Owner / Applicant Information
Jud Wolfe
Plainfield Community School Corporation
985 S. LONGFELLOW LANE
PLAINFIELD IN 46168
Phon∈ 3178392578
Email JWOLFE@PLAINFIELD.K12.IN.US
Submitter Information
Ralph Gerdes
Ralph Gerdes Consultants, LLC
5510 S. East St.
Indianapolis IN
Phon∈ 3177873750
Email Ralph@rgc-codes.com
<u>Designer Information</u>
John Rigsbee
CSO Architects
8831 Keystone Crossing
Indianapolis IN
Phon∈ 3178487800
Email jrigsbee@csoinc.net
Project Information
Plainfield Van Buren Elementary School
225 Shaw Street
Plainfield IN 46168
County HENDRICKS
Project Type New Addition Y Alteration Y 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: 3177545381 Email: erudolphi@town.plainfield.in.us
Local Fire Official Phone 2177 45201
Phone: 3177545381 Email: wstevens@plainfieldfire.com

<u>Variance Deta</u>	Variance Details			
Code Name:	Other Code (Not in the list provided)			
	2014 InBC, 903.2.3			
Conditions:	Building addition of approximately 750 sq.ft. will increase existing fire area of approximately 42,030 sq.ft. Code interpretation would require all 43,000 sq.ft to be sprinklered since fire area exceeds 12,000 sq.ft.			
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:	 Building addition of 750 sq.ft. is insignificant compared to existing school area. Office addition does not significantly increase the fire hazard. Addition will be separated by one (1) hour corridor wall (with oversized fire window). Building has corridor smoke detection 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.			
Υ	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.			
Υ	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:

Cost of providing sprinklers in existing 42,000 sq.ft. area exceeds the cost of the addition.

/ariance Deta	<u>ils</u>		
Code Name:	Other Code (Not in the list provided)		
	2014 InBC, Table 716.6.7.2		
Conditions:	New 3/4 hour fire rated window assembly for administrative offices will exceed 25% of the common corridor wall. Code limits fire windows in fire partitions to 25% of the wall area.		
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:	 Window assembly will be 3/4 hour fire rated opening protective, as required by code. Corridors have smoke detection system for early warning. There are multiple exits out of the building. 		
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.		
Υ	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.		
Υ	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:	Owner wants administrative offices to have large view of main building entry and corridor.		
/ariance Deta	<u>ils</u>		
Code Name:	12-4-12 Existing Buildings; Additions or Alterations		
	12(f)		
Conditions:	Existing 1960's school will have administrative office addition of approximately 750 sq.ft. Code requires a two (2) hour fire wall be provided, sprinkler the entire school, or upgrade the fire rating the structure. The existing school is approximately 82,000 sq.ft and is Type IIB (non-rated) 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).

1. Addition is less than 0.01% of the existing floor area. Addition does not pose a greater Facts: hazard.

- Corridors have a smoke detection system.
 There are several pre-1998 two (2) hour fire walls in the building.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty)

	imposition of the rule would result in an undue nardship (unusual difficulty) because of physical limitations of the construction site or its utility services.
Υ	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.
Υ	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:	Cost of compliance exceeds the cost of the new addition.