IJNRD.ORG ISSN : 2456-4184
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF NOVEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (IJNRD) | IJNRD.ORG
An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Response Spectrum & Structural anylisis of G+30 building with the help of ETABS & STAD PRO

[1]Prof Kedar Shivraj Redekar [2]Vaibhav Sanjay Sutar, [3]Prathamesh Somanath Walvekar, [4]Shubham Dilip Udhan, [5]Pran Dagdu kamble.

[1]Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, D. Y. Patil Technical Campus, Talsande, Kolhapur
2,3,4,5 UG Students, Department of Civil Engineering, D. Y. Patil Technical Campus, Talsande, Kolhapur,
Department of Civil Engineering,
Shivaji University, City-Kolhapur, Country-India

Abstract :

This study analyzes and designs high-rise buildings for structural safety and seismic performance using ETABS and STADPRO software. High-rise buildings are essential in urban areas due to land scarcity and population growth, but they present unique challenges. The research focuses on buildings of varying heights (G+15, G+21, and G+30), considering seismic loads according to Indian Standard Codes like IS 456:2000, IS 875:1987, and IS 1893:2016, particularly for seismic zones III, IV, and V.The study incorporates dead, live, wind, and seismic loads in the analysis, with ETABS and STADPRO used for finite element and dynamic analysis. It examines structural elements like slabs, beams, columns, and shear walls, focusing on lateral stiffness, ductility, and stability. Response spectrum and time-history methods are applied to evaluate seismic performance.The impact of soil type, building height, and structural configurations (e.g., X-shaped or V-shaped layouts) is considered, showing that lateral load-resisting elements like shear walls and bracings improve earthquake resilience. Comparative results for base shear, lateral displacements, and drifts highlight optimal configurations. The study concludes with recommendations for material use and design strategies to enhance safety and cost-effectiveness in earthquake-resistant high-rise buildings.

IndexTerms **High-rise buildings, ETABS, STADPRO, Structural safety,Seismic performance**

1. INTRODUCTION

High-rise buildings (HRBs) are essential for maximizing floor space on limited urban land, particularly in earthquake-prone regions. Their design requires advanced engineering to ensure safety, especially under lateral forces like wind and seismic activity. While early tall structures, like the Egyptian pyramids, set a foundation, modern HRBs face greater challenges due to rapid urbanization and population growth.In India, seismic zones range from Zone III (low risk) to Zone V (high risk) according to the Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS). In high-risk zones, shear walls are crucial for enhancing rigidity and resisting lateral loads. Advanced tools like ETABS and STAAD.Pro help engineers model and analyze HRBs, using dynamic analyses such as time history and response spectrum methods to ensure seismic safety per codes like IS 1893:2002. Techniques like base isolators, tuned mass dampers, and braced frame systems improve structural resilience, while materials like cold-formed steel enhance efficiency. In conclusion, designing HRBs in seismic zones requires a multidisciplinary approach to ensure resilient and sustainable urban structures.

2. Literature Review.

2.1. Puppala Harshanth1, Katukoori Veda Samhitha2 [2024], The study concludes that seismic Zone V poses a significantly higher risk compared to Zone IV, as it experiences greater seismic forces and moments, leading to more intense structural impacts and potential deformations. Consequently, buildings in Zone V require stronger reinforcements and advanced seismic design measures to ensure safety and stability. Conversely, Zone IV demonstrates lower seismic forces and moments, resulting in more stable structural responses and reduced seismic damage risk. This makes Zone IV comparatively better suited for resisting seismic forces with less intensive design requirements. Proper planning, material selection, and advanced analysis, such as through ETABS, are critical for optimizing structural resilience in both zones.

2.2. S. SHABANA & S. PRIYANKA, The conclusion highlights that the analysis and design using ETABS ensure the building's strength, durability, and compliance with seismic and wind load standards. The software effectively evaluates seismic and wind forces, optimizes design for energy efficiency and collapse prevention, and integrates seismic safety measures. The process improves the building's performance, safety, and overall structural resilience while identifying opportunities for further design enhancements

2.3. Shradha Nimbalkar and Mr. Sanjeev Raje (2019),Their conclusion have been successfully carried out design of G+30 building structure using ETAB software. The performance analysis of design has done for 4 zones. Additionally, it is noted that the results of the static analysis are more conservative than those of the dynamic method, leading to an uneconomical structure in both zone 4 and zone 5. Extensive investigations can be carried out with a variety of factors and traits as future work. Additionally, the inclusion of a soft storey in the model as well as various loadings on various building levels must be taken into account.

2.4. Sarwan Gupta & Shubham Gaika, They studies on the "The analysis shows significant improvements in seismic performance: X-direction: Maximum storey displacement is reduced by 34.42%, and storey drift by 26.64%.Y-direction: Maximum storey displacement is reduced by 39.93%, and storey drift by 45.37%. These reductions highlight the effectiveness of the design measures in minimizing both displacement and drift, thereby enhancing structural stability and resilience under seismic forces.

2.5. Sahil Kanojiya1, Gokuldeep Kurup2, Onkar Khutwad3, Kushal Hankare4, Mr. P.R. Barbude5, The conclusion highlights that seismic forces and structural responses, such as base shear, story shear, displacement, and drift, significantly increase as seismic zones escalate from Zone II to Zone V. Static analysis tends to overestimate these values compared to dynamic analysis (response spectrum), making dynamic methods more accurate for forecasting. Seismic demands typically rise by 50–60% between adjacent zones, emphasizing the need for robust design strategies in higher seismic zones to address the increased structural demands.

2.6. A.Pavan Kumar Reddy, R.Master Praveen Kumar, The conclusion highlights key findings from the analysis: 1. Story Drift: Maximum drift occurs at the 31st story, with Zone V showing higher drift than Zone IV. 2. Story Shear: Shear values are higher in Zone V compared to Zone IV. 3. Support Reactions: o Z-direction forces are the largest among support reactions. o X-direction moments are the highest compared to Y and Z moments. 4. Zone Comparison: Zone V exhibits higher forces and moments across all metrics compared to Zone IV. 5. Software Efficiency: Tools like ETABS and STAAD.Pro save significant design time and provide detailed analysis for all structural elements.

2.7. Bilal Shaikh, Mohammed Sawood, Farasha, Sarfraj Ahmed, Haneef, The project provided an excellent opportunity to gain practical experience in planning and designing high-rise buildings. It allowed us to apply and coordinate various design principles and methods effectively. Through the use of software tools such as AutoCAD, 3ds Max, and ETABS, we developed a deeper understanding of their practical applications in structural analysis and design. ETABS, in particular, proved to be highly efficient, enabling the completion of analysis and design tasks within the stipulated time. Overall, the project enhanced our confidence and preparedness to undertake future high-rise building design projects with greater competence and efficiency.

3. CONCLUSION,

Based on the studies, fanalyzed the seismic performance of buildings across different seismic zones using various software tools like ETABS & STAD PRO. The conclusions reveal significant differences between Zone IV and Zone V, with Zone V experiencing higher seismic forces, moments, and structural impacts. Consequently, buildings in Zone V require stronger reinforcements and advanced seismic measures to ensure safety, while Zone IV demands comparatively less intensive design requirements. The use of ETABS in analysis ensures building strength, durability, and compliance with seismic and wind load standards, optimizing design for energy efficiency and collapse prevention. Static analysis, although conservative, was found to be less economical than dynamic methods, particularly in Zones IV and V. In addition, various factors such as story drift, shear, and support reactions show greater seismic demands in higher zones, highlighting the need for robust design strategies. Overall, ETABS and similar software tools improve structural resilience, design efficiency, and safety across various seismic conditions.
The methodology section outline the plan and method that how the study is conducted. This includes Universe of the study, sample of the study,Data and Sources of Data, study's variables and analytical framework. The detailsare as follows;

4. REFERENCES ,

1. https://www.irjet.net/archives/V6/i5/IRJET-V6I5623.pdf
2. ww.kresttechnology.com/krest-academic-projects/krest-mtech-projects/Civil/Civil%20M.tech%20Projects%202017%20-2018/1.%20Simulation%20Projects/BASE%20PAPERS/4.%20Analysis%20of%20G+30%20Highrise%20%20buildings%20by%20using%20Etabs%20for%20various%20frame%20sections%20in%20ZoneIV%20and%20ZoneV.pdf
3. https://www.irjet.net/archives/V11/i4/IRJET-V11I452.pdf
4. https://www.scribd.com/document/485103419/4-Analysis-of-G-30-Highrise-Buildings-by-Using-Etabs-for-Various-Frame-Sections-In-Zone-IV-and-Zone-V
5. https://www.scribd.com/document/596494404/DYNAMIC ANALYSIS OF MULTI STOREY BUILDING WITH AND
6. https://www.jetir.org/papers/JETIR2207023.pdf
7. https://www.irjet.net/archives/V11/i11/IRJET-V11I1142.pdf