

# Appraisal - a cyclical process of inspection and calculation

Autor(en): **Beckmann, Paul / Happold, Edmund**

Objekttyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **IABSE reports = Rapports AIPC = IVBH Berichte**

Band (Jahr): **46 (1983)**

PDF erstellt am: **23.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-35830>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.


## Appraisal - a Cyclical Process of Inspection and Calculation

Evaluation - un procédé alternatif d'inspection et de calcul

Bewertung - ein zyklischer Prozess der Inspektion und Berechnung

### Paul BECKMANN

Technical Director  
Ove Arup & Partners  
London, England



Paul Beckmann, born 1924, graduated from the Danish Technical University. Responsible for many restoration projects. Awarded the I.C.E. Telford Gold Medal for paper «York Minster Structural Restoration». Lecturer at ICCROM-Rome, Member ISE committee on «Appraisal of existing structures».

### Edmund HAPPOLD

Professor  
University of Bath  
Bath, England



Edmund Happold, born 1930, Engineer for many restoration projects including St. Katherine's Dock and Theatre Royal, Bath. Awarded Oscar Faber medals of I.Struct.E for papers on working on Centre Pompidou and the Riyadh Conference Centre. Member of Technical Committee and Chairman WC V, Chairman ISE committee on «Appraisal of existing structures».

### SUMMARY

This paper describes the process of appraisal of existing structures with special emphasis on the refining of calculations by a conscious cyclical process of inspection and calculation.

### RESUME

L'article décrit un procédé pour l'évaluation de structures existantes, mettant l'accent sur l'exactitude des calculs suite à un procédé alternatif conscient d'inspection et de calcul.

### ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Der Artikel beschreibt das Vorgehen der Bewertung von bestehenden Bauten unter spezieller Betonung der Verfeinerung der Berechnungsmethoden durch einen bewussten zyklischen Prozess der Inspektion und Berechnung.



In 1742 Pope Benedict XIV, concerned with the state of the dome of St. Peters, requested three men, Le Seur, Jacquier and Boscowich to carry out a structural survey to determine the causes of distress and to devise remedial measures. The report, published the following year, was prefaced by an apology that said they had assessed it with theoretical mathematical reflection only because the building was so unique. Then followed a detailed survey of the dimensions and a discussion on possible explanations for the damage and named the yielding of the tie rings at the circumference as the cause. But the interesting part of this report was the second part because an attempt was made to calculate the horizontal thrust and to prove that the two tie rings built in at the time of erection were no longer able to carry this thrust.

The report caused a forore. One comment at the time stated: 'If it were possible to design and build St. Peter's dome without mathematics and especially without the new fangled mathematics of our time, it will also be possible to restore it without the aid of mathematicians and mathematics ... Michelangelo knew no mathematics and yet was able to build the dome ... Heaven forbid that the calculation is correct. For, in that case, not a minute would have passed before the entire structure would have collapsed.' Certainly the analysis contained some errors. But in spite of disagreements as to the causes of the damage most people were agreed on the measures to be taken, and in 1743 five additional rings were built in the cupola.

The importance of this event was that, contrary to tradition, the stability of a structure had not been based on empirical rules and opinion but on a detailed survey and mathematical analysis.

Today we are even more interested in developing the art of structural appraisal. We have a large stock of structures and buildings representing successive deposits of human imagination, which we are reluctant to discard for emotional or hard economic reasons. Urban renewal is a rapidly expanding exercise.

The art of appraisal of structures is different from design. In design the forces follow the choice of form and the analysis follows that. In appraisal the engineer is left face to face with an existing structure of definable qualities and must determine its condition and suitability of use. This is not an easy task.

The reasons for appraisal to assess the present condition may arise from change of ownership, change of use, deterioration in service, defects in the structure, future safety, accidental damage etc.

This requires consideration of the levels of safety appropriate to the further use of the construction, the assessment of loading, the evolution of methods for determining the strength of the structures, their components and constituent materials, and the derivation of suitable methods for calculating their composite behaviour. Requirements for remedial measures, restriction of use and monitoring performance may also form part of an appraisal procedure.

With this in mind the Institution of Structural Engineers in 1976 formed a working committee of experienced engineers to produce a guide to the appraisal of existing structures. This committee produced its report in 1980 and the authors of this paper are, in effect, representing the committee since one author was the Chairman and the other author one of the other two writers.

#### THE PROCESS

The process of appraisal is cyclical as shown in the flow charts (see Figs. 1, 2, 3 and 4). Information is collected and assessed. If the result shows that the structure is adequate the process can stop there. If inconclusive more information can be collected, assessed more thoroughly and so on. The action required should be taken in stages, each stage depending on the findings of the previous one.

Like all engineering activities, structural assessments are usually subject to cost and time limitations. The time spent on calculations should therefore be used as



effectively as possible: There is no merit in an elaborate elastic analysis of a truss, if the strengths and stiffnesses of the joints are only imperfectly known. It would be far better to spend time studying the behaviour of the joints, using member forces from an approximate calculation.

## STAGE 1

### Gathering of Information

Fig. 1 illustrates the initial gathering of information. The first loop emphasises the need to obtain as much documentary evidence as possible: some effort at this stage may save a considerable amount of calculations and physical testing later. The other important operations are the site inspections: a) to make sure that the paper information is relevant to the actual building (and has not been superseded by a subsequent design alteration, lost in the meantime); b) to give the appraising engineer a first hand visual impression on how the structure performs in its present condition; this can be a very useful check on the validity of later calculations.

### The Initial Assessment

Fig. 2 shows the processes which may be involved in ensuring that the structure is a stable configuration and not liable to progressive collapse in case of relatively minor accidental damage. It is important here, as elsewhere in appraising, to choose a mathematical model which not only is easily understood, in terms of stability, but also takes advantage of such physical features, which in ordinary design might be ignored but which, in the actual building, contribute significantly to stability (eg. infill brickwork panels in a framed structure).

The instructions following the question on collapse are reminders to the engineer not to leave an inherently dangerous structure just because it happens still to be standing, nor to be too easily satisfied with his first answer to the question of why it fell down.

Fig. 3 indicates the steps in the initial assessment of the strength of the structure.

The assessments of loads, forces and strengths of materials will at this stage usually be based on the available documents combined with the information from the in-situ survey. Tests on the actual materials will rarely be appropriate before the "simple check calculation"; they may however be called for in the course of the re-cycling loop under: "Re-assess Strengths ...".

"Simple check calculation" refers to the absence of assumptions and/or procedures beyond what is normally used in initial design. The "frame analysis" may at first be no more than reasonable estimates of support moments, but when "recycling" a proper analysis may be necessary. "Check satisfied" means that the calculation indicates (possibly by inference) that the recommendations of the relevant code of practice could be shown to be observed.

Attention is drawn to the repeated instruction: "Re-inspect Structure in-situ": This is a most essential, perhaps the most essential, step in the process, and without this cross-reference to reality, the entire appraisal can become invalid.

"Drastic Deficiency" may be assumed to be the case if the calculated overall load factor is 1.1, or less, on dead load alone.

If the results of the assessment at the end of this stage are unequivocal, one way or the other, there remains only to report the conclusions. If, however, the structure has been observed to carry most of its load with little or no sign of distress, but the calculations indicate an overall factor of safety greater than 1, but less than what is normally accepted, then it may be profitable to improve the basis for the calculation.



## STAGE 2

### Improving the Assumptions

The calculations, so far, have been based on conventional design assumptions. It is therefore worth examining the mathematical model for simplifications which may have led to over-conservative results of the calculations.

Another field for re-examination is the values used for loads and materials' properties: if they can be ascertained with less uncertainty than is the case for conventional pre-construction design calculations, then the same real factor of safety can be achieved with a lower calculated factor.

This may be most easily understood by considering the basic design equation in the partial factor format:

$$\gamma_s \times \text{load effects} = \frac{\text{structural resistance}}{\gamma_m \times \gamma_c}$$

where  $\gamma_s$  is a factor compensating for the uncertainties in predicting the effects of the loads,  $\gamma_m$  is a factor compensating for the uncertainties in predicting the resistance of the structure and  $\gamma_c$  is a modification factor compensating for differences in failure sequences and failure consequences. According to ISO 2394, each of these  $\gamma$  factors is made up of two or more sub-factors and their relation to appraisal of existing structures is discussed below.

I.S.O. 2394

COMMENTS

#### DEFINITION

$\gamma_{s1}$  takes account of the possibility of unfavourable deviation of the loads from the characteristic external loads, thus allowing for abnormal or unforeseen actions

The inherent variability of the live loads is clearly independent of whether the structure is existing or only at design stage. There is therefore usually no justification for reducing the  $\gamma_{s1}$  for live loads.

Dead loads can often be ascertained with less uncertainty in an existing situation: thicknesses and densities of partitions and floor finishes can be measured, and so can actual structural dimensions.  $\gamma_{s1}$  can therefore be reduced for dead loads, provided adequate measurements and sampling are carried out.

$\gamma_{s2}$  takes account of the reduced probability that various loadings acting together will all be simultaneously at their characteristic value.

The probability of simultaneous occurrence of loads of different origin should not change significantly from 'design stage' to 'as existing'. There is therefore usually no justification for varying  $\gamma_{s2}$ .



$\gamma_{s3}$  is intended to allow for possible adverse modification of the loading effects due to incorrect design assumptions (introduction of simplified support conditions, hinges, neglect of thermal and other effects which are difficult to assess), constructional discrepancies such as dimensions of cross-section, deviation of columns from vertical and accidental eccentricities.

$\gamma_{m1}$  is intended to cover the possible reductions in the strength of the materials in the structure as a whole as compared with the characteristic value deduced from the control test specimens

$\gamma_{m2}$  is intended to cover possible weakness of the structure arising from any cause other than the reduction in the strength of the materials allowed for in  $\gamma_{m1}$ , including manufacturing tolerances

$\gamma_{c1}$  is intended to take account of the nature of the structure and its behaviour: for example structures or parts of structures in which

It is usually possible, albeit to a varying degree, to reduce the amount of approximation in the assumptions, when one is analysing a particular structure or element. 'Constructional discrepancies' can also sometimes be measured and included in the calculations of an existing structure.

Subject to the verisimilitude of the analytical model and adequate measurements of structural dimensions,  $\gamma_{s3}$  can therefore be reduced.

If the strength of the material in the actual structure is adequately tested, then the reason for introducing  $\gamma_{m1}$  has been eliminated. Usually, however, the testing regime, which complete elimination of  $\gamma_{m1}$  would require, is too onerous, but a reasonable amount of testing should nevertheless justify a worthwhile reduction of  $\gamma_{m1}$ .

This covers, among other things, the local variations, within the structure, of the strength of the material. When measurements include this, eg. when concrete core samples from the top and from the bottom of columns are tested, a reduction of  $\gamma_{m2}$  is justified.

This applies equally to design and to appraisal. Many design codes do not appear to vary their safety factors to take sufficient account of this but it should be possible to do so when assessing existing structures.

In the case of brittle structures such as cast-iron columns and over-reinforced concrete beams, an increase in  $\gamma_{c1}$  will be called for.



*partial or complete collapse can occur without warning, where redistribution of internal forces is not possible, or where failure of a single element can lead to overall collapse*

*$\gamma_{c2}$  is intended to take account of the seriousness of attaining a limit state from other points of view, for example economic consequences, danger to community etc.*

Here again, some existing design codes do not show any graduation, ie. the stipulated safety factors are the same for a 1m lintol as for a 15m beam over an assembly hall.

When appraising an existing structure one should distinguish between secondary members, failures of which will not cause progressive collapse, and primary members supporting other parts of the structure or secondary members which, if collapsing, might cause loss of life and limb.

The values for imposed loads are usually defined by Standards and Codes of Practice. All other values can, in the case of appraisal of an existing structure, be defined by observation and measurement. Defining at an appropriate level the values used for materials' properties is extremely important and the Institution of Structural Engineers' report provides a statement of the state of the art including a section on load testing.

Fig. 4 illustrates the improvement of the assumptions and reconsideration of partial safety factors.

It must however not be overlooked that extensive measurements, sampling and testing are time consuming and expensive and in some historical buildings they are nearly impossible to carry out without causing unacceptable damage to finishes.

The engineer should beware of initiating a surveying and testing exercise if he has doubts that they will lead to significant savings on strengthening works, because the end result could be that his client has to pay for both survey and remedial works.

The process of appraisal is cyclical because refinement of calculations is only justifiable if they are based on equally accurate factual information and facts may be expensive to collect.

On the other hand, there is no excuse for the intellectual laziness which condemns an old, good, building on the grounds that a conventional design calculation indicates non-compliance with a present-day code of practice.



Fig. 1




Fig. 2

