



# **Comparative Analysis of Reinforced Cement Concrete Structure with Vertical Column and Y Shaped Column Using Staad Pro**

**Aghav Rahul Srihari, Prof. Shaikh A.N.**

*P.G. Student, Department of Civil Engineering, M.S. Bidve Engineering College, Latur, Maharashtra, India*

*Associate Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, M.S. Bidve Engineering College, Latur, Maharashtra, India*

**ABSTRACT:** Nowadays utility/floor area of Residential RC Structure is very costly. Any analysis and design approach which enhances the utility area of residential/commercial buildings is highly appreciable. Many researchers/design engineers attempted to achieve it. Strategies like floating columns, central core columns and cantilever beam structures are one of the usual techniques. In the present study Y shaped columns are adopted instead of conventional (rectangular or square) columns. In the presented study, 10 storied structures are considered for analysis and comparative study between regular and Y shaped columns. All the analysis and design work conducted using Staad Pro V8i version Software.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

A Y-shaped concrete column is a type of column that has a Y-shaped cross section. The Y shape is created by two branches that extend from the top of the column. Y-shaped concrete columns are often used in buildings with large open spaces, such as stadiums and convention centers. They can also be used in buildings with heavy loads, such as hospitals and office buildings. Y-shaped concrete columns are made of reinforced concrete where the concrete provides strength and durability, while the steel reinforcement provides tensile strength. The Y shape of the column helps to distribute the load more evenly, which makes the column more efficient and reduces the amount of material needed.

The artistic change in the shape of columns to the requirements led to the tree type column concept. Thus, in the sense T-shaped, V-shape and Y-shaped columns arrived from the simplification of tree concept as shown in Figure. Concerned mainly about the columns the varied shape of the columns such as V-shape, Y-shape, T, L and cross shapes, trapezoidal column, spindle column etc. There are even more varieties of application of different shapes based on the architectural requirement. Also, the numbers of the columns are reduced it makes an ease and faster construction which is more beneficial. Therefore, an experimental approach is presented here to reduce the number of columns.

### **1. Objectives of project:**

Structural Performance Comparison:

- **Seismic Resistance:** Evaluate the performance of both types of columns under seismic loading, focusing on displacement, base shear, story drift.
- **Load Distribution and Transfer:** Analyze how loads are distributed and transferred through the structure with both vertical and Y-shaped columns, considering the impact on beams and overall structural behavior.
- **Lateral Displacement:** Compare the lateral displacements of structures with Y shaped and vertical columns, as Y-shaped columns may exhibit higher lateral displacements due to load concentration and cantilever beam effects.

Design and Architectural Benefits:

- **Reduced Column Count:** Investigate the potential for Y-shaped columns to reduce the number of columns required, leading to increased usable floor area and architectural flexibility.
- **Aesthetic Considerations:** Explore the architectural advantages of Y-shaped columns, such as their potential to create more open and visually appealing spaces.

Economic Considerations:

- **Cost-Effectiveness:** Evaluate the cost implications of using Y-shaped columns versus vertical columns, including material costs, construction time, and potential savings from reduced column count.

Material and Design Parameters: • Material Properties: Determine the material properties and design parameters used in the project, such as concrete strength, steel grade, and reinforcement details. • Design Parameters: Analyze the design parameters adopted for both types of columns, including dimensions, spacing, and reinforcement details.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW:

### 1. “Comparative Study of Y-Shaped Columns with Conventional Rectangular Shaped Columns.” - *Shivaranjitha T H, Naveen Kumar*

In this research paper they used Etabs software or comparative studied Conventional column and Y shape column. The main objective of study to check the structural behavior of Y-shaped column compared to conventional structure and reducing the number of columns. In this study G+7 stories structure analyzed.in the conclusion they compared the Quantity of concrete for both the shape as well compare number of columns.

### 2. “Comparative analysis of reinforced concrete oblique column and Y shaped columns by using Etabs.”- *Harshada Ashok Targe, Utkarsha Dilip Bhadan, Gauri Madhav Derle, Sakshi Sandip Mane, Sayali Satish Bahalkar*

In this research paper study of oblique column and Y shaped column for displacement of stories and storey drift and base shear result compared. the main motive of research is how to utilize the structure member and check the displacement of structure. In this research time history method analysis used for displacement. In the conclusion on the basis of result the oblique column structure is more sustainable than y shaped structure.

## II. METHODOLOGY

SEISMIC ANALYSIS: Seismic analysis is a major tool in earthquake engineering which is used to understand the response of buildings due to seismic excitations in a simpler manner. In the past the buildings were designed just for gravity loads and seismic analysis is a recent development. It is a part of structural analysis and a part of structural design where earthquake is prevalent. There are different types of earthquake analysis methods.

1. Equivalent Static Analysis
2. Response Spectrum Analysis
3. Time History Analysis

In this project the Equivalent static analysis method is used. EQUIVALENT STATIC ANALYSIS: The equivalent static lateral force method is a simplified technique to substitute the effect of dynamic loading of an expected earthquake by a static force distributed laterally on a structure for design purposes. This approach defines a series of forces acting on a building to represent the effect of earthquake ground motion, typically defined by a seismic design response spectrum. It assumes that the building responds in its fundamental mode. For this to be true, the building must be low-rise and must not twist significantly when the ground moves. The response is read from a design response spectrum given the natural frequency of the building (either calculated or defined by the building code). The applicability of this method is extended in many building codes by applying factors to account for higher buildings with some higher modes, and for low levels of twisting. To account for effects due to "yielding" of the structure, many codes apply modification factors that reduce the design forces.

## III. MODELLING AND ANALYSIS

In the present study we are investigating the behavior of different shapes of irregular high rise structure subjected to seismic and wind forces with and without different types of steel bracing systems which helps us to determine more feasible and effective type of steel bracing system by using STAAD.pro.V8i.SS5. The procedure of the above-mentioned investigation is described in this chapter of methodology.

### Description of structure:

Models that have been prepared for present investigational study along with other parameters for G+9 building for all is represented in the Table No.

Model No.	SHAPE OF STRUCTURE	LENGTH(m)		SHAPE OF CLOUMN
		X	Z	
1	Square	15	15	Vertical column
2	Square	15	15	Y-Shape column
3	C	18	27	Vertical column
4	C	18	27	Y-Shape column
5	T	27	27	Vertical column
6	T	27	27	Y-Shape column
7	L	18	18	Vertical column
8	L	18	18	Y-Shape column

**Geometrical Data:**

- o Floor to Floor Height: 3.0 m
- o Total height of Structure: 31.2 m
- o Type of building: commercial building
- o Foundation or Plinth height: 3.2 m
- o Column Size: 600mm X 600mm
- o Beam size: 600mm X 600mm
- o Slab thickness: 125 mm
- o Wall thickness:
  - a) External wall: 230 mm
  - b) Internal wall: 150 mm

**Earthquake Data:**

- (Based on Indian seismic Code, IS 1893:2002)
- o Seismic Zone: Zone III (Table 2, IS1893(Part 1):2002)
  - o Seismic zone factor: 0.16 (Table 2, IS 1893(Part 1):2002)
  - o Response Reduction: Special RC Moment Resisting Frame (SMRF) (Table 7, IS 1893 (Part 1):2002)
  - o Importance Factor: 1.5 (Table 6, IS 1893(Part 1):2002)
  - o Type of Soil: Medium Soil (Fig. 2, IS 1893(Part 1):2002)
  - o Damping Ratio: 5% (Table 3, IS 1893(Part 1):2002)
  - o Drift Factor:  $0.004 \times h = 0.2048$

**Loading Data:**


- Earthquake Loading:
- o Earthquake Load: In X and Z direction i.e. EQX and EQZ
- Dead Load:
- o Self-weight: Automatically defined by software.
  - o Wall Load:
    - o External Wall:  $20 \times 1 \times 0.23 \times 3 = 13.8 \text{ KN/m}$
    - o Internal Wall:  $20 \times 1 \times 0.15 \times 3 = 9 \text{ KN/m}$
    - o Parapet Wall:  $20 \times 1 \times 0.15 \times 1.2 = 3 \text{ KN/m}$
  - o Slab Load:  $25 \times 1 \times 1 \times 0.125 = 3.125 \text{ KN/m}$
  - o Floor Finish: 1.375 KN/m
  - o Live Load: 4 kN/m (Table 1, IS 875(Part 2): 1987)
  - o Roof Live Load: 2 kN/m (Table 8, IS 1893(Part 1):2002)


Load Combination based on IS 1893:2002

- 1.5 (DL + LL)
- 1.2 (DL + LL ± EQX)
- 1.2 (DL + LL ± EQZ)
- 1.5 (DL ± EQX)
- 1.5 (DL ± EQZ)
- 0.9 DL ± 1.5 EQX
- 0.9 DL ± 1.5 EQZ

**Analysis in STAAD.pro:**

After computation of all of the above steps then final operation of analysis is carried out. The software studies the required data given and assumes some data automatically to analyze the structure.






IV. RESULT

1. Comparison of base shear in X and Y direction for medium soil in KN


Shape of building		Base Shear
Square shape	Vertical column	2075.96
	Y shape column	2219
C shape	Vertical column	3729.88
	Y shape column	3996.83
T shape	Vertical column	3729.88
	Y shape column	3971.53
L shape	Vertical column	1143.75
	Y shape column	1625.07



2. Comparison of storey drift in X and Y direction for medium soil in mm.


A) SQUARE SHAPE STRUCTURE

Storey/Soil/ Zone/Shape/Direction	Square shape			
	Vertical column		Yshape Column	
	X-dir.	Y-dir.	X-dir.	Y-dir.
0	0.23	0.23	0	0
1	1.94	1.94	0.14	0.88
2	2.23	2.23	0.33	1.18
3	2.29	2.29	0.49	1.30
4	2.29	2.29	0.61	1.36
5	2.23	2.23	0.71	1.38
6	2.21	2.21	0.78	1.35
7	1.90	1.90	0.82	1.27
8	1.62	1.62	0.84	1.14
9	1.24	1.24	0.84	0.96
10	0.65	0.65	0.83	0.75




B) C SHAPE STRUCTURE

Storey/Soil/ Zone/Shape/Direction	C shape			
	Vertical column		Yshape Column	
	X-dir.	Y-dir.	X-dir.	Y-dir.
0	0.23	0.23	0.24	0.29
1	1.94	1.94	0.13	0.87
2	2.22	2.22	0.30	1.11
3	2.28	2.27	0.43	1.23
4	2.27	2.26	0.54	1.26
5	2.21	2.20	0.59	1.126
6	2.08	2.07	0.69	1.12
7	1.87	1.86	0.73	1.12
8	1.59	1.58	0.74	0.981
9	1.15	1.20	0.75	0.79
10	0.80	0.78	0.74	0.58




C) T SHAPE STRUCTURE

Storey/Soil/ Zone/Shape/Direction	T shape			
	Vertical column		Yshape Column	
	X-dir.	Y-dir.	X-dir.	Y-dir.
0	0.23	0.23	0.24	0.29
1	1.90	1.90	0.12	0.86
2	2.22	2.21	0.28	1.11
3	2.28	2.27	0.42	1.18
4	2.27	2.27	0.53	1.32
5	2.21	2.17	0.63	1.33
6	2.08	2.07	0.71	1.14
7	1.88	1.86	0.77	1.22
8	1.59	1.58	0.81	1.10
9	1.21	1.20	0.85	0.66
10	0.79	0.78	0.88	0.72



D) L SHAPE STRUCTURE

Storey/Soil/ Zone/Shape/Direction	L shape			
	Vertical column		Yshape Column	
	X-dir.	Y-dir.	X-dir.	Y-dir.
0	0.116	0.116	0.16	0.19
1	0.95	0.95	1.83	0.637
2	1.12	1.12	0.26	0.82
3	1.16	1.16	0.4	0.92
4	1.17	1.17	0.51	0.98
5	1.14	1.14	0.54	0.98
6	1.07	1.07	0.66	0.96
7	0.98	0.98	0.64	0.92
8	0.83	0.83	0.73	0.83
9	0.64	0.64	0.74	0.72
10	0.43	0.43	0.73	0.58



V. CONCLUSION

1. The Base shear in all shape of structure increases in Y shape column as compare to vertical column are 6.89% in Square, 7.15% in C shape, 6.08% in T shape and 42.08% in L shape of structure.
2. The base shear in all structure increases in Y shape column as compare to vertical column, in square shape structure the base shear increases by 6.789%, in C shape increase by 7.15%, in T shape increase by 6.08% and in L shape 42.08%.
3. The analysis reveals that the base shear significantly increases in Y-shaped columns compared to vertical columns, with notable variations across different structural shapes, particularly highlighting a substantial 42.08% increase in L-shaped structures.
4. The storey drift in any storey due to the minimum specified design lateral force, with partial load factor of 1.0 shall not exceed 0.004 times the storey height. That is in our case  
 $Storey\ Drift = 0.004 \times 30 = 0.12m = 120mm$   
 The limiting value of storey Drift is 120 mm. from above result of storey Drift in any model this limit is not exceeded. So, the Storey Drift of each Structure in Limit.
5. The comparison of storey drift in both X and Y directions for square-shaped structures on medium soil reveals that while vertical columns exhibit consistent drift values, Y-shaped columns demonstrate increased drift, particularly in the Y-direction as the storey height increases.
6. The comparison of storey drift in both X and Y directions for C-shaped structures on medium soil reveals significant variations, with the Y-direction exhibiting consistently higher drift values across all storeys.
7. The comparison of storey drift in both X and Y directions for T-shaped structures on medium soil reveals significant variations, particularly highlighting that the Y-shaped column exhibits greater drift in the Y direction at higher storeys.

8. The comparison of storey drift in both X and Y directions for L-shaped structures on medium soil reveals that the Y-shaped column exhibits significantly higher drift values, particularly at lower storeys.
9. In conclusion, the analysis demonstrates that Y-shaped columns lead to increased base shear across various structural shapes, with the most significant impact observed in L-shaped structures. Importantly, while all structures remain within the acceptable limits for storey drift

#### REFERENCES

1. “Comparative Study of Reinforced Concrete Oblique Columns Y Shaped Columns and Vertical Columns for High Rise Structure by Using Etabs”- *Mr. Akash Urf Hiralal Nandkishor Jaiswal, Dr. V. S. Rajamanya*
2. “Earthquake Analysis of Reinforced Concrete Oblique Columns and Y-Shaped Columns using ETABS: A Comparative Study” -*Prof. Dr. P. L. Naktode1, Yogesh R. Pawar, Shubham V. Sarode, Sujay S. Khairnar, Bhavesh S. Chaudhari, Vaibhav M. Bedse.*
3. “Comparative Study of Y-Shaped Columns with Conventional Rectangular Shaped Columns.” -*Shivaranjitha T H , Naveen Kumar*
4. “Comparative analysis of reinforced concrete oblique column and Y shaped columns by using Etabs.”-*Harshada Ashok Targe, Utkarsha Dilip Bhadan, Gauri Madhav Derle, Sakshi Sandip Mane, Sayali Satish Bahalkar*
5. IS 1893 (Part 1) : 2002, “Criteria for Earthquake Resistant Design of Structures”, Part 1 General Provisions and Buildings, Fifth Revision, Bureau of Indian Standards, New Delhi.
6. IS 456: 2000, Plain and Reinforced Concrete – Code of Practice, Fourth Revision, Bureau of Indian Standards, New Delhi.
7. IS 875 (Part 1): 1987, “Code of Practice for Design Loads for Building and Structures”, Part 1 Dead Loads – unit weight of building materials and stored materials, second revision, Bureau of Indian Standards, New Delhi.
8. IS 875 (Part 2): 1987, “Code of Practice for Design Loads for Building and Structures”, Part 2 Imposed Loads, second revision, Bureau of Indian Standards, New Delhi.



INTERNATIONAL  
STANDARD  
SERIAL  
NUMBER  
INDIA



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

 9940 572 462  6381 907 438  [ijirset@gmail.com](mailto:ijirset@gmail.com)



[www.ijirset.com](http://www.ijirset.com)

Scan to save the contact details