Owner	/	Applicant	Information

Roger Roberts ELSA, LLC 1240 INDIANA 37

ELWOOD IN 46036

Phon€ 7655572027

Email RROBERTS@ELSALLC.COM

Submitter Information

Melissa Tupper RTM Consultants, Inc. 6640 Parkdale Place

Indianapolis IN

Phon€ 3173297700

Email tupper@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Robert Stephen Bray American Structurepoint, Inc. 7260 Shadeland Station

Indianapolis IN

Phon€ 3175475580

Email rbray@structurepoint.com

Project Information ELSA Training Center 1240 Indiana 37				
EDGEWOOD IN 46036				
County MADISON          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?				
Violation Issued by: NA				
Local Building Official Phone: 7658259808 Email: dnichols@elwood.in.gov Local Fire Official				
Phone: 7658259808 Email: msullivan@cityofelwood.com				

## Variance Details

1

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

2014 IBC, 1018.6

Conditions: The variance request is to permit the lounge (1st floor), kitchenette/dining (1st floor), and kitchenette/dining (2nd floor) to be open to the corridor in the apartment building, R-2 Occupancy. The code requires corridors to be 1-hour fire-resistive construction and does not permit them to be interrupted by intervening rooms except for foyers, lobbies, and reception rooms. The common areas include game areas, pub, dining and nourishment/ servery kitchen. Areas are shaded on attached drawing.

The project consists of a new apartment building classified as an R-2 Occupancy. The building is Type VB construction and 2-stories, and approximately 9,342 square feet per floor.

## 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

- 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 building will be protected throughout with a sprinkler system per NFPA 13R.
  2. The proposed design will exceed the requirements of Sec. 30.3.6.4, NFPA 101, Life Safety Code for apartment buildings, which permits spaces to be unlimited in area and open to the corridor where the spaces are not used for dwelling units, guest rooms, or hazardous areas, the space is protected by a sprinkler system in accordance with NFPA 13R, and the space does not obstruct access to required exits.

3. Smoke detectors tied to the fire alarm system will be provided in areas open to the corridor, this is not required by NFPA 101 or the IBC.

4. The maximum travel distance to an exit is approximately 100 feet, code permits 200 feet. 5. Similar variances have been granted in the past, including: Ball State University New Residence Hall (17-12-54), Midtown Flats (17-06-64), Skyline Suites (17-06-57), The Whittaker Inn (16-11-46), Kennard Senior Apartments (16-09-28), The Kent (16-05-24), St. Vincent House (15-09-09), and The Vue (15-06-42(b)).

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.

,		
	Y	
	•	

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 owner wishes to provide an open and inviting appearance to these areas for the residents of the apartment building.