the project with the help of software different figures are taken into account from the software graphs and designs.

[Ibrahim, et.al (April 2019)]: Design and Analysis of Residential Building(G+4): After analyzing the G+4 story residential building structure, conducted that the structure is safe in loading like dead load, live load, wind load and seismic loads. Member dimensions (Beam, column, slab) are assigned by calculating the load type and its quantity applied on it. Auto CAD gives detailed information at the structure members length, height, depth, size and numbers, etc. STADD Pro. has a capability to calculate the program contains number of parameters which are designed as per IS 456: 2000. Beams were designed for flexure, shear and tension and it gives the detail number, position and spacing brief.

[Dunnala Lakshmi Anuja, et.al (2019)]: Planning, Analysis and Design of Residential Building (G+5) By using STAAD Pro.: Frame analysis was by STAAD-Pro. Slab, Beams, Footing and stair-case were design as per the IS Code 456-2000 by LSM. The properties such as share deflection torsion, development length is with the IS code provisions. Design of column and footing were done as per the IS 456-2000 along with the SP-16 design charts. The check like one way shear or two-way shear within IS Code provision. Design of slab, beam, column, rectangular footing and staircase are done with limit state method. On comparison with drawing, manual design and the geometrical model using STADD Pro.

[Mr K. Prabin Kumar, et.al (2018)]: A Study on Design of Multi-Storey Residential Building: They used STADD Pro. to analysis and designing all structure member and calculate quantity of reinforcement needed for concrete section. Various structure action is considered as members such as axial, flexure, shear and tension. Pillar are delineated for axial forces and biaxial ends at the ends. The building was planned as per IS: 456- 2000.

[R.D. Deshpande et al., (2017)] has said that the structural analysis may be a branch that involves resolution of working on construction, so as to forecast the reply of real construction such as buildings, bridges, trusses etc. This project makes an attempt to view the construction working of varied elements in the multi-storied building. Analysis, scheming and evaluation of multi-storied building has been obsessed for Basement+G+2 Building. According to material properties the dead load is calculated, live loads is taken from code.

**III.****METHODOLOGY**

There are two load combination analysis of a building which can be done by the with seismic load and without seismic load combination.

**Building Description and Specifications:**

Utility of building: Residential building

- Type of structure -multi-storey fixed jointed plane frame. Number of stories 30, (G+29)
  - Floor height 3.5m
  - No of bays and bay length 4 nos, 5 m each.
  - Materials Concrete (M 35) and Reinforcement (Fe 500).
  - Size of column .8m x .8m.
  - Size of beam .45m x .45m
  - Depth of slab 125mm thick
  - Specific weight of RCC 25 KN/m<sup>3</sup>
  - Specific weight of infill 19.2 KN/m<sup>3</sup>
  - Type of soil medium soil.
  - Response spectra as per IS 1893.
  - Seismic zone V (IS 1893 (part 1):2002).




FIGURE A: Structure




FIGURE B: Loading condition

### IV. DESIGN AND ANALYSIS

#### A. Analysis of the Building without Seismic Load Combination: Dead load, live load and wind load combination




FIGURE C: Deflection Diagram.





FIGURE D: Bending moment Diagram





```

C O L U M N   N O .   1 2 1   D E S I G N   R E S U L T S

M35                Fe500 (Main)                Fe500 (Sec.)

LENGTH:  3500.0 mm  CROSS SECTION:  800.0 mm X  800.0 mm  COVER:  40.0 mm

** GUIDING LOAD CASE:  1 END JOINT:  2 TENSION COLUMN

REQD. STEEL AREA   :  5120.00 Sq.mm.
REQD. CONCRETE AREA:  634880.00 Sq.mm.
MAIN REINFORCEMENT :  Provide  48 - 12 dia. (0.85%,  5428.67 Sq.mm.)
                    (Equally distributed)
TIE REINFORCEMENT  :  Provide  8 mm dia. rectangular ties @ 190 mm c/c

SECTION CAPACITY BASED ON REINFORCEMENT REQUIRED (KNS-MET)
-----
Puz :  11919.36  Muz1 :  785.02  Muy1 :  785.02

INTERACTION RATIO:  0.02 (as per Cl. 39.6, IS456:2000)

SECTION CAPACITY BASED ON REINFORCEMENT PROVIDED (KNS-MET)
-----
WORST LOAD CASE:  5
END JOINT:  2 Puz :  12030.25  Muz :  1327.82  Muy :  1327.82  IR:  0.0
=====

```

FIGURE G: Detail of Reinforcement for column no.121

```

***** CONCRETE TAKE OFF *****
(FOR BEAMS, COLUMNS AND PLATES DESIGNED ABOVE)
NOTE: CONCRETE QUANTITY REPRESENTS VOLUME OF CONCRETE IN BEAMS, COLUMNS, AND
REINFORCING STEEL QUANTITY REPRESENTS REINFORCING STEEL IN BEAMS AND
REINFORCING STEEL IN PLATES IS NOT INCLUDED IN THE REPORTED QUANTITY.

TOTAL VOLUME OF CONCRETE = 2895.1 CU.METER

      BAR DIA      WEIGHT
      (in mm)     (in New)
-----
          8          340921
          10         72367
          12        1285108
          16         32420
          20          7741
-----
      *** TOTAL= 1738557

```

FIGURE H: Total quantity required concrete and steel for structure

**B. Analysis of the Building with Seismic Load Combination:** Under dead load, live load , wind load and seismic load combination.






FIGURE I: Deflection Diagram.

FIGURE J: Bending moment Diagram



B E A M N O. 1351 D E S I G N R E S U L T S					
M35		Fe500 (Main)		Fe500 (Sec.)	
LENGTH:	4998.7 mm	SIZE:	450.0 mm X 450.0 mm	COVER:	25.0 mm
SUMMARY OF REINF. AREA (Sq.mm)					
SECTION	0.0 mm	1249.7 mm	2499.4 mm	3749.0 mm	4998.7 mm
TOP REINF.	1330.94 (Sq. mm)	573.98 (Sq. mm)	321.30 (Sq. mm)	543.02 (Sq. mm)	1267.02 (Sq. mm)
BOTTOM REINF.	1143.39 (Sq. mm)	577.45 (Sq. mm)	321.30 (Sq. mm)	574.64 (Sq. mm)	1144.24 (Sq. mm)
SUMMARY OF PROVIDED REINF. AREA					
SECTION	0.0 mm	1249.7 mm	2499.4 mm	3749.0 mm	4998.7 mm
TOP REINF.	17-10 $\phi$ 2 layer(s)	8-10 $\phi$ 1 layer(s)	5-10 $\phi$ 1 layer(s)	7-10 $\phi$ 1 layer(s)	17-10 $\phi$ 2 layer(s)
BOTTOM REINF.	15-10 $\phi$ 2 layer(s)	8-10 $\phi$ 1 layer(s)	5-10 $\phi$ 1 layer(s)	8-10 $\phi$ 1 layer(s)	15-10 $\phi$ 2 layer(s)
SHEAR REINF.	2 legged 8 $\phi$ @ 190 mm c/c				
SHEAR DESIGN RESULTS AT DISTANCE d (EFFECTIVE DEPTH) FROM FACE OF THE SUPPORT					
SHEAR DESIGN RESULTS AT 815.0 mm AWAY FROM START SUPPORT					
VY = 92.10 MX = -0.07 LD= 23					
Provide 2 Legged 8 $\phi$ @ 190 mm c/c					
SHEAR DESIGN RESULTS AT 815.0 mm AWAY FROM END SUPPORT					
VY = -89.74 MX = 0.08 LD= 21					
Provide 2 Legged 8 $\phi$ @ 190 mm c/c					

FIGURE K: Reinforce Concrete design detail for beam no.1351



```

M35                Fe500 (Main)                Fe500 (Sec.)

LENGTH:  3499.1 mm  CROSS SECTION:  800.0 mm X  800.0 mm  COVER:  40.0 mm

** GUIDING LOAD CASE:  1  END JOINT:  1  TENSION COLUMN

REQD. STEEL AREA   :  9216.00 Sq.mm.
REQD. CONCRETE AREA:  630784.00 Sq.mm.
MAIN REINFORCEMENT : Provide  48 - 16 dia. (1.51%,  9650.97 Sq.mm.)
                    (Equally distributed)
TIE REINFORCEMENT  : Provide  8 mm dia. rectangular ties @ 255 mm c/c

SECTION CAPACITY BASED ON REINFORCEMENT REQUIRED (KNS-MET)
-----
Puz :  13390.85  Muz1 :  668.46  Muy1 :  668.46

INTERACTION RATIO:  0.92 (as per Cl. 39.6, IS456:2000)

SECTION CAPACITY BASED ON REINFORCEMENT PROVIDED (KNS-MET)
-----
WORST LOAD CASE:  20
END JOINT:  1  Puz :  13547.11  Muz :  1781.79  Muy :  1781.79  IR:  0.
=====
    
```

FIGURE L: Detail of Reinforcement for column no.121

\*\*\*\*\* CONCRETE TAKE OFF \*\*\*\*\*  
 (FOR BEAMS, COLUMNS AND PLATES DESIGNED ABOVE)  
 NOTE: CONCRETE QUANTITY REPRESENTS VOLUME OF CONCRETE IN BEAMS, COLUMNS, AND  
 REINFORCING STEEL QUANTITY REPRESENTS REINFORCING STEEL IN BEAMS AND  
 REINFORCING STEEL IN PLATES IS NOT INCLUDED IN THE REPORTED QUANTITY.


TOTAL VOLUME OF CONCRETE = 2894.3 CU.METER




BAR DIA (in mm)	WEIGHT (in New)
8	347489
10	101531
12	1361483
16	210654
20	290728
25	245993
-----	
*** TOTAL=	2557878

FIGURE L: Total quantity required concrete and steel for structure under seismic load

V. **RESULTANDDISCUSSION**

Here are some of the graphs and results from the above design and analysis.





**VI. FUTURESCOPE**

1. Advanced Seismic Analysis Techniques.
2. Performance-Based Design Approaches.
3. Optimization of Seismic Design Strategies.
4. Seismic Design for Non-Structural Components.
5. Integration of New Materials and Technologies.
6. Field Studies and Post-Earthquake Assessments.

- 7.Socioeconomic Implications.
- 8.Public Awareness and Education.

## VII.

## CONCLUSION

From the above comparison between two 30-storey building taking same beam and column size using different load combination beam and column size using different load combination it was clearly visible that the top beams of a building in seismic load combination required more reinforcement than the building under wind load combination (for example beam no 1351 required 17 no of 10 mm $\varnothing$  and 15 no of 10 mm $\varnothing$  bars whereas for wind load combination it required 4 nos of 12 mm $\varnothing$  and 4 nos of 12 mm $\varnothing$ ). but the deflection and shear bending is more in wind load combination compare to seismic. But in lower beams more reinforcement is required for wind load combination. For column the area of steel and percentage of steel always greater required for wind load combination than the seismic load combination. The inclusion of seismic loads significantly improves the structural performance and resilience of the building. It reduces lateral displacements and accelerations, enhancing the stability and integrity of the structure during seismic events.

### References:

- [1]. [Mohammed Uvaish Mansoor ,Rajesh Misra].Comparative Study of Analysis and Design of Pre-engineered- Buildings Using Staad Pro Software. International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)Volume 11 Issue II Feb 2023.
- [2]. [AbhiyankJoshi, Mr.RahulSharma]A Research Paper on Design and Analysis of aMultistoreyBuilding(G+4)UsingStaad.Pro withDifferentGradeofConcrete.International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)) Volume 10 Issue I Jan 2022.
- [3]. Shaikh Ibrahim, Md Arifuzzaman, Jisan Ali Mondal, Md TaukirAlam, Sanuwar Biswas, Sagar Biswas, Design and Analysis Of Residential Building, International Research Journal Of Engineering And Technology (IRJET), Volume: 06 Issue: 04 | Apr 2019.
- [4]. Dunnala Lakshmi Anuja, V.S.Nagasai, Planning, Analysis And Design Of Residential Building (G+5) By Using STAAD Pro. International Journal of Engineering Development andResearch (IJEDR), Volume 7, and Issue 3 | ISSN: 2321-9939. 2019
- [5]. Mr. K. Prabin Kumar, R. Sanjaynath, A Study On Design Of Multi Storey Residential Building -A Review, International Journal Of Pure And Applied Mathematics(IJPAM), Volume 119 No. 17 2018, 2797-2802 ISSN: 1314-3395.
- [6]. Imam Usman Shekh, UdaysinhRedekar, Kartar Rathod, Sagar Sabale, Sachin Ghatule, Pranay Khare, N. L. Shelke, Analysis, Design And Estimation Of G +7 Storey Building Structure By Using IS Code Methods And By Software's, International Journal Of Engineering And Management Research (IJEMR), Volume-7, Issue 2, March-April 2017, Page Number: 522-528.
- [7]. Anoop. A FousiyaHussian, Neeraja.R, Rahul Chandran, Shabina.S, Varsha.S, "Planning Analysis and Design of Multi Storied Building by Staad.Pro.v8i", International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, Volume 7, Issue 4, April-2016.
- [8]. Nasreen. M. Khan, 'Analysis and Design of Apartment Building', International Journal of InnovativeScience, Engineering and Technology, Volume 03, Issue: 03, ISSN 2348- 7698, March-2016.R.D. Deshpande, Manoj. N. Pai, N. Pawan, Aashish.P. Pednekar, 'Analysis, Design and Estimation ofBasement+G+2 Residential Building', International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology(IRJET), Volume: 04, Issue: 06, e-ISSN: 2395 -0056, pISSN: 2395-0072, June -2017.
- [9]. R.D. Deshpande, Manoj. N. Pai, N. Pawan, Aashish.P. Pednekar, 'Analysis, Design and Estimation of Basement+G+2 Residential Building', International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET), Volume: 04, Issue: 06, e-ISSN: 2395 -0056, p-ISSN: 2395-0072, June -2017.
- [10.] SK Saleem, B. Ravi Kumar, 'Analysis and Design of Multi Storeyed Building by Using STAADPRO', Anveshana's International Journal of Research in Engineering and Applied Sciences, Volume 2, Issue: 1, ISSN-2455-6300, Jan-2017.
- [11.] Deevi Krishna Chaitanya, L. Santhosh Kumar, 'Analysis and Design of a (G + 6) Multi Storey Residential Building Using STAAD.PRO', Anveshana's International Journal of Research in Engineering and Applied Sciences, Volume 2, Issue: 1, ISSN-2455-6300, Jan-2017.
- [12.] Sreeshna K.S1, "Analysis and Design of an Apartment building", International Journal of Innovative Science, Engineering & Technology, Vol. 3 Issue 3, March 2016., ISSN 2348 – 7968. Page 456-479