

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 4, Issue 8, April 2024

Seismic Analysis of Horizontal and Vertical Irregular RC Multi Storey Building With Effect of Opening in Shear Wall

Panchal Jay Sureshkumar¹ and Mr. Jigar Zala²

P.G. Student¹ and Assistant Professor²

SAL Institute of Technology and SAL Institute of Technology and Engineering Research, Ahmedabad, India jay98989890@gmail.com and jigar.zala@sal.edu.in

Abstract: At present days building a structure with all the regular configurations is not feasible in most of the cases due to the irregular plot dimensions, aesthetic visual and functional requirements in the urban cities. The structure with more irregular configuration either horizontally or vertically are more vulnerable to earthquake which leads to collapses of structure, property loss and casualties. The shear walls are commonly used as a vertical element. Shear walls may have one or more openings for functional reasons such as windows, ventilation and other types of openings in shear wall. Frequently the shear wall is provided with openings thus necessary to study effect of irregular building. The present study was carried out the opening in shear wall with different shape of RC multi-Storey building and Study different building model with Combination of Horizontal & Vertical irregularities. The models were created using the ETABS software with Full Shear walls, Shear walls with a 25% opening. The location of the Shear wall was optimal. Prepared models of G+9 story and Analyze the model by Response Spectrum Analysis and Compare the Result with different buildings layout with parameters like storey Displacement, Storey Shear, Storey Drift, Storey Stiffness, Base shear, Torsion, Time Period and Mode Shape

Keywords: Response Spectrum Analysis, Vertical & Horizontal Combination of Irregularity, Regular and Irregular building, Shear wall with Opening

I. INTRODUCTION

Seismic activity affects approximately 50-60% of India's total land area. Lateral forces caused by earthquake, and uneven settlement loads, in addition to the weight of structure and occupants; create powerful twisting (torsion) forces. As a result, the understanding of earthquake-resistant construction is must needed.

At present days building a structure with all the regular configurations is not feasible in most of the cases due to the irregular plot dimensions, aesthetic visual and functional requirements in the urban cities. The structure with more irregular configuration either horizontally or vertically are more vulnerable to earthquake which leads to collapses of structure, property loss and casualties.

Shear walls are vertical structural elements for resisting the lateral loads that may be induced by the effect of wind and earthquakes. Shear wall is a structure considered to be one, whose resistance to horizontal loading is provided entirely by them. Introduction of shear walls in a building is a structurally efficient solution to stiffen the building because they provide the necessary lateral strength and stiffness to resist horizontal forces.

Shear walls generally start at the foundation level and are continuous throughout the building height. They are generally provided along both length and width of the building and are located at the sides of the buildings or arranged in the form of core. The size and location of shear walls is extremely critical. They must be symmetrically located in plan to reduce the effect of twisting in buildings.

Shear walls may have one or more openings for functional reasons such as doors, windows, and other types of openings in shear wall. The size and location of openings may vary depending on purposes of the openings. The size and location of shear walls is extremely critical. Properly designed and detailed buildings with shear walls have shown good performance in past earthquakes.

Copyright to IJARSCT www.ijarsct.co.in





International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 4, Issue 8, April 2024

1.1 OBJECTIVE OF STUDY

To study the behavior of horizontal and vertical irregular RC multi-Storey building with a combination of irregularities. Study the effect of Opening in Shear wall with irregular building & also verify Torsion Ratio under seismic forces.

II. METHODOLGY

The present study was carried out the of opening in shear wall with L-Shape & C-Shape of G+9 RC multi-Storey building and Study different building model with Combination of Horizontal & Vertical irregularities. The Combination of irregularities [like Setback Case-1 irregularities with Re-entrant corner and setback Case-2 irregularities with Re-entrant corner] are Considered in models.

The models were created using the ETABS software having Without Shear wall, Full Shear walls and Shear walls with a 25% opening. The location of the Shear wall was optimal. Analyze the model by Response Spectrum Analysis and Compare the Result with different buildings layout with parameters like storey Displacement, Storey Shear, Storey Drift, Storey Stiffness, Base shear, Torsion, Time Period and Mode Shape.

Vertical Geometric Irregularity was modeled with a setback configuration Setback Case-1 (ground to 4thfloor, 5th to 9th floor) and Setback Case-2 (Stepped frame). As per IS 1893-2016 [11] (clause 7.1, Table 6, Fig. 4C) a building is said to be vertical geometric irregular building if the horizontal proportions of any storey which acts as a lateral force resisting system is over and above 125 percent.

Plan (Horizontal) Irregularity was modeled with a re-entrant corner configuration with a projection at any corner of the building along horizontal direction. As per IS 1893-2016 [11] (clause 7.1, Table 5, Fig. 3B) a structure is said to be Horizontal Irregular if the floor has a slab projection of measurement over and above 15 percent of floor proportions in the given direction.

MODEL PARAMETERS	
No of Storeys	G+9
Length of Bays in X direction	4m
Length of Bays in Y direction	4m
Plan Dimension	40m x 40m
Grade of steel	Fe500
Grade of concrete	M30
Slab thickness	125mm
Typical Storey height	3m
Bottom Storey height	3.5m
Size of Opening	As per analytical approach
Shear Wall Thickness	230mm
Floor Finish	1.5 kN/m ²
Live Load	4 kN/m ² (Business & office Building)
Zone	III
Importance Factor	As per Specified clause
Type of Soil	Medium (II)
Response Reduction Factor	5 (SMRF)

III.MODELING DETAILS Table 1. Model Parameters

Copyright to IJARSCT www.ijarsct.co.in





International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 4, Issue 8, April 2024



Figure 1.1 L-Shape Without Shear wall (WOTS)



Figure 1.2 L-Shape Opening in Shear wall (Opening)



Figure 1.3 L-Shape Setback Case-1 Without Shear wall (WOTS)

Figure 1.4 L-Shape Setback Case-1 Opening in Shear wall (Opening)





International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 4, Issue 8, April 2024



Figure 1.5 L-Shape Setback Case-2 Without Shear wall (WOTS)



Figure 1.7 C-Shape Without Shear wall (WOTS)



Figure 1.6 L-Shape Setback Case-2 Opening in Shear wall (Opening)



Figure 1.8 C-Shape Opening in Shear wall (Opening)







International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

IJARSCT

Volume 4, Issue 8, April 2024



Opening in Shear wall (Opening)

1. Maximum Displacement (mm)

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

According to IS: 1893:2016, the G+9 Storey without Shear Wall Models have the Maximum Storey displacement of

Dynamic Load Combination. Displacement beyond the limit. According to IS: 1893:2016, the code limit is h/250. Storey model limit for earthquake code G+9 is 122mm.

Copyright to IJARSCT www.ijarsct.co.in





International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 4, Issue 8, April 2024







Figure 1.2 Maximum Storey Displacement for C-Shape





International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 4, Issue 8, April 2024

2. Storey Drift

As per Indian standard, Criteria for earthquake resistant design of structures, IS 1893(Part 1): 2016, the storey drift in any story shall not exceed 0.004 times storey height.













International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal



Figure 1.4 Storey drift C-Shape

Torsion Ratio

The torsion irregularity As Per IS: 1893:2016 the maximum Displacement / minimum Displacement greater than 1.5 is building is Under Torsion Irregular.

Torsion Ratio										
Storey		I SHADE			L-SHAPE SETBACK			L-SHAPE SETBACK		
		L-SIIAI	ΓL.		CASE-1			CASE-	-2	
	WOTS	WS	OPENING	WOTS	WS	OPENING	WOTS	WS	OPENING	
Storey9	1.022	1.021	1.207	1.46	1.092	1.115	1.476	1.005	1.043	
Storey8	1.022	1.02	1.206	1.46	1.091	1.113	1.476	1.004	1.044	
Storey7	1.022	1.019	1.205	1.458	1.09	1.111	1.481	1.003	1.051	
Storey6	1.021	1.018	1.204	1.453	1.089	1.108	1.552	1.005	1.061	
Storey5	1.021	1.017	1.204	1.444	1.087	1.105	1.549	1.008	1.067	
Storey4	1.021	1.016	1.205	1.564	1.084	1.100	1.602	1.013	1.084	
Storey3	1.02	1.015	1.207	1.557	1.077	1.088	1.600	1.022	1.101	
Storey2	1.019	1.012	1.211	1.549	1.069	1.076	1.596	1.032	1.123	
Storeyl	1.017	1.009	1.218	1.539	1.060	1.061	1.589	1.049	1.151	
G.F.	1.014	1.001	1.229	1.521	1.050	1.072	1.573	1.085	1.19	

Table 3. Torsion Ratio L-Shape Table 4. Torsion Ratio C-Shape

Torsion Ratio										
Storey	C-SHAPE			C-SHAP	C-SHAPESETBACK CASE-1			C-SHAPE SETBACK CASE-2		
Storey	WOTS	WS	OPENING	WOTS	WS	OPENING	WOTS	WS	OPENING	
Storey9	1.008	1.001	1.035	2.001	1.049	1.037	1.995	1.001	1.168	
Storey8	1.009	1.022	1.037	2.005	1.041	1.026	2.005	1.001	1.191	
Storey7	1.01	1.013	1.039	2.010	1.036	1.019	2.010	1.001	1.202	
Storey6	1.011	1.021	1.041	2.017	1.033	1.015	2.013	1.001	1.196	
Storey5	1.011	1.015	1.043	2.019	1.034	1.016	2.009	1.001	1.177	
Storey4	1.013	1.028	1.046	2.015	1.027	1.009	2.006	1 OUT CHIN SOM	1,162	

Copyright to IJARSCT www.ijarsct.co.in





International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 4, Issue 8, April 2024

Storey3	1.015	1.032	1.051	2.011	1.018	1.004	2.004	1.001	1.145
Storey2	1.018	1.041	1.057	2.008	1.009	1.01	2.002	1.001	1.125
Storey1	1.023	1.044	1.067	2.005	1.012	1.023	2.001	1.001	1.102
G.F.	1.034	1.032	1.085	2.003	1.041	1.043	1.999	1.001	1.074

Mode Shape & Time Period

As per IS: 1893:2016 The First Three modes together contribute at least 65 percent mass participation factor in each principal plan direction. And the fundamental tensional mode of oscillation shall be smaller than those of the first two translational modes along each of the principal plan direction.

	SETBACKCASE-1 (WOTS)								
Case	Mode	Time Period (sec)	UX	UY	RZ	Ok/Not			
Modal	1	1.894	0.037	0.884	0.079	Ok			
Modal	2	1.725	0.812	0.081	0.107	Ok			
Modal	3	1.476	0.157	0.044	0.799	Ok			
		SETBACKC.	ASE-1 (Ol	PENING)					
Case	Mode	Time Period (sec)	UX	UY	RZ	Ok/Not			
Modal	1	1.284	0.358	0.642	0.000	Ok			
Modal	2	1.113	0.614	0.343	0.043	Ok			
Modal	3	0.949	0.039	0.028	0.933	Ok			

Table 5. Mode Shape & Time Period L-Shape Setback Case-1

SETBACKC	ASE-2 (WOT	(S)				
Case	Mode	Time Period (sec)	UX	UY	RZ	Ok/Not
Modal	1	1.814	0.033	0.886	0.081	Ok
Modal	2	1.642	0.797	0.080	0.124	Ok
Modal	3	1.404	0.188	0.055	0.757	Ok
		SETBACKCASE	2-2 (OPEN	NING)		
Case	Mode	Time Period (sec)	UX	UY	RZ	Ok/Not
Modal	1	1.250	0.356	0.643	0.001	Ok
Modal	2	1.078	0.640	0.350	0.010	Ok
Modal	3	0.998	0.028	0.032	0.941	Ok

Table 7. Mode Shape & Time Period C-Shape Setback Case-1

	SETBACKCASE-1 (WOTS)									
Case	Mode	Time Period (sec)	UX	UY	RZ	Ok/Not				
Modal	1	1.932	0.000	1.000	0.000	Ok				
Modal	2	1.779	0.841	0.000	0.159	Ok				
Modal	3	1.628	0.161	0.000	0.839	Ok				
		SETBACKCA	SE-1 (OP	'ENING)						
Case	Mode	Time Period (sec)	UX	UY	RZ	Ok/Not				
Modal	1	1.334	0.994	0.000	0.006	Ok				
Modal	2	1.262	0.000	1.000	0.000	Ok				
Modal	3	1.247	0.008	0.000	0.991	Ok				

Copyright to IJARSCT www.ijarsct.co.in







International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

IJARSCT

Volume 4, Issue 8, April 2024

SETBACKCASE-2 (WOTS)								
Case	Mode	Time Period (sec)	UX	UY	RZ	Ok/Not		
Modal	1	1.790	0.000	1.000	0.000	Ok		
Modal	2	1.683	0.704	0.000	0.296	Ok		
Modal	3	1.428	0.331	0.000	0.669	Ok		
SETBACK	KCASE-2 (C	PENING)						
Case	Mode	Time Period (sec)	UX	UY	RZ	Ok/Not		
Modal	1	1.246	0.949	0.000	0.051	Ok		
Modal	2	1.071	0.000	1.000	0.000	Ok		
Modal	3	0.997	0.1	0.000	0.900	Ok		

Table 8. Mode Shape & Time Period C-Shape Setback Case-2

V. CONCLUSION

L-Shape

- In L-Shape G+9 Storey Buildings, Irregularity Models were Increased Displacement Response by 6% to 22% Above the Allowed Limit; Therefore, By Providing Shear Wall with Opening Models, Displacement was Reduced by 12% to 39% Below the Allowed Limit.
- Torsion Ratio in an L-shaped building with a G+9 storey irregularity model were increased by 10% to 16%, which exceeds the limit, adding a Shear wall with Opening model cases can reduce the torsion ratio by up to 15% to 30% compared to case models without a shear wall.
- In L-Shape G+9 Storey model Cases Maximum drift was present 2nd and 7th Storey. Storey Drift decrees by L-Shape Shape Building by Providing a Shear wall with Opening 32% to 45% respectively.

C-Shape

- Irregularity Models in C-Shape G+9 Storey Buildings Increase Displacement Response by 9% to 25% Above the Allowed Limit; As a result, By Providing Shear Wall with Opening Models, Displacement was Reduced by 30% to 38% Below the Allowed Limit.
- Torsion ratio of the G+9 Storey C-Shape with Irregularity Cases were 20% to 25% above the limit and. And by including a Shear wall with Opening model, Torsion Ratio is 11% to 27%. Reduced when compared to models without shear walls.
- Maximum drift was present in the second, and eight storeys of the C-Shape G+9 Storey irregularity building Model Cases, Additionally, C-shaped buildings must provide a Shear wall with Opening 18% and 42% Decrees a Drift
- Shear walls play a crucial role in G+9 Storey models by increasing a building's storey stiffness and its ability to withstand lateral forces.
- In G+9Storey all model Case is L-Shape was Better Response as Compare to C-Shape and Square Shape Models.

REFERENCES

- Seismic Analysis of Vertical Irregularities in Buildings (Author: Sanyogita, Babita Saini) Journal: Springer-2019
- [2]. Seismic Response on Multi-Storied Building Having Shear Walls with And Without Openings (Author: V. Naresh Kumar Varma, Uppuluri Praveen Kumar) Elsevier-2020
- [3]. Comparative Analysis of Behavior of Horizontal and Vertical Irregular Buildings with And Without Using Shear Walls by Etabs Software (Author: RachakondaDivya, K. Murali) Elsevier-2021
- [4]. Performance Evaluation of Setback Buildings with Open Ground Storey on Plain and Sloping Ground Under Earthquake Loadings and Mitigation of Failure (Author: Rahul Ghosh, Rama Derbarma) Springer-2019

Copyright to IJARSCT www.ijarsct.co.in





International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)

International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal

Volume 4, Issue 8, April 2024

- [5]. Effect of In-Plan Eccentricity on Vertical Stiffness Irregular Buildings Under Earthquake Loading (Author: Archana J.Satheesh, B. R. Jayalekshmi, kattaVenkataramana) Journal: Elsevier -2020
- [6]. Effect of In-Plan Eccentricity in Vertically Mass Irregular Rc Framed Buildings Under Seismic Loading (Author: Archana J. Satheesh, B. R. Jayalekshmi, Katta Venkataramana) Journal: Springer-2019
- [7]. Analysis of Irregular Structures Under Earthquake Load (Author: Siva Naveen, Nimmymariam, Anitha Kumar) Journal: Elsevier-2019
- [8]. IS 1893. 2016. "'Criteria For Earthquake Resistant Design Of Structures, Part 1:General Provisions And Buildings." Bureau Of Indian Standards, New Delhi 1893(December):1–44
- [9]. IS: 456:2000 Plain and Reinforced Concrete, India, Bureau of Indian Standards, 2000.
- [10]. IS: 13920:2016 Ductile Detailing of Reinforced Concrete Structures
- [11]. IS:875(PART-3):2015 Design Loads (Other than Earthquake) for Buildings and Structures Code of Practice Part-3 Wind Loads, India, Bureau of Indian Standards, 2015.

