

Owner / Applicant Information

Laurie Siler
CCC Holland,LLC
770 3RD AVENUE SW

CARMEL IN 46032

Phone 3175870340

Email LSILER@PEDCOR.NET

Submitter Information

Edwin Rensink
RTM Consultants Inc
6640 Parkdale Place

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email rensink@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

James Stutzman, AIA
Pedcor Design Group
255 City Center Drive

Carmel IN

Phone 3177057979

Email jrs@pedcor.net

Project Information

Holland
880 West Monon Green Boulevard

Carmel IN 46032

County HAMILTON

Project Type New 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)
1007.2.1, 2014 IBC

Conditions: The elevator will not be provided with generator backup for the purpose of providing the accessible means of egress requirement for buildings 5 or more stories in height. The project involves a 5-story building with commercial tenants on the 1st floor, and residential apartments on the upper floors. The building will be designed per Sec. 510.2, with a 1st floor podium of Type IA Construction and 4 floors above of Type VA Construction.

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. The Type VA building will be protected throughout with a sprinkler system per NFPA 13R, and the 1st floor with a sprinkler system per NFPA 13.
2. The elevator will have battery back-up provided in order to permit lowering of the elevators in the event of loss of power. Additionally, a transfer switch will be provided to permit hookup of a portable generator.
3. Accessible means of egress are not required by the federal Fair Housing Act for multi-family housing.
4. The variance as requested has been approved at numerous times previously for 5-story buildings, (18-10-48c), (18-08-10), (18-02-25), (18-01-25a), (17-09-46b), (17-07-45d), (17-06-64a), (16-11-39a), (16-08-59e), (16-06-34c), (16-02-47a), (11-01-43e), (14-10-55), (07-11-12c), (16-12-52b), and (16-12-53a).

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:

Variance Details

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

706.1.1, 2014 IBC

Conditions: Floors 2-5 will be separated from the immediately adjacent Playfair building with a 2-hour fire wall with protected openings in lieu of a party wall. The 1st floor will not be separated from the immediately adjacent Playfair building 1st floor. Due to the existence of a lot line and separate ownership of the two (2) buildings, a party wall without openings is required. The project involves a 5-story building with commercial tenants on the 1st floor, and residential apartments on the upper floors. The building will be designed per Sec. 510.2, with a 1st floor podium of Type IA Construction and 4 floors above of Type VA Construction.

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. The 1st floor of each building will be constructed as Type IA Construction (noncombustible, with 3-hour rated structure and 3-hour horizontal assembly above), and protected with a sprinkler system per NFPA 13.
2. Floors 2-5 of the building will be separated with a 2-hour fire wall with 90 minute rated openings, and will be protected with a sprinkler system per NFPA 13R.
3. Legal agreements are in place between the two (2) owner entities involved to ensure mutual maintenance of sprinkler and fire alarm systems, as well as all other related utilities - to be maintained in perpetuity with the deed of each property.
4. Several similar variances have been granted for past projects to permit construction of less than a party wall to separate buildings of separate ownership under a wide variety of circumstances, including 18-08-71, 18-04-35, 17-09-19b, 17-03-65, 17-03-49, 15-03-09, and 15-02-11c.

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.

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 Holland and Playfair buildings are owned by separate entities in order to facilitate necessary financing terms for each property. The ownership entities are very closely aligned. Imposition of the rule would result in less favorable financing terms.

Variance Details

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

510.2, Condition 7, 2014 IBC

Conditions: Building height in feet (60 feet, 9 inches) will exceed that permitted (60 feet) for the overall building based upon installation of an NFPA 13R sprinkler system in the R-2 Occupancy Type VA building (building complies with the allowable 4 stories in height). The project involves a 5-story building with commercial tenants on the 1st floor, and residential apartments on the upper floors. The building will be designed per Sec. 510.2, with a 1st floor podium of Type IA Construction and 4 floors above of Type VA Construction.

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

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. The height exceeds that permitted by 8 (eight) inches.
2. The Type VA building will be protected throughout with a sprinkler system per NFPA 13R, and the 1st floor with a sprinkler system per NFPA 13.
3. Several similar variances have been granted for the 60-ft height limit for similar podium buildings over the past several years, including 17-09-46c, 16-12-53c, 16-03-29b, 15-02-11a, 14-07-04b, 14-04-42b, 13-09-47c, 13-10-28e, 12-09-11d, and 12-06-08b.

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:

Overall height is driven by the height of the 1st floor commercial tenant spaces.

Variance Details

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

3004.1, 2014 IBC

Conditions: Hoistway venting will not be provided for the elevator to be installed in the building. An elevator with four (4) or more stops requires hoistway venting where the building contains an R Occupancy.
The project involves a 5-story building with commercial tenants on the 1st floor, and residential apartments on the upper floors. The building will be designed per Sec. 510.2, with a 1st floor podium of Type IA Construction and 4 floors above of Type VA Construction.

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. The 2015 International Building Code has eliminated the requirement for venting of elevator hoistways.
2. Reference to hoistway venting has been eliminated from the 2010 Edition of the ASME A17.1, Safety Code for Elevators and Escalators.
3. Elevator hoistway vents, when opened, could potentially draw smoke and heat into the elevator hoistway.
4. The building will be protected with an automatic sprinkler system throughout. Recent studies indicate that sprinklered buildings do not pose a threat for smoke and heat spread through elevator shafts.
5. Past interpretations rendered by the Elevator Section have said that venting is not required for buildings 5 stories or less in height.
6. Similar variances have been granted for 4-, 5-, and 6-story buildings, including 18-10-48d, 18-10-45d, 18-09-18b, 18-08-14c, 18-06-60f, 18-04-28, 18-04-25, 17-09-38b, 17-09-52, and 17-09-62d.

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: Venting of elevator hoistways appears to be a vestige of decades-ago theories about smoke spread in nonsprinklered buildings. At this point, the intent of hoistway venting in current codes is not clear. In addition to potentially drawing smoke into the hoistway from the building, hoistway venting also has a detrimental effect on energy conservation. In addition to potential adverse affects noted, hardship is the cost to install and maintain elevator vents.

