Owner / Applicant Information					
Seivers Janie					
Avondale Meadows Academy, Inc dba Avondale Meadows Middle School					
3980 MEADOWS DR					
INDIANAPOLIS IN 46205					
Phon∈ 3176080477					
Email JSEIVERS@UNITEDSCHOOLSINDY.ORG					
Submitter Information					
Jason Burk					
HALSTEAD architects					
1139 Shelby Street					
Indianapolis IN					
Phon∈ 3176841431					
Email jasonb@halstead-architects.com					
Desire as Information					
Designer Information					
Michael Halstead HALSTEAD architects					
1139 Shelby Street					
Indianapolis IN					
Phon∈ 3176841431					
Email mikeh@halstead-architects.com					
Project Information					
Avondale Meadows Academy Middle School					
3980 Meadows Drive					
INDIANAPOLIS IN 46205					
County MARION					
Project Type New Addition Y Alteration Existing Change of Occupancy					
Project Status F F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled					
Violation Issued by: LBD					
Local Building Official					
Phone: 3173274104 Email: planreview.class1@indy.gov					
Local Fire Official Phone: 3173274104 Email: Margie.Bovard@indy.gov					
1 Hone. 3173274104 Email. Ivial gle. Doval delli luy. gov					

## Variance Details

Code Name: 2009 ANSI A117.1

404.2.10 Vision Lites

Conditions:

Doors and sidelites adjacent to doors containing one or more glazing panels that permit viewing through the panels shall have the bottom of at least one panel on either the door or an adjacent side lite 43 inches (1090 mm) maximum above the floor. Vision lites in doors throughout the project are installed with the bottom of the glass approximately 2 1/2" too high to comply with the code.

to comply with the code. 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). The vast majority of vision lites installed in doors throughout the project were included Facts: primarily for the purpose of providing owner-required security as opposed to a public / occupant amenity. While not having vision lites AT ALL could be considered contributing to a negative effect to the public health, safety and welfare, having vision lites which are not compliant with the maximum height above the floor will not impact the public health, safety, and / or welfare. 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 Code-compliant options of the current installation are as follows: 1) Remove / replace the Facts: glass / door slabs with compliant glass locations; 2) Utilize the exception to the code section which allows for "transom type" vision lites above 66" AFF; 3) Remove the vision lites altogether (most easily achieved by installing opaque film over the glazing) or 4) Obtain a variance to the code section. With school safety being the primary concern, options moving forward to make the vision lites compliant with the above-referenced code section are either impossible to achieve in the desired time frame, cost prohibitive to the value of the change of scope, or functionally unacceptable from a school security standpoint. It is clear that the replacement option is

excessively costly compared to the value of compliant vision lites in this instance.