

Owner / Applicant Information

Michael Rabinowitch
Bottleworks District, LLC
525 THIRD STREET
SUITE 300
BELOIT WI 53511
Phone 3176396151
Email MICHAEL.RABINOWITCH@WOODENMCLAUGHLIN.COM

Submitter Information

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

Designer Information

John Gallagher, AIA
Eppstein Uhen Architects
333 East Chicago Street

Milwaukee WI
Phone 4142715350
Email chrisg@eua.com

Project Information

Bottleworks Development Blocks 2 and 3
College Avenue and Mass Avenue

Indianapolis IN 46204

County MARION

Project Type New ☐ Addition ☒ 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: Email:

Local Fire Official

Phone: Email:

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
1004.1.2, 2014 IBC

Conditions: The design occupant load for the roof-top outdoor plaza will be based upon a fixed number for purposes of egress requirements in lieu of a calculated occupant load for a variety of uses. See attached for details. The plaza will be located on the roof a 2-story portion of the development.
The project involves development of Blocks 2 and 3 of the former Coca-Cola bottling plant for mixed use, including retail, dining, office, residential, a cinema, and parking. The Phase I portion includes conversion of two (2) existing garage structures for use as public market-small vendor retail and food service functions, as well as a building addition to connect the structures. Block 3 includes development of existing Building 17 as retail restaurant use, as well as a new parking garage structure and cinema. Phase II of Block 3 includes additional parking as well as office and retail.

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 permitted occupant load will be posted in multiple locations on the rooftop plaza. Egress width will be provided as required for the occupant load.
2. The entire development, including the open parking garage levels below the roof deck, will be protected with an automatic sprinkler system per NFPA 13.
3. Access to the rooftop terrace is controlled by the owners of the project and will not be open to the public outside of planned events where the occupant load is controlled.
4. Nearly identical variances have been previously approved for rooftop terraces including 14-05-44c and 12-10-22c.

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: Table 1004.1.2 does not have categories for occupancy of a rooftop plaza except within the narrow boundaries of standing room or row seating (5 or 7 sq ft per person) or table-and-chair seating (15 sq ft per person). Calculating an occupant load using these factors results in an occupant load far beyond the intended uses of the rooftop plaza.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
510.2, Condition 1, 2014 IBC

Conditions: A portion of the 3-hour separation between the Type IA podium structure and the adjoining Type II Construction will be vertical in addition to the horizontal separation described in Sec. 510.2. The podium structure is a parking structure, with one (1) level below grade and two (2) levels above grade. The adjoining 2-story Type II structure includes a 2nd story cinema, with grade level cinema entry, retail, and dining.
The project involves development of Blocks 2 and 3 of the former Coca-Cola bottling plant for mixed use, including retail, dining, office, residential, a cinema, and parking. The Phase I

mixed use, including retail, dining, office, residential, a cinema, and parking. The Phase I portion includes conversion of two (2) existing garage structures for use as public market-small vendor retail and food service functions, as well as a building addition to connect the structures. Block 3 includes development of existing Building 17 as retail restaurant use, as well as a new parking garage structure and cinema. Phase II of Block 3 includes additional parking as well as office and retail.

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. Both the podium structure and the adjoining mixed use Type II building will be protected with a sprinkler system throughout per NFPA 13.
2. The vertical portion of the separation will be 3-hour rated and will terminate at the 3-hour horizontal separation on top of the 2nd level of the podium. The 3-hour horizontal assembly will be supported by 3-hour rated construction.
3. Similar variances have been previously approved, including 18-01-25c, 17-06-52b and 15-07-53b.

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:

Imposition of the rule would prohibit the proposed design which includes a cinema entry at grade level. Requiring all adjoining construction to a podium to be placed on top of the podium does not increase the level of safety.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
510.2, Condition 2, 2014 IBC

Conditions: A portion of Block 3 of the Bottleworks Development will have two (2) levels of above grade parking garage in a portion of the Type IA podium. Current code permits a maximum of one (1) level above grade plane in a podium using the horizontal building separation option in Sec. 510.2.
The project involves development of Blocks 2 and 3 of the former Coca-Cola bottling plant for mixed use, including retail, dining, office, residential, a cinema, and parking. The Phase I portion includes conversion of two (2) existing garage structures for use as public market-small vendor retail and food service functions, as well as a building addition to connect the structures. Block 3 includes development of existing Building 17 as retail restaurant use, as well as a new parking garage structure and cinema. Phase II of Block 3 includes additional parking as well as office and retail.

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 2015 (and 2018) International Building Code, Sec. 510.2 eliminates the maximum 1-story limitation for a podium.
2. The entire Type I podium will be protected throughout with a sprinkler system per NFPA 13.
3. Similar variances have been granted for other projects, including 15-02-05(c), 16-06-34(e), 16-11-39c, 17-03-17, and 17-07-45(a).

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

Y

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 condensed site is the driver for adding the partial 2nd level of parking garage within the podium.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
1027.1, 2014 IBC

Conditions: Exit discharge from an enclosed stair to be constructed in Phase 1 will discharge through a portion of the 1st floor without having direct vision to the exterior exit as a result of a Phase 2 addition. The area involved is a parking garage.
The project involves development of Blocks 2 and 3 of the former Coca-Cola bottling plant for mixed use, including retail, dining, office, residential, a cinema, and parking. The Phase I portion includes conversion of two (2) existing garage structures for use as public market-small vendor retail and food service functions, as well as a building addition to connect the structures. Block 3 includes development of existing Building 17 as retail restaurant use, as well as a new parking garage structure and cinema. Phase II of Block 3 includes additional parking as well as office and retail.

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

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 stair in question will not be required for egress width or number of exits, but will be required based upon common path of travel limit from upper levels.
2. The building will be protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system per NFPA 13.
3. Based upon multiple egress stairs provided in Phase 2, the noncompliant discharge condition for this particular stair will not be adverse to safety.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

Y

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 configuration of the building is driven largely by the unique site conditions. The stair is necessary for the preliminary phase as a means of egress, with very limited options for alternative locations without significant loss of usable space.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
1023.5, 2014 IBC

Conditions: An exit passageway will have openings provided to permit transfer of storage carts between service areas. Openings in an exit passageway are limited to those necessary for egress from normally occupied spaces.
The project involves development of Blocks 2 and 3 of the former Coca-Cola bottling plant for mixed use, including retail, dining, office, residential, a cinema, and parking. The Phase I portion includes conversion of two (2) existing garage structures for use as public market-small vendor retail and food service functions, as well as a building addition to connect the structures. Block 3 includes development of existing Building 17 as retail restaurant use, as well as a new parking garage structure and cinema. Phase II of Block 3 includes additional parking as well as office and retail.

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 doors in question will be 90-minute rated as required, with closers.
2. The building will be protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system per NFPA 13.
3. Several very similar variances have been granted to permit openings from storage or service areas in large mixed-use structures, including 17-05-54a.

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 doors in question will allow service carts to pass across the exit passageway in lieu of using the passageway itself for service travel.

