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Abstract - Gaya Road is a way on which motorists usually travel at a high speed which poses danger to the lives of many students who cross the road during the school hours, because of that, this study is aimed at designing complete elements of a proposed concrete pedestrian bridge at KUST Wudil Campus main gate to reduce the rate of the accident, and to provide smooth traffic movement along the road. The design was made by a programmed spreadsheet to BS 8110-1997 2003 version. The overall length of the bridge is 14m with a width of 2.5m which is sufficient to accommodate pedestrian traffic, the height of the bridge is 5.5m, and the deck is precast in four segments of 3.5m length each. The longitudinal beams and decks are pre-stressed and precast while the remaining elements are cast in situ. The pre-stressed longitudinal beams and decks are designed as class 3 post-tensioned members, however, there are two 800 x 450 mm longitudinal beams which are themselves supported by three 700 x 500mm cross girders. Taking a segmental approach to the design proved to be more demanding than foreseen initially.
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1. INTRODUCTION

General design of bridge structure should be in accordance with requirements established by the owner, adapted to the geometric conditions of the site, and by the structural provisions of the applicable codes and specifications. (ACI-ASCE Committee 343, 1995). The geometry of the superstructure (beams and decks) is dictated by the specified deck width and the required clearance below the pedestrian bridge. These requirements are in turn directly related to the type of traffic passing under the pedestrian bridge as well as the volume of pedestrians to be carried on the bridge deck. (ACI-ASCE Committee 343, 1995). Once the overall geometry of the pedestrian bridge superstructure has been established, it should be designed to meet structural requirements. These should always include considerations of strength, serviceability, fatigue, and durability. (ACI-ASCE Committee 343, 1995). According to ACI-ASCE Committee 343 (1995), General- precast concrete, manufactured either at a plant or at the bridge site, offers many potential advantages in quality control, speed of construction, and frequent economy. The precast concrete pedestrian bridge, both short and long spans have been built in many environments from highly urbanized to rural areas.

The Research Study covers the areas of analysis and design of reinforced concrete bridge deck, columns, foundation as well as those of pre-stressed concrete beams. The design is in accordance to BS8110.

1.1 Need for The Research

Gaya road is a two-lane single carriageway on which motorists usually travel at high speeds. A complete absence of any facility (e.g., zebra markings or pedestrian bridge) at the university gate for safe crossing of students poses danger to their lives. It is also a problem to the motorists in the sense that they have to slow down their vehicles or even stop when there is a high volume of the pedestrian crossing. Moreover, this problem also reduces the efficiency of the expressway and thus, results in a low level of service.

1.2 Significant of the Research

The design would provide the information needed for the construction of the pedestrian bridge, this would be available for the University and Wudil community in general for reference when the need to construct the pedestrian bridge arises, the pedestrian bridge would also allow motorists to have a smooth through flow in the busy road, especially at the school main gate, this would prevent possible future accidents and fatalities. The findings will also help individuals having similar cases across the globe to adopt the design and implement it for general use with modification at the foundation level where the ground condition is not similar to those considered in this work.

2. ANALYSIS AND DESIGN DATA

2.1 Relevant Codes

The code required for the analysis and design of this pedestrian bridge are B.S.8110, AASHTO, and the B.S. 8110 deals mainly with the design of reinforced concrete structures and is the basis for all the reinforced concrete part of this design.

2.2 Elements of the Pedestrian Bridge

A typical bridge has the following essential element;
The design is done by using a programmed spreadsheet to BS 8110, the spreadsheet performed post-tensioned design for the Prestressed members and reinforced concrete design for the remaining members, the design parameters were inserted into the spreadsheet for the analysis and design to obtain the output, however, Some manual calculations were also involved as the software does not have the capacity to do all the design.

2.3 Proposed Drawings

Fig 1. Site layout

Fig 2. Plan

Fig 3. Slab Details

Fig 4. Stair details

Fig 5. Pile and Pile cap details

2.4 Materials

Concrete; Characteristic strength of concrete, $f_{cu}=50\text{N/mm}^2$ at 28 days, $\gamma_m=1.5$. The value of $f_{cu}$ was chosen because it satisfies the condition stated in clause 4.1.8.1 of BS 8110. The code specifies minimum $f_{cu}$ for pre-tension and post-tension concrete as $40\text{N/mm}^2$ and $35\text{N/mm}^2$ respectively. It
Cement content = 450kg/m³. The cement content was determined in accordance with Table 3.3 of BS 8110-1997. The code requires a minimum value of 400kg/m³ for grade 50 concrete.

Rebar; Characteristic strength of reinforcement bars, \( f_y = 460\text{N/mm}^2 \)
Strands; Tensile strength of the strands, \( f_{pu} = 1860\text{N/mm}^2 \). The value of \( f_{pu} \) was selected from the table of engineering properties of available strands as given by Caprani (2006/7) in accordance with BS 5896:1980.

### 2.5 Prestressing Options

Stressing Ends: The members will be jacked from both ends. Jacking Force/Strength = 0.7. This value given is used to make sure that the tensile strength of the strands is not encroached. It means that the jacking force will be limited to 0.7 of the tensile strength. This will allow the strands to yield since yield strength is always less than tensile strength as given by Caprani (2006/7).

Pre-stressed Member: BS 8110 class 3 members.

Pre-stress system: Un-bonded
Pre-stress losses: 30%

This occurs when there is no bond between the prestressing tendon and concrete, it is called an un-bonded tendon. When the grout is not applied after post-tensioning, the tendon is an unbonded tendon. The Pre-stressing Force is transferred to the concrete through the anchorage only. (Hemant, 2008).

Limiting Crack Width = 0.2mm: This is the maximum value permitted by clause 4.1.3 of BS 8110-1997.

### 2.6 Deck

The deck will be pre-cast with a width of 2.5m and a height of 0.175m. It will be in four segments of 3.5m each. As shown in figure 3.1, the deck is supported by two 800 x 450mm beams which are themselves supported by cross girders.

Design length = clear span + bearing = 1.6 + 0.45 = 2.05m
Design length is usually the effective span which is the distance between the centers of supports.

Loading on slab
Dead Load; Slab self-weight = 0.175 x 24 = 4.20 KN/m²
Weight of baluster on either side = 0.5 KN/m. This value is assumed depending on the material to be used, it is an acceptable practice to do so according to Iles, (2013).
Intermediate Landing
The landing has the same thickness as the waist that is 200mm.
Length of landing = 1.5m
Dead Load = 0.17 x 24 x 1.5 = 8.67 KN/m²
Live Load = 1.6 x 4.0 = 6.4 KN/m²
Load from flight 1 = \( \frac{Wl}{2} = 18 \times \frac{5.5}{2} = 49.5 \) KN/m²
Load from flight 2 = \( \frac{Wl}{2} = 18 \times \frac{5.5}{2} = 49.5 \) KN/m²
Total Load = 8.67 + 6.4 + 49.5 + 49.5 = 114.07 KN/m²

2.8 Longitudinal Beam
Since the width of the two sides of the carriageway is the same, only the beam of one side is designed. The width of the carriageway was measured with a tape.
Length of the beam = width of carriageway + width of drainage + extra spacing
Width of carriageway = 11.5m, Width of drainage = 1.5m, plus 1m spacing
Length of the beam = 11.5 + 1.5 + 1 = 14m

Loading on the beam; Since the deck is simply supported, the reaction of the beam due to the deck loading is the total load acting on the beam which has been calculated as 12.28KN/m. According to Mosey and Bungey (1990) for post-tensioned members,  \( h = \text{span}/25 + 0.5 \text{m if span is less than 30m.} \)
So, \( h_{\text{min}} = 14000/25 + 100 = 660 \text{m, Try h of 800m.m.} \)
Beam self-weight (800 x 450mm beam) = 0.8 x 0.45 x 24 x 1.4 = 12.10KN/m
Load from flight 2 = \( \frac{Wl}{2} = 18 \times \frac{5.5}{2} = 49.5 \) KN. The flight load acts in the one extreme end of the beam.
Weight of baluster = 0.5 KN
Therefore; Total loading on the beam (udl) = 12.28 + 12.10 = 24.38 KN/m

Total Point Load = 49.5 + 0.5 = 50 KN

2.9 Transverse Beam
The beam has a dimension of 700 x 500 mm and 1.2 m cantilevered end in both sides.
Self-weight of the beam = 0.7 x 0.5 x 0.7 x 1.4 = 11.76 KN/m²
Central Transverse Beam
Load from longitudinal beams = 24.38 x 14/2 + 24.38 x 14/2 = 352.66 KN.

Max. Moment = -\( (Pl + wl/2) = -(352.66 x 1.2 + 11.76 x 1.2/2) = -430.25 \text{ KNm} \)
Max. shear force = \( P + wl = 352.66 + 11.76 \times 1.2 = 366.77 \text{ KN} \)

Edge Transverse Beam
Load from longitudinal beams 24.38 x 14/2 =170.66 KN
Load from Flight 2 on the right-side cantilever (including weight of rails) = \( wL/2 = 18 \times \frac{5.5}{2} = 50 \text{ KN} \)
Total Load on right side cantilever = 170.66 + 50 = 220.66 KN.
Max. Moment = -(\( Pl + wL/2) = -(220.66 x 1.2 + 11.76 \times 1.2/2) = -271.85 \text{ KN} \).
The design will be based on central transverse beam moment since it is the most critical.

2.10 Column
Central Column
Axial load on the central column = Load on central transverse beam + self-weight of the beam.
\( N = 352.66 \times 2 + 11.76 \times 2.5 = 734.72 \text{ KN} \)
The height of the column is 5m.
The column is axially loaded because of the symmetry of span and loading.

Minimum Asc/Ac = 0.4%
Maximum Asc/Ac = 6%
Take Asc/Ac = 1% \( N = 0.4f_{cu}\text{Acc} + 0.8f_{y} \times 0.01 \times \text{Acc} \)

So, Acc = \( N/(0.4f_{cu} + 0.8f_{y} \times 0.01) = 734.72 \times 10^{3}/(0.4 \times 50 + 0.8 \times 460 \times 0.01) = 31,027.03 \text{mm}². \)
Using a circular column, try a column with a diameter of say 400mm. \((A = 125,663.71\text{mm}^2)\)
Circular column can be designed as equivalent rectangular column. Using 400 x 400 square columns

Edge Column
Axial load on the central column = Load on edge transverse beam + self-weight of the beam. = 220.66 + 170.66 + 11.76 x 2.5 = 420.72 KN

\[ N = 0.4f_{cu}Acc + 0.8f_y 0.01x Acc \]

\[ So, Acc = \frac{N}{(0.4f_{cu} + 0.8f_y x 0.01)} \]

\[ = 420.72 \times 10^3/(0.4 \times 50 + 0.8 \times 460 \times 0.01) \]

\[ = 17766.89\text{mm}^2. \]

It is obvious that the central column is the most critical; therefore, the design will be based on it.

Half Landing Column
Axial load on the central column = Load on landing + self-weight of the landing. = 114.07 KN

The height of the column = 2.5 m

\[ N = 0.4f_{cu}Acc + 0.8f_y 0.01x Acc \]

\[ So, Acc = \frac{N}{(0.4f_{cu} + 0.8f_y x 0.01)} \]

\[ = 114.07 \times 10^3/(0.4 \times 50 + 0.8 \times 460 \times 0.01) \]

\[ = 4817.15\text{mm}^2. \]

Try a circular column of diameter 300mm. The column can be designed as 300 x 300 square columns.

2.11 Foundation
Central Column Foundation Analysis
Total load on the foundation, Axial load on the column + self-weight of the column

\[ N = 734.72 + (1.4 \times 24 \times 0.126 \times 5) = 755.83 \text{KN}. \]

Base Area = \(N\) serviceability / Net Pressure

\[ N\text{ serviceability} = 755.83 / 1.46 \]

\[ = 517.69 \text{KN}. \]

Net Pressure = 130 KN/m\(^2\) (Assumed).

Base Area = 517.69 / 130 = 3.98 m\(^2\)

Try 2.5 x 2.5 x 0.5m base (A= 6.25m\(^2\)).

Intermediate Landing Foundation
Fig.14
Total load on the foundation, Axial load on the column + self-weight of the column

\[ N = 114.07 + (1.4 \times 24 \times 0.126 \times 2.5) \]

\[ N = 124.65\text{KN}. \]

Base Area = \(N\) serviceability / Net Pressure

\[ N\text{ serviceability} = 124.65 / 1.46 = 85.38\text{KN}. \]

Net Pressure = 130 KN/m\(^2\)

Base Area = 85.38 / 130 = 0.66 m\(^2\)

Try 1.0 x 1.0 x 0.4m base (A= 1m\(^2\)).

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION
3.1 Design Summary
Note: The Summary below provide the final result summary of the design. Detailed design cannot be provided due to the huge number of pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Deck Details</th>
<th>Reinforcement Details</th>
<th>Main Reinforcement</th>
<th>Distribution Reinforcement</th>
<th>Shear Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Steel</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.551%</td>
<td>0.138%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Staircase Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reinforcement Details</th>
<th>Main Reinforcement</th>
<th>Distribution Reinforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flights 1 And 2</td>
<td>Y16 – 260 c/c</td>
<td>Y12 – 425 c/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Landing</td>
<td>Y12 - 390 c/c</td>
<td>Y12 – 500 c/c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Longitudinal Beam Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reinforcement Details</th>
<th>Span Reinforcement</th>
<th>Support Reinforcement</th>
<th>Shear Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5Y20</td>
<td>5Y12</td>
<td>Y8-200 c/c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Steel</td>
<td>0.436%</td>
<td>0.157%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Transverse Beam Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reinforcement Details</th>
<th>Top Reinforcement</th>
<th>Bottom Reinforcement</th>
<th>Shear Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6Y20</td>
<td>3Y16</td>
<td>Y8-125 c/c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. Central Column Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reinforcement Details</th>
<th>Compression Reinforcement</th>
<th>Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4Y20</td>
<td>Y8 – 225 c/c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6. Edge Column Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reinforcement Details</th>
<th>Compression Reinforcement</th>
<th>Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4Y20</td>
<td>Y8- 225 c/c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7. Half Landing Column Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reinforcement Details</th>
<th>Compression Steel</th>
<th>Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Y6- 175 c/c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8. Foundation Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reinforcement Details</th>
<th>Main Reinforcement</th>
<th>Distribution Reinforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Foundation</td>
<td>11Y12- 200 c/c</td>
<td>11Y12- 200 c/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landing Foundation</td>
<td>5Y12-225 c/c</td>
<td>5Y12-225 c/c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 Discussion of Results

The spacing of distribution reinforcement of the two flights was determined by the software as 377mm, this, however, exceeded the maximum allowable spacing and as such, it should be limited to 300mm, for the same reason, the spacing between main and distribution reinforcement should also be limited to 300mm. The software also gave the number of compression reinforcement as 4Y20 for central and 3Y20 edge columns, and 3Y12 for the landing column, however, Since the columns are circular, a minimum number of 6 bars is required, therefore, 5 additional bars should be added. The number of bars for the central and edge column would be 6Y20 and 6Y13 for the half landing column.

### 4. CONCLUSIONS

The design was produced in adherence to the provision of relevant codes of practice and with regards to previous works and great ideas of prominent designers in the civil engineering field. The components designed according to B.S. 8110 includes the stair, slab, beam and the foundation to distribute the load to bearing capacity of the soil. The option of the reinforced concrete section for the pedestrian bridge was aimed at the maximization of materials, reduction in the dead weight of the bridge, economy, and safety throughout the service life of the bridge.

This study can, therefore, be used for the construction of pedestrian bridges anywhere in the world with modification at the foundation level where the ground conditions are not similar to those considered in this work.
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