Performance Assessment of RC Structure Under Conventional Slab, Flat Slab And Partial Flat-Conventional Slab Provisions Using Linear Static Method

Shubham Patidar[1], Prof.Kavita Golghate[2]
[1]Dept of Civil Engineering,
[2]Assistant Professor, Dept of Civil Engineering,
[1, 2] Sushila Devi Bansal College of engineering, Indore

Abstract-*flats lab structures are replacing conventional lab structures as they are more feasible to construct, take less time and shows good aesthetic appearance (V. P. Thakkar, 2012). But the major disadvantage of flat slab is its high flexibility due to which many problems like motion sickness, high story displacement etc. occurs so to overcome this the concept of Perimeter beams is adopted which reduces the flexibility of the flat slab structure to a much greater extend. Comparative study of conventional slab structure, flat slab structure & Structure with both flat and conventional slabs as it is necessary to analyze seismic behavior of structure. In this study, ETABS software is used for the analysis of different structures in Indian seismic zone IV with 10 stories. The models taken in this study have Rectangular shape configurations. IS 1893: 2016 is referred for the analysis purpose.*

Keywords- Base Shear, ETABS, Flat slab, High rise building,seismic zone.

I. INTRODUCTION

Slab is defined as the structural member of the building which is used to construct floors and ceilings. It is very important element in horizontal plane and its top and bottom surfaces are parallel. They are used in buildings, bridges, roads and many other types of structures. The slab is supported on beams which are monolithically casted with slab or directly on columns (R. G. Madiwalar et al., 2016). In civil engineering there are a number of slabs which are used at different places as per the design or as per the requirement.

In this research work, we have considered only two types of slabs –

a) Conventional Slab
b) Flat Slab

Reinforced Concrete slabs with huge spans extended over various bays and only hold up by columns, without beams known as flat slab. Flat slabs display economic, favourable as well as larger open space with more clear heights as compared to other systems of framing. Flat slab structure is effortless to construct and is efficient too it requires the minimum building height for a given number of stories. It is preferred in many parts of the world due to its relatively simple formwork and reinforcement layout and the potential for shorter story heights i.e. increasing the number of floors that can be built within a specific height. This gives a very well-regulated structure which minimizes material utilization and reduces the economic span range when compared to reinforced concrete conventional slab. In flat slab construction a plain ceiling is obtained and hence it offers charming appearance from architectural point of view (H. S. Mohana et al. 2015). The construction of flat slab is simple and cost-effective compare to other beam slabs and requires less formwork. And also required less time for construction compare to other beam slabs. The main disadvantage of flat slab is problem of two-way shear around the columns which is called the punching shear to overcome this limitation Drop Panels around the columns are provided which gives extra or additional resistance to shear. Provision of thickened portion of slab around column is called drop panel, drops haver shown an increase in shear strength of slab and to reduce negative reinforcement in the slab column connections thus reducing the effect of punching shear failure.

Familiar use of outline and development is to help the slabs by beams and support the beams by columns. This might be called as slab beam development. The beams diminish the open net clear roof height. Thus, in workplaces some of the beams are avoided and sections are specifically upheld on segments and can likewise be utilized at places where a lot of room is required like distribution centre, open corridors and so forth. These sorts of development are stylishly engaging too.

The flat slab system is generally the system of choice in low to moderate seismic zones where it is allowed as lateral force resisting system (LFRS), however in high seismic zones it is designed to resist only gravity loads. In this research, study is done on flat slabs with perimeter beams in high seismic zones

Figure 1: A Typical Flat slah

Along with the enlargement in stiffness of the structure perimeter beams also have several more advantages like-

- Flexibility in room layout, i.e., Partition walls can be positioned anywhere.
- Reinforcement placement is effortless.
- Framework installation gets easy.
- Foundation load will also reduce.
- Lesser time of construction.
- It provides higher headroom due to lack of interior beams.
- It provides more aesthetic appearance as compared to beam slab system.
- It gives repetitive construction sequence for formworks which accelerates the schedule and reduces the construction cost.
- Use of false ceiling is avoided.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main objectives of the present thesis are as follows;

- To study the Maximum Reactions, Maximum Story Displacement and Maximum Over turning Moments and Maximum Story Drift of high-rise structure having flat slab in all the stories.
- To compare the above results with the conventional slab structure.
- To study the effect of partially modelled flat slab structure at various stories (floors).
- To suggest the suitability of flat slab structure in seismic zone IV.

III. METHODOLOGY

The In order to study the effect seismic force on Assessment zone IV of India is considered.

Table 1: Cases Considered for the Study

Software used	ConfigurationofBuilding	Model Dimensions	Storey	Remarks
ETABS	All(10)floorswithCon ventionalSlab	18 mX 24 m	10	Seismic forces ofZoneIVasperIS: 1893:2002.
ETABS	All(10)floorswithFlat Slab	18 mX 24 m	10	Seismic forces ofZoneIVasperIS: 1893:2002.
ETABS	5 floors with Flat Slab & 5floorswith ConventionalSlab	18 mX 24 m	10	Seismic forces ofZoneIVasperIS:1 893:2002.
ETABS	5 floors withConventionalSlab&5 floorswith Flatslab	18 mX 24 m	10	Seismic forces ofZoneIVasperIS:1 893:2002.

Table 2: Description of the Structure

Specifications	Data
TypicalStoreyHeight	3 m
BaseStoreyHeight	3.0 m
No.ofBays alongX-Direction	3
No.ofBays alongY-Direction	4
BayLengthalongX-Direction	6 m
BayLengthalongY-Direction	6 m
ConcreteGrade	M-25
Densityof R.C.C.	25 KN/m3
Densityof Masonry	20 KN/m3
Columns	500mmx500mm
Beams	300 mm x450mm
Slab Thickness	150 mm
BottomSupportConditions	Fixed
Live Load-Roof **Restofthestructure**	1. KN/m2 2.5 KN/m2
SoilConditions	Type2Soil(medium)
DampingRatio	5%,asperIS-1893:2002(Part-1)
PoissonRatio	0.2
ResponseReductionFactor	5
ImportanceFactor	1
ZoneFactor	Asper IS1893-2002(Part1)for SeismicZone(IV)=0.24

Preparing the model of building frame



Figure.3PlanforStructure



Figure.43-DviewforStructure

IV. RESULTS

RC Structure with having

Rectangular configuration is studied with the Conventional Slab Structure, Flat Slab Structure & structure having flat and conventional slabs both for Seismic Zone IV of India with respect to 10 stories. The results of these is mic analys is are shown below



Figure 5MaximumReactionin Zdirection



Figure 6MaximumBase Shear in X direction



Figure7MaximumBase Shearin Ydirection



Figure 8Maximum Overturning Moments

V. CONCLUSIONS

The best combination for smallest value of storey drift is G+F (5+5).The base shear for building Model in X direction is reduced by 75.22% after the implementation of F+C (5+5) mixed structure system and in Y direction the same is reduced by 82.80% as compared to Conventional Slab Structure.For building Model the base shear in X direction is reduced by 18.54 % after the implementation of Flat Slab System and in Y direction the same is reduced by 14.16%.The Maximum Reaction for building Model in Z direction is reduced by 29.33% after the implementation of C+F (5+5) mixed structure system and the same is reduced by 87.60% after the implementation of Flat Slab system in Conventional Slab Structure.The effect of C+F (5+5) Slab System is considerable in the overturning Moment as 13.41% of a multistoried building but it is 10 times smaller for the Same Structure Flat slab system.summation of moments in those structures which have large number of beam elements (C 10) are higher than the summation of moments in those structures which have less number of beam elements (F 10) or either does not have any beam elements

REFERENCES

[1] Badry P., "A Comparative analysis of residential building with flat slab and conventional slab," Vol. 4, Issue no. 2, January, 2018.

[2] Lal S., "Comparison between Flat and Conventional Slab of High Rise Buildings with Varying Geometry under Seismic Loading Condition," Vol. 3, Issue no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2018.

[3] Thakkar V. P., "Comparative Study of Seismic Behavior of Flat Slab and Conventional RC Framed Structures," Vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 17–26, 2012.

[4] Kumar M., and Umamaheshwar C., "Analysis on Design of Flat SLAB Structure," Vol. 20, pp. 1282–1293, 2017.

[5] Chavan G. R., "Analysis and Design of Flat Slab," Int. J. Latest Trends Eng. Technol., Vol. 7, pp. 5–10, 2016.

[6] Chiranjeevi R., "Seismic Performance of Flat Slab with Drop and Conventional Structure," Vol. 5, Issue no. 10, pp. 283–296, 2016.

[7] Jain M.,Khan D., "Open Access Seismic analysis of flat slab and wide beam system," Issue no. 10, pp. 291–295, 2016.

[8] Madiwalar R. G. and Vijapur V., "Comparative Study of Different Type of Flat Slab and Conventional Slab for an RC Structure Under Earthquake Loading," Bonfring Int. J. Man Mach. Interface, Vol. 4, Issue no. Special Issue, pp. 50–55, 2016.

[9] Bhatia N. K. and Golait T., "Studying the Response of Flat Slabs & Grid Slabs Systems in Conventional RCC Buildings," vol. 3, Issue no. 3, pp. 334–337.

[10] Mohana H. S. and Kavan M. R., "Comparative Study of Flat Slab and Conventional Slab Structure Using ETABS for Different Earthquake Zones of India," pp. 1931–1936, 2015.

[11] Basavaraj H. S., "Seismic Performance of Flat-Slab Building Structural Systems," Int. J. Inf. Futur. Res., vol. 2, Issue no. 9, pp. 3069–3084, 2015.

[12] Khan Shazada 2012. Experimental Seismic Performance of Unreinforced Brick Masonry Buildings. Earthquake Spectra Volume 28, No. 3 page 1269-1290.

[13] Keri. L. Ryan (2010). Evaluation of Design Review Process and Requirements for Seismic-
Isolated Buildings. Earthquake Spectra Volume 26, No. 4 page 1101-11

[14] Reddy V. K. and Ghorpade V. G., "Comparitive Study of Seismic Analysis Between Conventional and Flat Slab with Drop and without Drop Framed Structures with DifferentMasonary Infills," vol. 3, Issue no. 10, pp. 694–699, 2014.

[15] P. N. Sanjay, S. S. Umesh, and K. Mahesh, "Behaviour of Flat Slab Rcc Structure Under Earthquake Loading," vol. 3, Issue no. 5, pp. 1386–1395, 2014