

Owner / Applicant Information

James VanGorder
Town of Zionsville Indiana
1100 W OAK ST

ZIONSVILLE IN 46077

Phone 3178735358

Email JVANGORDER@ZIONSVILLE-IN.GOV

Submitter Information

Ralph Gerdes
Ralph Gerdes Consultants, LLC
5510 S. East St.

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3177873750

Email rgerdesconsultants@ameritech.net

Designer Information

Alan Tucker
CSO Architects Inc
8831 Keystone Crossing

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3178487800

Email atucker@csoinc.net

Project Information

Zionsville Government Center
1100 W Oak St

ZIONSVILLE IN 46077

County BOONE

Project Type New ☒ Addition ☐ Alteration ☐ Existing ☐ Change of Occupancy ☐

Project Status ☒ F F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled

IDHS Issued Correction order? ☒ No Has Violation been Issued? ☒ No

Violation Issued by: NA

Local Building Official

Phone: Email:

Local Fire Official

Phone: Email:

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)

2014 InBC, 1005.7.2

Conditions: Stair newel posts project more than 1.5 inches into stair width. Code limits nonstructural projections such as trim to 1.5 inches of projection.

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

1=Non-compliance with the rule will not be adverse to the public health, safety or w

1

2= Applicant will undertake alternative actions in lieu of compliance with the rule to ensure that granting of the variance will not be adverse to public health, safety, or welfare. Explain why alternative actions would be adequate (be specific).

Facts:

1. Section 1012.8 allows handrails to project 4.5 inches on each side.
2. Three (3) exit stairs are provided. This exceeds the code minimum of two (2) stairs.
3. Total stair exit width is approximately twice the code minimum. Minor projection does not affect exiting for this building.
4. Building is sprinklered allowing more time for evacuation.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

☐

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of physical limitations of the construction site or its utility services.

☒

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of major operational problems in the use of the building or structure.

☒

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of excessive costs of additional or altered construction elements.

☐

Imposition of the rule would prevent the preservation of an architecturally or a historically significant part of the building or structure

Facts: Building has more than code exits to exceed general code requirements.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)

2014 InBC, 1009.8

Conditions: Stair C has landing width that is 4 inches shorter than stair width. Landing is approximately 60.25 inches and stair is approximately 64.25 inches wide.
Code requires width of landings to be not less than width of stairway.

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

1=Non-compliance with the rule will not be adverse to the public health, safety or w

1

2= Applicant will undertake alternative actions in lieu of compliance with the rule to ensure that granting of the variance will not be adverse to public health, safety, or welfare. Explain why alternative actions would be adequate (be specific).

Facts: 1. Three (3) stairs are provided. Code minimum for second floor population (approx 480 persons) is two (2) stairs.
2. Total stair width of 3 stairs is approximately twice minimum code (approx 192 inches provided, approx 96 inches required).
3. Building is sprinklered, allowing occupants more time to evacuate.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

☐

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of physical limitations of the construction site or its utility services.

☒

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of major operational problems in the use of the building or structure.

☒

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of excessive costs of additional or altered construction elements.

☐

Imposition of the rule would prevent the preservation of an architecturally or a historically significant part of the building or structure

Facts: Built stair enclosure dictated the available space, or resulting dimensions. Width of exits provided exceed code minimums.

