

Owner / Applicant Information

Mark Padgorski

200 HIGH PARK AVENUE

GOSHEN IN 46526

Phone 5743642440

Email MPODGORS@GOSHENHEALTH.COM

Submitter Information

Derek Holman

RTM consultants, Inc.

6640 Parkdale Pl Suite J

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email holman@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

John Berghoff

Bone Vita Architecture

112 North Main Street

Roanoke IN

Phone 2604719449

Email jberghoff@bonavitaarchitecture.com

Project Information

Goshen Health Dock addition

200 High Park Avenue

Goshen IN

County ELKHART

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: 5745344181

Email: buildingoffice@goshencity.com

Local Fire Official

Phone: 5745344181

Email: kimwhitehead@goshencity.com

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)

2014 InBC Section 717.6.1

Conditions: Ductwork penetrating one floor level in an I-2 occupancy will not be provided with a shaft enclosure. Code requires ducts that penetrate floors in an I-2 Occupancy to be enclosed within a shaft enclosure.

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. A fire damper will be provided at the floor where the ductwork penetrates the floor assembly.
2. The building will be fully sprinklered.
3. The design complies with Section 5.3.2 of NFPA 90A - 2012 Standard for Installation of HVAC Systems, as required by the ISDH and CMS.
4. Similar variances have been granted on other healthcare facilities in the past (17-06-14, 17-08-59, 18-02-04).

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 cost of providing shaft enclosures and additional fire dampers at the shaft enclosures. This design complies with the Life Safety Code as required by CMS and the ISDH.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)

2014 InBC Section 706

Conditions: A 2 hour fire barrier will be used in lieu of a 3 hour fire wall in order to separate the addition to the hospital. The current hospital is over allowable area for new construction requirements. Per code, the addition is required to be a separate building separated by a 3 hour fire wall.

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. Both the existing hospital and the addition will be fully sprinklered.
2. The use of a 2 hour fire barrier to separate the addition is permitted by the 2012 Life Safety Code - NFPA 101.
3. Similar variances to allow fire barriers in lieu of fire walls to separate construction types have been granted on numerous healthcare facilities in the past (17-04-13, 16-06-41, 17-03-10)

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: The hardship is the logistics and the costs of providing a 3 hour fire wall with associated exterior wall extensions and all associated opening protectives (dampers and door openings) without an added life safety benefit.

