

Owner / Applicant Information

Scott Jarred  
Jarred Bunch Consulting  
9000 KEYSTONE CROSSING  
SUITE 450  
INDIANAPOLIS IN 46240  
Phone 3172021891  
Email SJARRED@JARREDBUNCH.COM

Submitter Information

Melissa Tupper  
RTM Consultants, Inc.  
6640 Parkdale Place  
Suite J  
Indianapolis IN  
Phone 3173297700  
Email tupper@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Kyle Douglas Copelin  
Epoch Architecture + Planning  
300 W Jefferson Blvd  
  
South Bend IN  
Phone 5743079990  
Email kylec@epoch-design.com

Project Information

Office Remodel/ Addition  
3625 E 96th St

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46240

County MARION

Project Type New ☐ Addition ☐ Alteration ☐ Existing ☐ Change of Occupancy ☐

Project Status ☐ F F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled

IDHS Issued Correction order? ☐ Has Violation been Issued? ☐ yes

Violation Issued by: LBD

Local Building Official

Phone:  Email:

Local Fire Official

Phone:  Email:

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)  
2009 ANSI A117.1, 404.2.5

Conditions: The distance between two doors in series, plus door width, is 75 inches leaving 39 inches when the door is fully open. Code requires 48 inches when the door is fully open.  
  
The project is a renovation of an existing office building.

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. An automatic door opener will be provided on one set of vestibule doors in a series.  
  
2. The 60 inch turning space has been provided in the vestibule and a 30" x 48" clear floor has been provided to allow for a parallel approach to the door from the vestibule into the office.  
  
3. The code does not have exceptions that would permit less than 48" between doors in a series when clearances have been provided that would permit a parallel approach.  
  
4. Non-compliance is not adverse to public health, welfare, or safety based upon a parallel approach being provided as well as automatic door openers.

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: This was cited during a construction inspection after the vestibule was constructed, it was not cited during state or city plan review. The cost to modify the vestibule to provide 48 inches, plus the width of the door swinging into the space, is \$22,000.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)  
2014 IBC, 1109.3

Conditions: Sinks located in the training room and in the library have been installed in cabinets that are 36" above the floor and therefore it does not meet the accessibility requirements of Chapter 11.  
  
The project is a renovation of an existing office building.

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

- 1

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 sinks in the restrooms and kitchen comply with the accessibility requirements of Chapter 11.

2. A parallel approach has been provided at the sink, as permitted for kitchen sinks where a cook top or conventional range is not provided. The faucet can be operated from a parallel approach.

3. The sink is not a required plumbing fixture and has been provided for convenience, to pour a drink down the sink or for water to clean up a spill without having to walk to the kitchen.

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:
- This was cited during a construction inspection after the sinks were installed, it was not cited during state or city plan review. The cost to modify the built-in casework to provide accessible sinks is \$11,000.

