

Owner / Applicant Information

Richard Reth  
Sisters of the Holy Cross  
100 LOURDES HALL  
SAINT MARY'S  
NOTRE DAME IN 46556  
Phone 5742845660  
Email RRETH@CSCSISTERS.ORG

Submitter Information

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

Designer Information

Gregory Kil  
Kil Architecture / Planning  
1126 Lincolnway East  
South Bend IN  
Phone 5742882654  
Email gkil@kilarchitecture.com

Project Information

Remodeling at Loretto Convent  
100 Lourdes Hall  
Saint Mary's  
Notre Dame IN 46556

County ST JOSEPH

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

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

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

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)  
2014 IBC, 1021.1, 3412.6.11

Conditions: The project involves the conversion of an attic from storage to classrooms and bedrooms for the existing convent (R-2 Occupancy). The building will be evaluated using Ch 34. The variance request is to permit both of the exit stairs that serve the 3rd floor to be open and protected by a draft curtain and closely spaced sprinklers in accordance with NFPA 13. Code requires each story above the 2nd to have at least one enclosed stair.

The building was constructed as a convent circa 1914. The building is Type IIIB Construction and 3 stories with a basement. There will be a new vestibule addition (105 sf) to provide access to the new elevator being installed to serve all floors of the existing 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 NFPA 13R sprinkler system will be installed throughout the existing building which is currently not sprinklered.

2. A fire alarm system will be installed throughout the building.

3. Smoke detection will be provided throughout the building.

4. The maximum travel distance is 140 feet, code permits 250 feet.

5. Similar variances have been granted for the YWCA Women’s Shelter (15-05-7), Eagledale Senior Living Apartments (15-07-42(c)), and Davis Zeller Place - School Building (16-11-27b).

6. The open stairs protected by a draft curtain and closely spaced sprinklers will not be adverse to health and safety based upon sprinkler protection throughout the building, smoke detection in the corridors and areas open to the corridor, and a fire alarm system throughout 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.
- ☒ 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 difficulty to enclose the existing stairs. The existing stair layout would make it extremely difficult to provide a code compliant stair enclosure. Many of the stairs do not have landings, they terminate at the corridor edge.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)  
2014 IBC, 1009.3, exc. 4, 3412

Conditions: 2014 IBC. 1009.3. exc. 4. 3412.6.6

The project involves the conversion of an attic from storage to classrooms and bedrooms for the existing convent (R-2 Occupancy). The building will be evaluated using Ch 34. The variance request is to permit the existing stairs to be open and protected by a draft curtain and closely spaced sprinklers in accordance with NFPA 13. This is permitted for buildings equipped throughout with an NFPA 13 sprinkler system, this building will be equipped throughout with an NFPA 13R sprinkler system.

The building was constructed as a convent circa 1914. The building is Type IIIB Construction and 3 stories with a basement. There will be a new vestibule addition (105 sf) to provide access to the new elevator being installed to serve all floors of the existing 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

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. An NFPA 13R sprinkler system will be installed throughout the existing building which is currently not sprinklered.
2. A fire alarm system will be installed throughout the building.
3. Smoke detection will be provided throughout the building.
4. The maximum travel distance is 140 feet, code permits 250 feet.
5. Similar variances have been approved for The Kent (18-04-13), Liberty Lofts (17-07-55), Painters and Decorators Building (17-06-06), Florence Fay Senior Living (16-09-36(b)), Eagledale Senior Living Apartments, (15-07-42(a)) YWCA Women's Shelter (15-05-07).
6. The open stairs protected by a draft curtain and closely spaced sprinklers will not be adverse to health and safety based upon sprinkler protection throughout the building, smoke detection throughout the building, and a fire alarm system throughout 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.

☒

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 difficulty to enclose the existing stairs. The existing stair layout would make it extremely difficult to provide a code compliant stair enclosure. Many of the stairs do not have landings, they terminate at the corridor edge.