

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

Chris Gallagher, AIA  
Eppstein Uhen Architects  
333 East Chicago Street  
  
Milwaukee WI  
Phone 4142715350  
Email chrisg@eua.com

Project Information

Bottleworks District Building Two  
Bellfontaine Street and East 10th Street

Indianapolis IN 46204

County MARION

Project Type New ☒ Y 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)

705.8, 2014 IBC

Conditions: Openings in the south exterior wall of the building will exceed that permitted (45%) based upon 10 feet of fire separation distance (total of 20 feet between Buildings 1 and 2). Actual percentage of openings will be 55% on the 1st floor, 52% on the 2nd floor, 69% on the 3rd floor, 67% on the 4th floor, 41% on the 5th floor, and 57-59% on floors 6-13.  
The project involves construction of a 14-story building with commercial tenants and lobbies on the 1st floor, parking on floors 2-5, offices on floors 6-9, and residential on floors 10-13. The partial 14th floor is mechanical, tenant amenities and a rooftop pool.

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. Building Two will be protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system per NFPA 13.  
2. Building One (the exposing building) will be protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system per NFPA 13.  
3. Sec. 5.6.3, NFPA 80A, Recommended Practice for the Protection of Exterior Fire Exposures, states that 'where the exposing building or structure is protected throughout by an approved, properly maintained automatic sprinkler system or other approved automatic fire suppression system of adequate design for the hazard involved, no exposure hazard should be considered to exist.'  
4. Based upon automatic sprinkler protection per NFPA 13 in both buildings and the 20-ft separation between buildings, the increased percentage of openings 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 proximity of the buildings is proposed based upon existing site limitations. Viability for the development depends upon maximizing efficient use of the site.