

Example 13.4
Design of continuous flight auger piles from cone tests
Verification of strength (limit state GEO)

Design situation

Consider the design of continuous flight auger (CFA) piles for a site in Twickenham, London. Ground conditions at the site comprise dense, becoming loose gravelly, SAND. Cone penetration tests have been performed at the site to a depth of 8m. (Data courtesy CL Associates.) The limiting average unit shaft resistance p_s and limiting unit base resistance p_b at each cone location are estimated to be:

$$p_s = \begin{pmatrix} 120\text{kPa} \\ 120\text{kPa} \\ 100\text{kPa} \\ 120\text{kPa} \end{pmatrix} \quad p_b = \begin{pmatrix} 2800\text{kPa} \\ 3000\text{kPa} \\ 2000\text{kPa} \\ 3000\text{kPa} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{①}$$

A group of $N = 6$ piles with diameter $D = 400\text{mm}$ and length $L = 6\text{m}$ are required to carry between them a permanent action $F_{Gk} = 2100\text{kN}$ together with a variable action $F_{Qk} = 750\text{kN}$. The weight density of reinforced concrete is $\gamma_{ck} = 25 \frac{\text{kN}}{\text{m}^3}$ (as per EN 1991-1-1 Table A.1).

Design Approach 1

Actions and effects

The self-weight of pile is $W_{Gk} = \left(\frac{\pi \times D^2}{4} \right) \times L \times \gamma_{ck} = 18.8 \text{ kN}$

Partial factors from Sets (A1): $\gamma_G = \begin{pmatrix} 1.35 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\gamma_Q = \begin{pmatrix} 1.5 \\ 1.3 \end{pmatrix}$ ②

Design total action per pile is:

$$F_{cd} = \frac{\gamma_G \times (F_{Gk} + W_{Gk}) + \gamma_Q \times F_{Qk}}{N} = \begin{pmatrix} 664 \\ 516 \end{pmatrix} \text{ kN}$$

Calculated shaft resistance

Number of cone penetration tests $n = 4$

$$\text{Calculated shaft resistance } R_s = \pi \times D \times L \times p_s = \begin{pmatrix} 905 \\ 905 \\ 754 \\ 905 \end{pmatrix} \text{ kN}$$

$$\text{Mean calculated shaft resistance } R_{s,\text{mean}} = \frac{\sum R_s}{n} = 867 \text{ kN}$$

$$\text{Minimum calculated shaft resistance } R_{s,\text{min}} = \min(R_s) = 754 \text{ kN}$$

Calculated base resistance

$$\text{Calculated base resistance } R_b = \left(\frac{\pi \times D^2}{4} \right) \times p_b = \begin{pmatrix} 352 \\ 377 \\ 251 \\ 377 \end{pmatrix} \text{ kN}$$

$$\text{Mean calculated base resistance } R_{b,\text{mean}} = \frac{\sum R_b}{n} = 339 \text{ kN}$$

$$\text{Minimum calculated base resistance } R_{b,\text{min}} = \min(R_b) = 251 \text{ kN}$$

Calculated total resistance

$$\text{Mean calculated total resistance } R_{t,\text{mean}} = R_{s,\text{mean}} + R_{b,\text{mean}} = 1206 \text{ kN}$$

$$\text{Minimum calculated total resistance } R_{t,\text{min}} = R_{s,\text{min}} + R_{b,\text{min}} = 1005 \text{ kN}$$

Characteristic resistance

$$\text{Correlation factor on mean measured resistance } \xi_3 = 1.31 \quad \textcircled{3}$$

$$\text{Correlation factor on minimum measured resistance } \xi_4 = 1.20 \quad \textcircled{3}$$

For a pile group that can transfer load from weak to strong piles (§7.6.2.2.(9)), ξ may be divided by 1.1 (but ξ_3 cannot fall beneath 1.0).

$$\text{Thus } \xi_3 = \max\left(\frac{\xi_3}{1.1}, 1.0\right) = 1.19 \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_4 = \frac{\xi_4}{1.1} = 1.09$$

$$\text{Calculated resistances } \frac{R_{t,\text{mean}}}{\xi_3} = 1013 \text{ kN} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{R_{t,\text{min}}}{\xi_4} = 922 \text{ kN} \quad \textcircled{4}$$

Characteristic resistance should therefore be based on the minimum value.

$$\text{Characteristic shaft resistance is } R_{sk} = \frac{R_{s,\min}}{\xi_4} = 691 \text{ kN} \text{ ⑤}$$

$$\text{Characteristic base resistance is } R_{bk} = \frac{R_{b,\min}}{\xi_4} = 230 \text{ kN} \text{ ⑤}$$

Design resistance

$$\text{Partial factors from Sets } \begin{pmatrix} R1 \\ R4 \end{pmatrix}: \gamma_s = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1.3 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \gamma_b = \begin{pmatrix} 1.1 \\ 1.45 \end{pmatrix} \text{ ⑤}$$

$$\text{Design resistance is } R_{cd} = \frac{R_{sk}}{\gamma_s} + \frac{R_{bk}}{\gamma_b} = \begin{pmatrix} 901 \\ 691 \end{pmatrix} \text{ kN}$$

Verification of compression resistance

$$\text{Degree of utilization } \Lambda_{GEO,1} = \frac{F_{cd}}{R_{cd}} = \begin{pmatrix} 74 \\ 75 \end{pmatrix} \% \text{ ⑥}$$

Design is unacceptable if degree of utilization is > 100%

Design Approach 2

Actions and effects

$$\text{Partial factors from set A1: } \gamma_G = 1.35 \text{ and } \gamma_Q = 1.5 \text{ ②}$$

$$\text{Design total action per pile is } F_{cd} = \frac{\gamma_G \times (F_{Gk} + W_{Gk}) + \gamma_Q \times F_{Qk}}{N} = 664 \text{ kN}$$

Design resistance

Characteristic shaft and base resistances are unchanged from DA1

$$\text{Partial factors from set R2: } \gamma_s = 1.1 \text{ and } \gamma_b = 1.1 \text{ ⑦}$$

$$\text{Design resistance is } R_{cd} = \frac{R_{sk}}{\gamma_s} + \frac{R_{bk}}{\gamma_b} = 838 \text{ kN}$$

Verification of compression resistance

Degree of utilization $\Lambda_{GEO,2} = \frac{F_{cd}}{R_{cd}} = 79\%$ ⑥

Design is unacceptable if degree of utilization is > 100%

Design Approach 3

Actions and effects

Partial factors from set A1: $\gamma_G = 1.35$ and $\gamma_Q = 1.5$ ②

Design total action per pile is $F_{cd} = \frac{\gamma_G \times (F_{Gk} + W_{Gk}) + \gamma_Q \times F_{Qk}}{N} = 664 \text{ kN}$

Characteristic resistance

Partial factors from set M2 should be applied to material properties... but since there are no material properties to factor, we will factor the resistances instead using $\gamma_\varphi = 1.25$. Since resistances are governed by the minimum calculated resistance (as per DAs 1 and 2)...

Characteristic shaft resistance is $R_{sk} = \frac{R_{s,min}}{\xi_4 \times \gamma_\varphi} = 553 \text{ kN}$

Characteristic base resistance is $R_{bk} = \frac{R_{b,min}}{\xi_4 \times \gamma_\varphi} = 184 \text{ kN}$

Design resistance

Partial factors from set R3: $\gamma_s = 1$ and $\gamma_b = 1$

Design resistance is $R_{cd} = \frac{R_{sk}}{\gamma_s} + \frac{R_{bk}}{\gamma_b} = 737 \text{ kN}$

Verification of compression resistance

Degree of utilization $\Lambda_{GEO,3} = \frac{F_{cd}}{R_{cd}} = 90\%$ ⑥

Design is unacceptable if degree of utilization is > 100%

Design to UK National Annex to BS EN 1997-1

Characteristic resistance

Correlation factor on mean measured resistance $\xi_3 = 1.38$ **8**

Correlation factor on minimum measured resistance $\xi_4 = 1.29$ **8**

For a pile group that can transfer load from weak to strong piles (§7.6.2.2.(9)), ξ may be divided by 1.1 (but ξ_3 cannot fall beneath 1.0).

$$\text{Thus } \xi_3 = \max\left(\frac{\xi_3}{1.1}, 1.0\right) = 1.25 \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_4 = \frac{\xi_4}{1.1} = 1.17$$

$$\text{Calculated resistances } \frac{R_{t,\text{mean}}}{\xi_3} = 961.6 \text{ kN} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{R_{t,\text{min}}}{\xi_4} = 857 \text{ kN} \quad \text{4}$$

Characteristic resistance should therefore be based on the minimum value, so...

$$\text{Characteristic shaft resistance is } R_{sk} = \frac{R_{s,\text{min}}}{\xi_4} = 643 \text{ kN}$$

$$\text{Characteristic base resistance is } R_{bk} = \frac{R_{b,\text{min}}}{\xi_4} = 214 \text{ kN}$$

Design resistance

$$\text{Partial factors from Sets (R1/R4): } \gamma_s = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1.6 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_b = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{9}$$

$$\text{Design resistance is } R_{cd} = \frac{R_{sk}}{\gamma_s} + \frac{R_{bk}}{\gamma_b} = \begin{pmatrix} 857 \\ 509 \end{pmatrix} \text{ kN}$$

Verification of compression resistance

$$\text{Degree of utilization } \Lambda_{\text{GEO},1} = \frac{F_{cd}}{R_{cd}} = \begin{pmatrix} 77 \\ 101 \end{pmatrix} \% \quad \text{10}$$

Design is unacceptable if degree of utilization is $> 100\%$