Owner /	Applicant	Information

Randee Bach Caesars Entertainment Corporation ONE CAESARS PALACE DRIVE

LAS VEGAS NV 89119

Phon€ 7025870253

Email RBACH1@CAESARS.COM

# Submitter Information

Edwin Rensink RTM Consultants Inc 6640 Parkdale Place

# Indianapolis IN

Phon∈ 3173297700

Email rensink@rtmconsultants.com

# Designer Information

Daniel Valle, AIA HBG Design One Commerce Square

Memphis TN

Phon€ 9015252557

Email DValle@hbg.design

Project Information		
Caesar¿s Horseshoe Southern Indiana Building Addition 11999 Casino Center Drive		
Elizabeth IN 47117		
County HARRISON		
Project Type New Addition Y Alteration Existing Change of Occupancy		
Project Status U F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled		
IDHS Issued Correction order? No Has Violation been Issued? No		
Violation Issued by: NA		
Local Building Official		
Phone: 8127388939 Email: pfleace@harrisoncounty.in.gov		
Local Fire Official Phone: 8127388939 Email: huttscott@gmail.com		

#### Variance Details

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

712.1, 2014 IBC

Vertical openings in the existing building and the addition will be protected with bulkheads Conditions: and closely spaced sprinklers in lieu of classification as an atrium or other vertical opening application listed in Sec. 712. The vertical openings include a 2-story communicating floor opening in the addition and two (2) sets of open stair-escalator openings in the existing building - one connecting the lower level entry and the 2nd floor, and the other connecting the 2nd floor and 3rd floor. Additionally, the existing Event Space has floor levels on the 2nd and 3rd floor of the existing building.

> The existing Shore Building is a 3-story building of Type IB Construction, and includes A-2, A-3, B Occupancies, as well as lower level S-2 Occupancy. The 2-story addition will also be of Type IB Construction. The addition will add additional dining and gaming space on the 2nd floor, as well as an at-grade open-air floor for bus parking, vehicular access to existing parking levels, and an entry lobby.

#### 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).

#### 1. Bulkheads with close-spaced sprinklers will be provided at the ceiling of each described Facts: floor opening.

2. A row of close-spaced sprinklers will be provided along the set of doors leading to the existing Event Space on the 2nd floor.

3. The building will be protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler protection, as required.

4. The current IBC recognizes the use of bulkheads and closely spaced sprinklers to protect both escalator openings and egress stairs. The proposed configuration will very closely approximate code compliance per current code versus the code of record (1993 IBC) for the existing building.

## DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

L	_	_	_	_

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

The existing building is provided with a smoke control system - believed to be related to 3-Facts: story openings in the existing building classified as an atrium - though the configuration of the openings do not meet the 1993 criteria for an atrium, including that the floor openings align on a common axis for the full height of the atrium. The current code contains a more robust set of design criteria for smoke control design, resulting in a significant design hardship and potential cost hardship to reconcile 1993 smoke control criteria with current code smoke control criteria. Based upon the limited size of the floor openings involved, and their disbursement throughout the building, the use of current-code floor opening protection is considered a much more cost-effective solution for vertical opening compliance.

Variance Details

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

1005.3, 2014 IBC

Conditions: Egress capacity on the 2nd floor of the addition and of the existing building will be based upon current code factors of 0.2 in/person for stairs and 0.15 in/person for doors. The 1993 Indiana Building Code, applicable to the original construction, required 0.3 in/person for stairs and 0.2 in/person for doors.

The existing Shore Building is a 3-story building of Type IB Construction, and includes A-2, A-3, B Occupancies, as well as lower level S-2 Occupancy. The 2-story addition will also be of Type IB Construction. The addition will add additional dining and gaming space on the 2nd floor, as well as an at-grade open-air floor for bus parking, vehicular access to existing parking levels, and an entry lobby.

# 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 proposed egress capacity factors comply with the model code IBC exception to this section, based upon provision of an automatic sprinkler system and a voice-alarm system throughout the building. The Indiana amendment to this section eliminates the requirement for a voice-alarm system as part of the exception - which will nonetheless be provided throughout the building.

2. The building will be protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler protection, as required.

3. Four (4) new enclosed exit stairs will be provided in the addition, plus a horizontal exit. The new stairs are optimally located at each corner of the addition.

#### DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

, Imp
be

nposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) ecause 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.



2

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 additional egress width required to meet the code of record egress factors would displace needed sq footage in the addition.

#### Variance Details

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

706, 2014 IBC

Conditions: A 2-hour fire barrier will be used to separate the existing open parking garage from the proposed 2-story addition to the Shore Building in lieu of a fire wall. The existing Shore Building is a 3-story building of Type IB Construction, and includes A-2, A-3, B Occupancies, as well as lower level S-2 Occupancy. The 2-story addition will also be of Type IB Construction. The existing parking garage is likewise of Type IB Construction. The addition will add additional dining and gaming space on the 2nd floor, as well as an atgrade open-air floor for bus parking, vehicular access to existing parking levels, and an entry lobby.

# 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. NFPA 88A, ¿Standard for Parking Structures¿, permits an open parking structure to be attached to a building of another

occupancy if ¿separated by walls, partitions, floor, or floor-ceiling assemblies having a fire resistance rating of not less than two hours¿.

2. The addition will be structurally independent of the existing building.

3. The 2-hour wall will be structurally stable for the time period required, based upon 2-hour structure supporting the wall in the existing parking garage.

The addition will be protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system, as required.
Similar variances have been granted in the past for separation of open parking garages, including 99-6-13 (Belterra Resort), 17-04-15(b), and 17-05-46.

Based upon the minimal hazard presented by an open parking garage, the 2-hour separation proposed, and protection of the 2-story addition with automatic sprinklers, the proposed design will not be adverse to the safety of the occupants or the integrity of the building structure.

## 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:

Construction of a separate fire wall would provide very little if any benefit, at great cost.