| Tony Knoble Florence Fay Senior Apartments, LP | | |
|--|--|--|
| Florence Fay Senior Apartments, LP | | |
| | | |
| 333 N PENNSYLVANIA ST STE 100 | | |
| INDIANAPOLIS IN 46204 | | |
| Phon∈ 3172641833 | | |
| Email TONY@TWGDEV.COM | | |
| Cultural the analysis of the second s | | |
| Submitter Information Maliana Tupper | | |
| Melissa Tupper RTM Consultants, Inc. | | |
| 6640 Parkdale Place | | |
| | | |
| Indianapolis IN | | |
| Phon∈ 3173297700 | | |
| Email tupper@rtmconsultants.com | | |
| Zindir tapper e rimeeriedina. No centre | | |
| Project Information | | |
| Florence Fay Senior Living | | |
| 2801 English Ave | | |
| INDIANAPOLIS IN 46201 | | |
| County MARION | | |
| Project Type New Addition Alteration Existing Y Change of Occupancy | | |
| Project Status F F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled | | |
| | | |
| IDHS Issued Correction order? Has Violation been Issued? | | |
| Violation Issued by: NA | | |
| Local Building Official | | |
| Phone: 3173278700 Email: planreview.class1@indy.gov | | |
| Local Fire Official Phone: 3173278700 Email: margie.bovard@indy.gov | | |
| Phone: 3173278700 Email: margie.bovard@indy.gov | | |

| <u>Variance Details</u> | | |
|--|--|--|
| Code Name: | Other Code (Not in the list provided) | |
| | 2014 IBC, 1008.1.9 | |
| Conditions: | The 2nd exit from the courtyard into the building will normally be locked to prevent unauthorized access into the apartment building. Two exits are required from the courtyard based upon having a calculated occupant load greater than 49. One of the exits is through a gate in the fence that encloses the courtyard, the second is back into the apartment building. | |
| | The building is a senior living apartment building. The building is sprinklered throughout. | |
| 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 occupant load of the courtyard on a daily basis will be less than 50 occupants. | |
| | 2. The apartment building residents will be able to unlock the doors to re-enter the building from the courtyard. | |
| | 3. There is an exit from the courtyard through the fence, this exit is always unlocked from the courtyard side. | |
| | 4. There may be times when community events and similar events are held in the courtyard resulting in an occupant load of more than 49 in the courtyard. When these events are held the egress doors into the building will be unlocked. | |
| 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 hardship is the security risk to the building occupants. Entry to the building could be gained by climbing the fence and walking into the building through the unlocked doors from the courtyard. | |