

Owner / Applicant Information

Thane Peterson  
Regenstrief Institute, Inc.  
410 WEST 10TH STREET  
SUITE 2000  
INDIANAPOLIS IN 46204  
Phone 3172749000  
Email PETERSTH@REGENSTRIEF.ORG

Submitter Information

Edwin Rensink  
RTM Consultants Inc  
6640 Parkdale Place  
Suite J  
Indianapolis IN  
Phone 3173297700  
Email rensink@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Sarah Hempstead  
Schmidt Associates  
415 Massachusetts Avenue  
  
Indianapolis IN  
Phone 3172636226  
Email shempstead@schmidt-arch.com

Project Information

Regenstrief Institute Inc - Headquarters  
1111 W 10th Street

Indianapolis IN 46204

County MARION

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? ☒ yes

Violation Issued by: LBD

Local Building Official

Phone:

Email:

Local Fire Official

Phone:

Email:

### Variance Details

Code Name: 2003 ANSI A117.1

604.5.1

Conditions: The horizontal grab bars in fitness toilet room is 2 inches short of the required 54 inches from the rear wall.

The building is 4 stories in height, and classified as primarily B Occupancy (office and administrative use), with accessory A-3 Occupancy spaces located on the 1st and 2nd floors, and S-1 Occupancy storage rooms. The building is of Type IIB Construction.

#### 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 grab bar is the required 42 inches in length.  
2. Vertical grab bars are provided and located as required.

#### 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: Hardship is the cost of demolition and reinstallation for an as-built condition. Cost will be significant as the extension of the wall to increase the length of the grab bar will result in a series of domino effects due to the need to completely re-construct the affected toilet rooms.

The owner was originally informed by the City in August, 2014, that the project was exempt from local review due to State ownership. Subsequent to that, attorneys at the City determined that the project is in fact subject to both Plan Review and Inspection. Both of these enforcement activities occurred after completion of the building.

Variance Details

Code Name: 2003 ANSI A117.1  
404.2.3

Conditions: Stair doors have been cited as not having latch side maneuvering clearances, which are required for doors on an accessible route.

The building is 4 stories in height, and classified as primarily B Occupancy (office and administrative use), with accessory A-3 Occupancy spaces located on the 1st and 2nd floors, and S-1 Occupancy storage rooms. The building is of Type IIB Construction.

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

- 1

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: Sec. 404.1 states;  
Doors and doorways that are part of an accessible route shall comply with Sec. 404.

Stairs are not considered part of an accessible route per Sec. 404.2. Therefore, the maneuvering clearance requirement for doors on an accessible route do not apply to stair doors.

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.
- Y

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: Hardship is the cost of demolition and reconstruction of stair door openings, for which there is no violation.

The owner was originally informed by the City in August, 2014, that the project was exempt from local review due to State ownership. Subsequent to that, attorneys at the City determined that the project is in fact subject to both Plan Review and Inspection. Both of these enforcement activities occurred after completion of the building.

Variance Details

Code Name: 2008 Indiana Building Code (675 IAC 13-2.5)  
1011.3

Conditions: Tactile exit signs have been cited at exterior exit doors. The code states that they are required adjacent to each door to an egress stairway...and the exit discharge. We have interpreted exit discharge to be the door leading to the outside from the enclosed stair.

The building is 4 stories in height, and classified as primarily B Occupancy (office and administrative use), with accessory A-3 Occupancy spaces located on the 1st and 2nd floors, and S-1 Occupancy storage rooms. The building is of Type IIB Construction.

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 exterior exit door is an exit component per IBC definition, it is not part of the exit discharge per IBC definition. Sec. 1011.3 does not enumerate exterior exit doors as requiring tactile signs. It does, however, enumerate doors to egress stairways.
2. Tactile exit signs are provided at stairs and at the exit discharge from stairs as required.

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:

Hardship is providing tactile signs at locations other than those specified by the IBC.

The owner was originally informed by the City in August, 2014, that the project was exempt from local review due to State ownership. Subsequent to that, attorneys at the City determined that the project is in fact subject to both Plan Review and Inspection. Both of these enforcement activities occurred after completion of the building.

Variance Details

Code Name: 2008 Indiana Building Code (675 IAC 13-2.5)  
1020.1.2

Conditions: A e6-inch cast iron roof drain penetrates a stair enclosure above the ceiling on the 3rd floor. Penetrations of stairs by piping or utilities not serving the stairway are prohibited.

The building is 4 stories in height, and classified as primarily B Occupancy (office and administrative use), with accessory A-3 Occupancy spaces located on the 1st and 2nd floors, and S-1 Occupancy storage rooms. The building is of Type IIB Construction.

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 penetration will be sealed with fire caulk.  
2. The cast iron drain exits the stair enclosure through the slab on grade, therefore not penetrating the rated enclosure on the discharge end of the drain.  
3. The building is protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system.

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.

☒ Y 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: Hardship is the cost of demolition and re-installation of the drain to a different location in an already constructed and occupied building. Since the building has been occupied for some time, all work must be done on weekends. The cost for this has been estimated well into six figures.

The owner was originally informed by the City in August, 2014, that the project was exempt from local review due to State ownership. Subsequent to that, attorneys at the City determined that the project is in fact subject to both Plan Review and Inspection. Both of these enforcement activities occurred after completion of the building.

