Wind Effects On Multi-Storied Braced Steel Building

Mrs. Priyanka S. Shinde¹, Mr. Abhijeet S. Tambade², Prof. Rohit R. Zanjad³, Vishakha P. Padmawar⁴

^{1, 2} Dept of Civil

³Assistant Professor, Dept of Civil ^{1, 2, 4} JSPM NTC, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, India ³Sinhgad Collage, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, India

Abstract- Lateral Stability is important for the steel structures in seismic load and wind load application. Effective way to increase the lateral strength of structure by means of angle bracing system and tubular bracing system. An attempt is made to analyze the effect of wind force on bay framed high rise building with bracing system and also find the effective type bracing and shape of bracing. The Bay Framed steel Building is modeled and analyzed using ETABS and sections are selected based on their capability to control the maximum lateral storey displacements. The wind load pattern as per IS 875 - 1987 part 3 selected for study. Various parameters such as, storey displacement and bracing forces of angle and tubular bracing were studied. From the study it can be concluded that for multistory steel bay framed building, with tube bracing gives the effective results as compare to the angle bracing in terms of Storey displacement, dead load of the steel structure and cost of the structure.

Keywords- steel building, bracing, lateral displacement, wind

I. INTRODUCTION

Most of the steel structure is done with a type of steel Mild Steel. Grate advantage of steel building is immense strength and Flexibility. One of the biggest advantage of steel building is its ability to withstand strong wind both during extreme weather condition and during the everyday wear and tear of high winds, since steel buildings are cost effective and they are great for almost any purpose like high-rise buildings, Industrial buildings, Industrial buildings, Warehouse buildings, Temporary structure, Residential building. Due to the low weight of steel buildings means they have to be firmly bolted to the foundation to resist wind Forces. Steel performs for better in Wind Forces than other material because of these properties.

II. PROBLEM DEFINITION

Over the years as more number of hurricanes, tornados and strong winds have damages the steel buildings. To reduce the loss of structure, to reduces the human loss due to wind also to reduce the lateral deflection of steel building

Page | 2162

by providing a suitable shape of bracing and effective system of bracing.

III. STRUCTURAL MODELING

For the Purpose of study, eight models of high rise bay framed steel building (G+8) with different types of bracings and different shape of bracings, were selected in order to determine the behavior of steel structure during wind activity by using the ETABS Software. The columns are fixed at the ground and are taken as restrains. The building height is 24m. The length of the building in X-direction 14.5m and in Y-direction is taken as 20m Figure1 and 2 shows the geometrical configuration of the building. Table 1 gives the material properties of the members. The material properties are selected on the basis of displacement limitation and strength as per the IS 800–2007.



Fig: - 1 Plan of High Rise Steel Bay Frame Building

Fig: - 2 Elevation view of Steel Structure

1. Studied Structural Configuration

- a. G+8 Steel Framed structure without bracing
- b. G+8 Steel Framed structure with different bracing pattern with Angle shape bracing
- **c.** G+8 Steel Framed Structure with different bracing pattern with Tube shape bracing

Table 1: Material and Member Properties

Sr.	Mate	rial Properties
No.		1
		a. Built-up I
		section for
		bottom 3 Storey
		ofarea
1	Column Details	12672mm ²
•	Containin Doctains	b. ISHB 350 - 2 for
		above 3 Storey
		c. ISHB 250-2
		For above 2
	Deres Details	Storey
2	Beam Details	a. ISHB 200-2
		0. ISHB IDU-3
		d ISHB 200 2
		a ISHB 250-2
3	Angle Bracing	ISA 150X150X15
-	Details	1011 100111001110
4	Tube Bracing	ISB 172X92X4.8
	Details	
5	Grade of Steel	Fe 250
6	Concrete of	M20
	density 2500	
	Kg/m³	
	Distance in X-	14.5m
	Direction (L)	
/	Distance in Y-	20m
	Direction (B)	24
8	Distance in Z-	24m
0	Floor to Floor	3
7	Height	ш
10	Secondary Beam	1 33m
	Snacing	1.55m
	opacing	

The building is analyzed for the wind force for the location Pune with different type of bracing and different shape of bracing. The building is subjected to following loads as per IS 875 (part 1, 2, 3) – 1987:

- Floor Finish: 1.2 KN/m²
- Live Load: 3 KN/m²
- Live Load on Roof: 2 KN/m²

2. Different Types of Bracing Patterns Used in the Study

Different types of bracing pattern used in the study are shown in Figure 3 to $9\,$



Fig: - 5 Type 4 Bracing

ISSN [ONLINE]: 2395-1052



2. Wind Load parameters from IS 875:1987

• Location of the structure - Pune

- ISSN [ONLINE]: 2395-1052
- Wind velocity 39 m/sec
- An structure height 24m
- Terrain class 3
- Structure class B
- Terrain factor K_2 can be got from table for class B interpolating between 20m and 30m $K_2 = 1$
- The ground is assumed to be plain so the topography factor is $K_3 = 1$
- Design life of structure 50 years, Risk coefficient from IS 875:1987 Table 1
- Design wind speed (V_z) = Vb x K₁ x K₂ x K₃ = 39 x 1.96 x 1 x 1 =76.44 m/sec
- Design wind pressure (Pz) = 0.6 x Vz² = 0.6 x 76.44² 3505.844 N/m^2
- External wind pressure coefficient (Cpe) taken as 1.2 form IS 875:1987.
- Internal wind pressure coefficient (Cpi) is depends on the opening of structure in above all models Cpi value taken as 0.5.

4. Load Combination Taken in Consideration

a. 1.5(DL+LL+SDL) b. 1.2(DL+LL+SDL+WLx) c. 1.2(DL+LL+SDL+WLy)

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Wind analysis of Multi-storey steel bay frame building for various bracing system with shape of both Angle shape bracing and Tube shape bracing is carried out for the analysis. The results are tabulated such as Maximum storey displacement of Structure with no bracing provision, Angle shape bracing and Tube shape bracing with Types of bracing is noted.

1. Maximum Storey Displacement of Structure with Angle Bracing Provision:

Table 2: Maximum storey displacement and Dead Load of model with Angle bracing provision

IJSART - Volume 4 Issue 4 – APRIL 2018

No.	Type of	Maximus	m Storey	Dead Load
	Model	Displace	ment	of the
	Angle	In X	In Y	Structure
	Bracing	(mm)	(mm)	(KN)
1	Normal model	259.8	152.6	20002
2	Type 2 Bracing	30.3	13.5	20148
3	Type 3 Bracing	71.7	42.1	20104
4	Type 4 Bracing	41.9	13.2	20251
5	Type 5 Bracing	58.2	33	20204

0	Type 0 Bracing	78	08.7	20130
7	Type 7 Bracing	62.3	73	20103
8	Type 8 Bracing	63.6	78.2	20105

Table 3: X – Direction Angle Bracing Joint Displacement

Model	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5	Type 6	Type 7	Type 8	Normal
Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	2.8	4.9	2.9	3.3	4.3	3.9	5.6	15.6
2	7.6	13.5	7.7	9.5	16.3	14.5	12	50.4
3	12.6	23.3	13.1	16.8	25.3	21.7	23.1	93.7
4	17.4	33.9	19	25.1	40.7	34.7	30.2	141.2
5	21.7	44.4	25.2	33.8	50.3	41.7	42.2	184.9
6	25.3	54.4	31.1	42.4	63.7	52.5	48.7	221.3
7	28.1	63.8	36.8	50.7	72.1	58.2	58.7	247.8
Roof	30.3	71.7	41.9	58.2	78	62.3	63.6	259.8



Graph 1: Joint displacement (mm) for various bracing type of Angle Bracing in X - Direction



ISSN [ONLINE]: 2395-1052

Model	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5	Type 6	Type 7	Type 8	Normal
Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	2.3	4.4	1.5	2.6	1.8	2.7	18.9	22.2
2	4.7	9.7	3.2	6.2	21.3	22.4	22.5	48.2
3	6.8	15.3	5	10.4	24	26.2	39.5	71.1
4	8.8	21.3	6.8	15	46	48.4	43.5	98.3
5	10.5	27.1	8.6	19.8	48.9	52.4	61.5	120.2
6	11.8	32.6	10.3	24.4	62.2	65.8	65.2	136.3
7	12.8	37.7	11.8	28.9	64.8	69.2	75.2	147.9
Roof	13.5	42.1	13.2	33	68.7	73	78.2	152.6



Graph 2: Joint displacement (mm) for various bracing type of Angle Bracing in Y - Direction

2. Maximum Storey Displacement of Structure with Tube Bracing Provision:

 Table 5: Maximum storey displacement and Dead Load of model with Tube bracing provision

No	Time of	Mariante	n Storer	Deed Lord
110.	Type of	TALEA TILLUT	ii Storey	Dead Load
	Model	Displace	ment	of the
	Tube	In X	In Y (mm)	Structure
	Bracing	(mm)		(KN)
1	Normal	259.8	152.6	20002
	Model			
2	Type 2	59.9	26.8	20091
	Bracing			
3	Type 3	82.7	50.1	20059
	Bracing			
4	Type 4	49.3	17.4	20138
	Bracing			
5	Type 5	65	37.4	20129
	Bracing			
6	Type 6	89.1	72	20074
	Bracing			
7	Type 7	73.6	77	20059
	Bracing			
8	Type 8	74.2	81.5	20060
	Bracing			

Model	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5	Type 6	Type 7	Type 8	Normal
Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	5.1	6.1	3.9	5.6	5.7	5.3	6.4	15.6
2	14	17	10.3	12.8	19.7	18	15.2	50.4
3	23.5	29.2	17.2	21.6	31.2	27.8	28.6	93.7
4	32.8	41.9	24.4	30.9	48.5	42.8	37.7	141.2
5	41.2	54	31.5	40.3	59.8	51.5	51.1	184.9
6	48.6	65.1	38.2	49.4	74.1	63.2	58.7	221.3
7	54.7	75	44.3	57.7	83	69.4	69.2	247.8
Roof	58.9	82.7	49.3	65	89.1	73.6	74.2	259.8

 $\label{eq:constraint} \textbf{Table 6: } \textbf{X} - \textbf{Direction Tube Bracing Joint Displacement}$



Graph 3: Joint displacement (mm) for various bracing type of Tube Bracing in **X** – Direction

Table 7: Y – Direction Tube Bracing Joint Displacement

Model	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5	Type 6	Type 7	Type 8	Normal
Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	4.5	6.3	2.4	3.9	2.9	4.1	19.1	22.2
2	9	13.4	5	8.5	22.6	24.1	24	48.2
3	13.1	20.4	7.5	13.6	26.2	29.1	41.4	71.1
4	16.9	27.7	9.9	18.7	48.4	51.5	46.2	98.3
5	20.3	34.5	12.2	23.9	51.8	56.1	64.4	120.2
6	23.1	40.6	14.2	28.8	65.3	69.6	68.5	136.3
7	25.3	45.9	16	33.2	68	73.3	78.6	147.9
Roof	26.8	50.1	17.4	37.2	72	77	81.5	152.6



Graph 4: Joint displacement (mm) for various bracing type of Tube Bracing in Y – Direction

3. Tube Bracing and Angle Bracing Joint Displacement Difference for Various Models in Percentage

	Angle	Bracing	Tube E	Bracing	% Difference	
Model Type	Х	Y	Х	Y	Х	Y
Normal	259.8	152.6	259.8	152.6	0	0
2 Туре	30.3	13.5	59.9	26.8	49	50
3 Туре	71.7	42.1	82.7	50.1	13	16
4 Туре	41.9	13.2	49.3	17.4	15	24
5 Туре	58.2	33	65	37.4	10	12
6 Туре	78	68.7	89.1	72	12	5
7 Туре	62.3	73	73.6	77	15	5
8 Туре	63.6	78.2	74.2	81.5	14	4

4. Tube Bracing and Angle Bracing Dead Load Difference for Various Models in Percentage

	DL of Angle Bracing Model (KN)	DL of Tube Bracing Model (KN)	Weight Difference (KN)
Model Type			
Normal	20002.37	20002.37	0
2 Type	20147.77	20091.25	56.525
3 Туре	20103.64	20058.78	44.86
4 Type	20251	20137.95	113.05
5 Type	20204.89	20129.51	75.38
6 Туре	20129.99	20073.45	56.54
7 Туре	20103.64	20058.78	44.86
8 Type	20105.33	20060.47	44.857

V. CONCLUSIONS

From the above result it can be concluded that:

- The Angle shape bracing and Tube shape bracing in the building reduces the lateral displacement or joint displacement due to Wind load effects in Multi-storey steel building as compare to the Multi-storey steel building without any bracing provision.
- From this study it can be seen that, Angle bracing Type 4 model gives the minimum lateral displacement as compare to other angle bracing models. Also Type 4 Tube bracing model gives the minimum lateral displacement as compare to other tube bracing system models.
- It is also observed that, steel framed buildings with Tube bracing system have less joint displacement than Normal building. Also Tube bracing steel structure has less weight than Angle bracing steel structure.
- Tube bracing steel structure is much effective in terms of Joint displacement, Dead load of entire structure.

REFERENCES

- [1] https://www.steelconstruction.info/Braced_frames
- [2] J. S. Jagadish, T. D. Doshi, "A study on bracing systems on high rise steel structures", International Journal of Engineering Research and Technology, Volume 2, Issue 7 July 2013.
- [3] IS 875 Code of practice for design loads (other than earthquake) for buildings and structures, (Part 1) Dead loads Unit weight of building material and stored materials.
- [4] IS 875 Code of practice for design loads (other than earthquake) for buildings and structures,(Part 2) Imposed loads.
- [5] IS 875 Code of practice for design loads (other than earthquake) for buildings and structures,(Part 3) Wind loads.