<u>Owner /</u>	Applicant	Information

Jim Calloway Calloway Limited Partnership, dba Calloway Properties Inc. PO BOX 6009

LAFAYETTE IN 47903

Phon€ 7652377044

Email JULIE\_IMPERIAL@COMCAST.NET

## Submitter Information

Melissa Tupper RTM Consultants, Inc. 6640 Parkdale Place

Indianapolis IN

Phon€ 3173297700

Email tupper@rtmconsultants.com

### Designer Information

George Kurt Wahl The Wahl Architecture Studio, LLC 1815 Underwood Street

Lafayette IN

Phon€ 7654295880

Email kurt@wahlarch.com

Project Information Indiana Mentor Interior Remodel 22 Executive Drive		
Lafayette IN		
County TIPPECANOE		
Project Type New Addition Alteration Y Existing Change of Occupancy Y		
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: 7654239225 Email: mwolf@tippecanoe.in.gov		
Local Fire Official		
Phone: 7654239225 Email: dathomas@lafayette.in.gov		

#### Variance Details

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

2014 IBC, Table 3412.8, 3412.2

# Conditions: The mandatory scores for an E Occupancy in Table 3412.8 will be used for the evaluation of the change of

occupancy to I-4 Occupancy (each parameter is evaluated based upon the IBC requirements for an I-4 Occupancy, but scored based upon an E Occupancy in Ch 34).

The project involves a conversion of an existing 1-story office building (B Occupancy) to an adult daycare (I-4 Occupancy). The building is Type VB construction and approximately 5,504 square feet.

### 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. An automatic sprinkler system in accordance with NFPA will be installed throughout the building.

2. The maximum travel distance to an exit is 75 feet, code permits 200 feet.

There are 3 exits from the building. The calculated occupant load of the building is 100 occupants. Code only requires 2 exits based upon the calculated occupant load.
A clear exit width of 96" has been provided from the building which will accommodate and occupant load of 640. Code requires a minimum of 2 exits 32" in clear width based upon the calculated occupant load only requiring and exit capacity of 15".

5. Egress lighting and exit signs will be provided per code.

6. The facility provides services for around 24 adults per day with typically around 12 adults at the facility at one time. The staff to client ratio depends on the needs of the client. Some are 8 clients to 1 staff member and some are 4 clients to 1 staff member.

7. The change of use is not adverse to health or safety based upon the building being protected by an automatic sprinkler system, exceeding the number of exits and exit capacity required, and a short travel distance.

8. This approach of using Ch 34 and evaluating an adult day care as an E Occupancy was taken on a previous variance (13-11-59(c) Reliable Care Adult Day Care) to convert a portion of a building to an adult daycare.

### 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:	There is no category in Chapter 34 for the evaluation of an I-4 Occupancy. The NFPA 101A standard referenced in the Indiana amendment does not have a corresponding chapter in NFPA 101A for a day care occupancy. Based upon the owners installing a sprinkler system, the building being 1 story, short travel distances and more exits than required the proposed conversion is not adverse to the health or safety of the clients.