

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

William Browne, Jr., FAIA  
Ratio Design  
101 South Pennsylvania Street  
Indianapolis IN  
Phone 3176334040  
Email bbrowne@ratiodesign.com

Project Information

Bottleworks West Elm Hotel  
831 Massachusetts Avenue

Indianapolis IN 46204

County MARION

Project Type New  Addition  Alteration  Existing  Change of Occupancy

Project Status  F 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 1st floor of the north 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). The actual percentage will be 60%.

The project will involve renovation of the former Coca-Cola administration building for use as the West Elm Hotel. The development includes 1st floor commercial tenants with storefront windows on the north exterior wall. The original building was constructed in 1930, with subsequent additions in 1940 and 1946.

The building was used for Coca-Cola bottling operations and administrative functions.

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 One will be protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system per NFPA 13.  
2. Building Two (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:

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.

Y Imposition of the rule would prevent the preservation of an architecturally or a historically significant part of the building or structure

Facts: The 1st floor openings are designed to match the size, design, and appearance of the original storefront windows and are considered an historically significant part of the building structure.

