

Owner / Applicant Information

David Leazenby
Onyx+East, LLC
460 VIRGINIA AVENUE

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46203

Phone 3172269500

Email david.leazenby@onyxandeast.com

Submitter Information

Timothy Callas
J & T Consulting, LLC
8220 Rob Lane

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3178894300

Email tcallas@jtconsult.us

Designer Information

Todd William Rottmann
Rottmann Collier Architects, Inc.
155 East Market Street

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3177212724

Email todd@rottmanncollier.com

Project Information

727 Illinois Hybrid Building
727 North Illinois Street

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46204

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? ☒ 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 IBC 1107.6.2

Conditions: A proposed 12 unit R-2 Occupancy (sold units), will not be designed as Type B units based upon each individual owner will custom design their units. During the presentation the Fire Prevention and Building Safety Commission agreed with the concept of sold units did not require compliance with Type B units.

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

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. Part 1 of the Fair Housing Design Manual for „reasonable modifications“ for both existing construction and new construction to be acceptable provided the seller of the unit brings the unit back to the minimum adaptable design required by ANSI 117.1.
This works both ways for a person with disabilities and persons without provided the unit is modified to make the next owner have „enjoyment of the premises“.
2. The condo association will prepare deeds that will address this issue with the current owner of each unit so that si clear they are responsible to update the unit to the minimum adaptable design.
3. Variances have been approved for this issue in the past Variance # 16-04-60, 17-03-35, and 17-07-53.

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: The owner's undue hardship involves the issues of preparing a unit for adaptable design for persons with disabilities while the owners of each unit will have input on how their unit will be designed.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
2014 IBC 602/705.8

Conditions: A new 4-story R-2 Occupancy, Type VA construction apartment building BLDG # 1 will have the south exterior wall 6 feet from property line that will have unprotected openings. Table 705.8 permits 10% unprotected openings. South Exterior wall has 12% openings.

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

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

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 is protected with a fire suppression system throughout per NFPA 13R, 2010 Edition.

2. Additional sprinklers will be provided a maximum of 6'-0" on center along the south wall for BLDG # 1(refer to exhibit drawing for locations).

3. Based upon additional sprinkler protection along the exterior walls the variance is not adverse to the public safety or welfare.

4. Variances have been approved in the past for this issue # 15-03-10, 17-03-35, and many more.

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 owner's undue hardship involves the constraints of the existing site and property lines, which would not permit and requires protected openings.