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#### Abstract

The design of multi-storey buildings and the architectural vision now require a new innovation. A number of competitors closed by them used to create a structure with their individual capabilities as well as market demands and multi-storey building as extremely critical work in pioneering and fresh areas. It should shed light on the complexity of the field of production along with the architectural and design aspects. Combined and diverse floor arrangements on similar terrain require consistency in design approach. These types of structures are the Twin Tower structures used in this modern world. In this investigation, the result evaluation parameters, such as floor displacement and drift, in the particulars of a multi-story twin-tower structure located in earthquake zone III, the effects of earthquakes on the structure under 11 different height combinations are obtained and analyzed with Staad pro design software assistant.
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## INTRODUCTION

With the help of multistory structure guide the structural engineer to analyze and design as per harmful earthquake effects. current days, Twin towers are very much in demand due to its good architectural and structural design, individual plan along with additional space with similar base support. For that, we should know the well-organized point parameters when these types of structures are in the get in touch with of earthquake loads

## MODELLING APPROCH

The twins tower modeling done in Staad pro software. The twin tower building detail of the multi storey construction are shown in Table A and Table B and shown graphically with the help of graphs. Top view and front view of various SHAPEs of G+12 building shown by the help of figures. various height combination used in this paper up to 12 floor
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twin with 11 different height combination. After than efficient height combination for each parameter along with its remarks has drawn below each parameters..

| Building configuration | $\mathrm{G}+12$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| No. of bays in X <br> direction | 9 |
| No. of bays in Z <br> direction | 9 |
| Height of building | 51.580 m |
| Dimensions of building | $45 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{X} \mathrm{45M}$ |
| Size of beam | $750 \mathrm{mmX650mm}$ |
| Size of column | 550 mmX 450 mm |
| Concrete and Steel Grade | $\mathrm{M} \mathrm{30} \mathrm{\& FE415}$ |

Table A Details of building

| Earthquake parameters | Zone III with RF 4 \& 5\% <br> damping ratio |
| :---: | :---: |
| Period in X \& Z direction | $0.692 \& 0.692$ for both <br> direction |
| Dead load for floor and <br> waterproofing | $2 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}^{2} \& 0.5 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| Live load for floor and <br> roof | $3.8 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{M}^{2} \& 1.2 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{M}^{2}$ |

Table B Detail of loading

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

These result is observed by the following cases-
Table.3: Maximum Displacement in X direction in Zone III

| HEIGHT <br> CASE | Maximum Displacement <br> $(\mathbf{m m})$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | For X Direction |
| B | 131.980 |
| C | 122.788 |
| D | 130.483 |
| E | 137.960 |
| F | 144.911 |
| G | 151.011 |
| H | 155.951 |
| I | 159.481 |
| J | 161.450 |
| K | 161.825 |



Fig. 1: Maximum Displacement shown in X direction Zone III
Table.4: Maximum Displacement shown in Z direction in Zone III

| HEIGHT <br> CASE | Maximum Displacement <br> (mm) |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | For Z Direction |
| A | 168.458 |
| B | 178.957 |
| C | 191.855 |
| D | 204.35 |
| E | 215.912 |
| F | 226.077 |
| G | 234.347 |
| H | 240.337 |
| I | 243.814 |
| J | 244.738 |
| K | 243.263 |



Fig. 2: Maximum Displacement shown in Z direction in Zone III
Table 5: Base Shear shown in X and Z direction in zone III

| HEIGHT CASE | Base Shear <br> (KN) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X direction | Z direction |
| $\mathbf{A}$ | 18079.26 | 14962.41 |
| $\mathbf{B}$ | 16797.29 | 13996.19 |
| $\mathbf{C}$ | 15203.78 | 13193.95 |
| $\mathbf{D}$ | 15102.46 | 14176.83 |
| $\mathbf{E}$ | 16083.18 | 14067.64 |
| $\mathbf{F}$ | 18463.25 | 14410.82 |
| $\mathbf{G}$ | 23552.23 | 15221.03 |
| $\mathbf{H}$ | 10012.44 | 14707.36 |
| $\mathbf{I}$ | 9804.96 | 14383.24 |
| $\mathbf{J}$ | 30472.28 | 8112.48 |
| $\mathbf{K}$ | 26285.39 | 8015.43 |



Fig. 3: Base Shear shown in X direction in zone III


Fig. 4: Base Shear shown in Z direction in zone III
Table 6: Maximum Axial Forces shown in Column at ground level in zone III

| HEIGHT CASE | Column <br> Axial Force <br> (KN) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | 8502.388 |
| $\mathbf{B}$ | 8698.226 |
| C | 8938.696 |
| D | 9171.270 |
| E | 9387.021 |
| F | 9576.525 |
| G | 9730.927 |


| $\mathbf{H}$ | 9843.141 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{I}$ | 9908.945 |
| $\mathbf{J}$ | 9927.641 |
| $\mathbf{K}$ | 9902.112 |



Fig. 5: Maximum Axial Forces shown in Column at ground level in zone III
Table 7: Maximum Shear Forces shown in Columns in zone III

| HEIGHT CASE | Column <br> Shear Force <br> (KN) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Shear along Y | Shear along Z |
| A | 294.635 | 374.260 |
| B | 306.869 | 397.620 |
| C | 321.973 | 426.315 |
| D | 336.671 | 454.078 |
| E | 350.341 | 479.839 |
| F | 362.323 | 502.463 |
| G | 371.990 | 520.886 |
| H | 378.839 | 534.253 |
| $\mathbf{I}$ | 382.566 | 542.051 |
| J | 383.115 | 544.191 |
| K | 380.689 | 541.011 |



Fig. 6: Maximum Shear Forces shown in Columns in zone III
Table 8: Maximum Bending Moment shown in Columns in zone III

| HEIGHT CASE | Column Bending Moment <br> (KNm) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Moment along Y | Moment along Z |
| A | 737.827 | 668.461 |
| $\mathbf{B}$ | 783.494 | 695.994 |
| C | 839.973 | 729.958 |
| $\mathbf{D}$ | 898.882 | 762.978 |
| $\mathbf{E}$ | 944.257 | 793.672 |
| F | 988.496 | 820.573 |
| $\mathbf{G}$ | 1024.505 | 842.288 |
| $\mathbf{H}$ | 1056.606 | 857.702 |
| $\mathbf{I}$ | 1065.789 | 866.142 |
| $\mathbf{J}$ | 1069.873 | 867.488 |
| $\mathbf{K}$ | 1063.524 | 862.186 |



Fig. 7: Maximum Bending Moment shown in Columns in zone III
Table 9: Maximum Shear Forces shown in beams parallel to X direction in zone III

| HEIGHT CASE | Beam <br> Shear Force <br> (parallel to X direction) <br> (KN) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | 158.162 |
| B | 162.153 |
| $\mathbf{C}$ | 167.055 |
| $\mathbf{D}$ | 171.798 |
| $\mathbf{E}$ | 176.199 |
| $\mathbf{F}$ | 180.066 |
| $\mathbf{G}$ | 183.232 |
| $\mathbf{H}$ | 185.529 |
| $\mathbf{I}$ | 189.871 |
| $\mathbf{J}$ | 187.242 |
| $\mathbf{K}$ | 186.701 |



Fig. 8: Maximum Shear Force shown in Beam for X in zone III
Table 10 : Maximum Shear Forces shown in beams parallel to Z direction in zone III

| HEIGHT CASE | Beam <br> Shear Force <br> (parallel to Z direction) <br> (KN) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{A}$ | 2.681 |
| $\mathbf{B}$ | 3.124 |
| $\mathbf{C}$ | 3.271 |
| $\mathbf{D}$ | 3.590 |
| $\mathbf{E}$ | 3.738 |
| $\mathbf{F}$ | 4.064 |
| $\mathbf{G}$ | 4.552 |
| $\mathbf{H}$ | 4.879 |
| $\mathbf{I}$ | 4.237 |
| $\mathbf{J}$ | 3.998 |
| $\mathbf{K}$ | 3.881 |



Fig. 9: Maximum Shear Force shown in Beam for Z direction in zone III
Table 11: Maximum Bending Moment shown in beams parallel to X direction in zone III

| HEIGHT CASE | Beam <br> Bending Moment <br> (along X direction) <br> (KNm) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | 6.701 |
| $\mathbf{B}$ | 7.810 |
| $\mathbf{C}$ | 8.336 |
| $\mathbf{D}$ | 8.975 |
| $\mathbf{E}$ | 9.347 |
| $\mathbf{F}$ | 10.161 |
| $\mathbf{G}$ | 11.381 |
| $\mathbf{H}$ | 12.199 |
| $\mathbf{I}$ | 10.673 |
| $\mathbf{J}$ | 9.995 |
| $\mathbf{K}$ | 9.838 |



Fig. 10: Maximum Bending Moment shown in beams parallel to X direction in zone III
Table 12: Maximum Bending Moment shown in beams parallel to Z direction in zone III

| HEIGHT CASE | Beam <br> Bending Moment <br> (along Z direction) <br> (KNm) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{A}$ | 253.577 |
| $\mathbf{B}$ | 264.028 |
| $\mathbf{C}$ | 276.940 |
| $\mathbf{D}$ | 289.433 |
| $\mathbf{E}$ | 301.023 |
| $\mathbf{F}$ | 311.203 |
| $\mathbf{G}$ | 319.493 |
| $\mathbf{H}$ | 325.510 |
| $\mathbf{I}$ | 329.024 |
| $\mathbf{J}$ | 329.994 |
| $\mathbf{K}$ | 328.574 |



Fig. 11: Maximum Bending Moment shown in beams parallel to Z direction in zone III

Table 13: Maximum Torsional Moment shown in beams parallel to X and Z direction in zone III

| HEIGHT CASE | Beam <br> Torsional Moment <br> (along X direction) <br> $(\mathbf{K N m})$ | Beam <br> Torsional Moment <br> (along Z direction) <br> (KNm) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{A}$ | 29.201 | 28.670 |
| $\mathbf{B}$ | 29.266 | 28.428 |
| $\mathbf{C}$ | 29.291 | 28.869 |
| $\mathbf{D}$ | 30.821 | 28.880 |
| $\mathbf{E}$ | 32.392 | 28.499 |
| $\mathbf{F}$ | 33.772 | 29.262 |
| $\mathbf{G}$ | 34.895 | 30.961 |
| $\mathbf{H}$ | 35.711 | 32.736 |
| $\mathbf{I}$ | 36.184 | 31.091 |
| $\mathbf{J}$ | 36.762 | 35.148 |
| $\mathbf{K}$ | 36.119 | 34.342 |



Fig. 12: Maximum Torsional Moment in beams parallel to X and Z direction in zone III

## CONCLUSION

The design of twin towers height combination of building subjected to seismic effects the analytical results obtained from 11 combination of twins tower multistoried structure. As seen in results the minimum displacement in X direction height case B and Z direction height case $B$, minimum base shear in height case $I$ and $K$ in respectively $X$ and $Z$ direction, minimum axial force in height case $B$, minimum column shear force in height case B in both direction, minimum column bending moment height case B in both direction, beam shear force height case $B$ is optimum as well result same for torsional force. That means height case B is very efficient cases for twins tower in height case.

## REFERENCES

[1] Surendra Chaurasiya, Sagar Jamle (2019), "Twin Tower High Rise Building Subjected To Seismic Loading: A Review", International Journal of Advanced Engineering Research and Science, ISSN: 2349-6495(P) | 2456-1908(O), Vol-6, Issue-4, pp. 324-328, https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijaers.6.4.38.
[2] Xilin Lu, Hua Yan, Jiang Qian, etc. (1997), Seismic Safety Analysis and Model Test of High-rise Building Structures, Proceedings of International Symposium on Engineering for Safety. Reliability and Availability, pp.187~194" http://www.jstor.org/stable/29775699.
[3] Surendra Chaurasiya and Sagar Jamle (2019) "Determination of Efficient Twin Tower High Rise Building Subjected to Seismic Loading" International Journal of Current

Engineering and Technology, E-ISSN 2277 - 4106, P-ISSN 2347 - 5161,
Vol.8,No.5,pp.1200-1203
[4] Henry petroski(1996) "The PETRONAS twin towers" American Scientist, Vol. 84, No. 4 (JULY-AUGUST 1996), pp. 322-326.
[5] Wensheng LU and Xilin LU (2000), Seismic Model Test and Analysis of Multi-Tower High-Rise Buildings, the 12th International Conference on Tall Buildings, paper 0281, pp. 01-08.
[6] Wensheng Lu, Xilin Lu, Zhili Hu (1998), Shaking Table Test of a High-rise Building Model with Multi-tower and Large Podium, the 5th International Conference on Tall Buildings, pp. 814-819.
[7] Xilin Lu, Huiyun Zhang et. Al (1998), Shaking Table Testing of a U-Shaped Plan Building Model with Engineering Application, Asia-Pacific Workshop on Seismic Design \& Retrofit of Structures, pp.114-191.
[8] Markanday Giri, Sagar Jamle and Kundan Meshram (2020), "Response Spectrum Analysis", LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, Mauritius
[9]Tak, N., Pal, A. and Choudhary, M. (2020). A Review on Analysis of Tower on Building with Sloping Ground. International Journal of Advanced Engineering Research and Science, 7(2), pp.84-87.
[10]Ahemad A., Pal, A. and Choudhary, M. (2020). Review Analysis on Determine the Best Location of Porch in Multistory Building with and without Seismic Loading International Journal of Advanced Engineering Research and Science, Vol-7, IssueIhttps://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijaers.71.25 ISSN: 2349-6495(P) | 2456-1908(O) pp 182184
[11]Ahemad A., Pal, A. and Choudhary, M. (2020). Determine the Best Location of Porch in Multistory Building with Seismic Loading International Journal of Current Engineering and Technology, Vol.10, No. 1 (Jan/Feb 2020) DOI: https://doi.org/10.14741/ijcet/v.10.1.12 pp 72-77
[12]Kumawat, M., Pal, A. and Choudhary, M. (2020). Review Study-Use of Different Shapes of Twin Towers High Rise building under Seismic Loading International Journal of Current Engineering and Technology E-ISSN 2277 - 4106, P-ISSN 2347 - 5161 pp 37-39

