

Owner / Applicant Information

David Imel  
Rolls-Royce Corporation  
450 S. MERIDIAN ST.

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46225

Phone 3172302000

Email DAVID.IMEL@ROLLS-ROYCE.COM

Submitter Information

Scott Perez  
Arxtheon Consulting, Inc.  
6015 Orchard Hill Lane

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3175202558

Email scott@arxtheon.com

Designer Information

Richard Judd  
TLF, Inc.  
3906 W. 86th St.

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173341500

Email rjudd@tlf-engineers.com

Project Information

Project Condor 5AB Building  
2059 S. Tibbs Ave.

Indianapolis IN 46241

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)  
2014 IBC, Sec. 910.2.1

Conditions: In the existing H-4 Occupancy area located to the east of the facility, there are existing roof/smoke vents that are leaking and many are non-functioning. The facility contains many open-bath systems which create the H-4 Occupancy. Leaking water is creating issues with the process the open baths provide for the manufacturing of parts.

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: The intent is to remove the existing smoke venting systems and patch the roofs in order to eliminate the leaking issues. Exhaust evacuation systems for the open bath processes within the facility have been installed in order to mitigate fumes from the facility.

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 owner's undue hardship involves the fact that the existing smoke and heat vents are leaking, are not sized to today's requirements and may not even work. The code at the time did not require smoke and heat venting, and currently, within an H-4 occupancy, are not required. The cost to replace the smoke and heat venting with a code compliant smoke removal system is a cost hardship.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)  
2014 IBC, Sec. 910.2.1

Conditions: The existing factory (ca 1942), is undergoing extensive remodeling and retooling for a major engine manufacturing company. The new 5 AB addition manufacturing area is going to being reclassified as an F-1 Occupancy in lieu of its originally intended F-1 Occupancy. The Building Code requires F-1 use groups over 50,000 sq ft of undivided space to have Smoke and Heat vents or a mechanical exhaust system.

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 manufacturing hall will be protected with a new ordinary hazard sprinkler system per NFPA 13  
2. Eight (8) new air handling units (AHU) and roof top units (RTU) are being installed with 20,000 cfm each, for a total of 160,000 cfm of total exhaust available.  
3. The AHU and RTU will be wired for automatic shut down upon activation of the sprinkler system, HVAC duct detectors, or fire alarm system. All units will be controlled, in two (2) separate zones, by the fire department at a control panel in the Training Center Lobby, per the request of the Local Fire Department.  
4. The smoke exhaust system will have normal wiring and ratings. This is a post incident convenience system, without high temperature wiring, and fans.  
5. The bottom of roof deck is approximately 28.5 ft above finish floor.

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: Studies show that smoke and heat vents should not be combined with sprinkler systems due to the potential of too many sprinkler heads going off over areas that are not over the fire as heat is drawing to an open smoke and heat vent

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)  
2014 IBC, Sec. 306.2 & 306.3

Conditions: The new addition (5 AB Annex) was constructed as a Type F-2 Occupancy based on the desires of the client to move forward with obtaining a new occupancy classification on the original structure to F-2 from its original occupancy classification of Type F-1.

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:

The 5 AB addition is constructed (currently completing construction) in accordance with a Type F-2 Occupancy. There will be no differences between the two areas in regards to manufacturing and both are fully sprinklered. Based on that they comply with having Unlimited area facilities in accordance with Sec. 507.3. They do not require separation as egress is provided throughout.

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 5 AB Addition which is just wrapping up was filed as a F-2 occupancy type. The owner was intending to modify the existing manufacturing area from F-1 to F-2. However, the owner has now decided to keep the entire manufacturing area as a Type F-1. Consequently we need to modify the new 5AB addition that is currently finishing construction, to an F-1 occupancy in lieu of the filed F-2.

Variance Details

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

2014 IBC, Sec. 1016.2

Conditions: When the training center portion of the building was renovated to become a training center, a Rule 8 analysis was performed. Egress for the training center was implemented through the 2-hour rated wall system separating the training center from the manufacturing area in order to provide egress from the training center in conformance with the code egress maximum distance requirements.

A previous Architect recently penetrated the 2-hour wall with windows and doors and nullified the 2-hour rating. The only reason the rating was there was so to provide egress from the training center into the factory.

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: New egress doors will be installed in the southeast section of the training center to provide immediate egress through the existing B-occupancy in order to satisfy the maximum egress distance in lieu of having to egress through the manufacturing (F-1) occupancy area. There are many restrictions now being placed on the Owner in regards to access to the manufacturing area by certain employees.

Additionally, construction was performed which penetrated the existing 2-hour rated assembly with glass/aluminum door and window systems which nullified the 2-hour rating.

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: A new means of egress will be provided through the new break room that is currently under construction in the Condor Training center. This egress will provide direct access to the exterior and will include the installation of a new accessible walkway which will lead to the parking lot area. This has been discussed with the Fire Marshal for Wayne Township and he agrees the new egress will be better than having additional travel distance through the manufacturing area. A Training Center (B-Occupancy) allows for 300-foot travel distance in a sprinklered building. The new proposed egress provides for a max travel distance of 295-feet and therefore will no longer require the 2-hour separation between the Training Center and Manufacturing area previously required by the variance.

The costs associated with the installation of rated door/window assemblies, or the installation of fire rated shutters, would be cost prohibitive to the owner, as well as creating maintenance issues over time.

