

Owner / Applicant Information

Jeffery Kittle
Herman and Kittle Properties
500 E 96TH STREET
SUITE 300
INDIANAPOLIS IN 46240
Phone 3178463111
Email HKPDESIGN@HERMANKITTLE.COM

Submitter Information

Melissa Tupper
RTM Consultants, Inc.
6640 Parkdale Place
Suite J
Indianapolis IN
Phone 3173297700
Email tupper@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Michael Jonathan Thomas
Herman and Kittle Properties
500 E 96th Street
Suite 300
Indianapolis IN
Phone 3178453111
Email hkpdesign@hermankittle.com

Project Information

Vue Apartments
718 Georgia St

Indianapolis IN 46202

County MARION

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

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

IDHS Issued Correction order? ☐ Has Violation been Issued? ☒ yes

Violation Issued by: LBD

Local Building Official

Phone: Email:

Local Fire Official

Phone: Email:

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
1004.9, ICC A117.1 2009

Conditions: Type B Units will not have the required operable parts reach range of 48" or clear floor space required per referenced Sections 309.2/309.3 for electrical panel boards.

The project involves the construction of wood-frame, Type VA, apartments (R-2 Occupancy) over a Type IA parking garage (S-2 Occupancy).

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. The federal Fair Housing Act does not require accessibility features for electrical panel boards.
2. The previously adopted 2003 edition of A-117.1 did not require accessibility features for electrical panel boards.
3. This variance was granted previously for other apartment projects, including; 15-12-09, 16-04-07, 16-04-60a, 16-05-15, 16-07-04, 16-07-05, and 16-09-12.

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:

The project is under construction. Retrofit at this stage of construction would be a significant cost and schedule delay hardship.