

Owner / Applicant Information

Debra Stolen-Hasbrook
Hotel Broad Ripple LLC
6520 WESTFIELD BOULEVARD

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46220

Phone 3177872665

Email DEBRASTOLEN@CS.COM

Submitter Information

Edwin Rensink
RTM Consultants Inc
6640 Parkdale Place

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email rensink@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Mark Demerly, AIA
Demerly Architects
6500 Westfield Boulevard

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3178470724

Email mark@demerlyarchitects.com

Project Information

6508 Westfield
6508 Westfield Boulevard

Indianapolis IN 46220

County MARION

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: 2010 NFPA 13 Installation of Sprinkler Systems (675 IAC 28-1-5)

11.1.4

Conditions: The sprinkler design will be based upon Chapter 6 of NFPA 13R in lieu of the water demand and design criteria requirements of NFPA 13. A score of zero will be taken for the Automatic Sprinklers parameter in the Chapter 34 evaluation of the building.
The immediate project scope for the existing 5-story building includes development of existing floors 4 and 5 into a single condominium unit, and completion of initial upgrades to the building to achieve compliance with the Chapter 34 evaluation for the change of occupancy of the building. The building was constructed in 1974 and has been used for a variety of Business Occupancy uses. The building is of Type IIB Construction, with masonry exterior walls and steel bar joist-metal deck-concrete floors and roof structure. The building has 1,460 sq ft of floor area on each floor level. Floors 2 and 3 will remain office use for at least the immediate future, with future potential development as hotel guest rooms or another condominium unit. The 1st floor is a small event and meeting space with an occupant load of less than 50, and is classified as a B Occupancy.

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 sprinkler system is not used for allowable area increase in Sec. 3412.6.2, nor allowable height increase in Sec. 3412.6.1, and is not given credit for positive points in the Automatic Sprinklers parameter in Sec. 3412.6.17, IBC.
2. The building is of noncombustible construction and does not have combustible concealed spaces.
3. Stairs will be upgraded to 2-hour construction. One stair discharges directly to the exterior, and the other through a small 1st floor vestibule to the exterior.
4. Other building upgrades include installation of a fire alarm system, elevator controls upgrade, and egress illumination and exit signage throughout.
5. Based upon the limited size of the building and proposed uses, the proposed sprinkler design will not be adverse to safety.

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 existing water service, which currently feeds an existing standpipe system, will not provide sufficient volume to serve an NFPA 13 system where designed using Chapter 11 criteria. The cost to provide a full NFPA 13 sprinkler system with a corresponding new water service has been estimated at \$109,550. This cost will make the project cost-prohibitive.

Variance Details

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

3314.1, 2014 IFC

Conditions: Sprinkler protection will be provided on floors 1, 4, and 5 as part of the initial project phasing. The request is to delay provision of the sprinkler system on office floors 2 and 3 for a period

The request is to delay provision of the sprinkler system on office floors 2 and 3 for a period of up to two (2) years.

The immediate project scope for the existing 5-story building includes development of existing floors 4 and 5 into a single condominium unit, and completion of initial upgrades to the building to achieve compliance with the Chapter 34 evaluation for the change of occupancy of the building. The building was constructed in 1974 and has been used for a variety of Business Occupancy uses. The building is of Type IIB Construction, with masonry exterior walls and steel bar joist-metal deck-concrete floors and roof structure. The building has 1,460 sq ft of floor area on each floor level. Floors 2 and 3 will remain office use for at least the immediate future, with future potential development as hotel guest rooms or another condominium unit. The 1st floor is a small event and meeting space with an occupant load of less than 50, and is classified as a B Occupancy.

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. Smoke detection will be provided on floors 2 and 3 as part of the initial fire alarm system build-out. The system will be operational prior to occupancy of floors 4 and 5.
2. The building will be protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system as described in the variance included in this filing.
3. Other building upgrades include upgrade of existing stairs, elevator controls upgrade, and egress illumination and exit signage 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:

Imposition of the rule would cause disruption of existing office tenants on floors 2 and 3, as well as potentially require retrofit of the installed system on these floors when these floors are subsequently developed. The proposed phasing will allow time to make the appropriate business decisions for development of floors 2 and 3.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
1015.2.1, 2014 IBC

Conditions: The existing scissor (interlocking) stairs are considered by Sec. 1015.2.1 as a single stair - Sec. 1015.2 is referenced in Sec. 3412.6.11 as mandatory compliance when evaluating a building per Sec. 3412 for a change of occupancy. The variance request is to permit the two (2) interlocking sets of exit stairs to satisfy the requirement for two (2) exits from the upper floors of the building.
The immediate project scope for the existing 5-story building includes development of existing floors 4 and 5 into a single condominium unit, and completion of initial upgrades to the building to achieve compliance with the Chapter 34 evaluation for the change of occupancy of the building. The building was constructed in 1974 and has been used for a variety of Business Occupancy uses. The building is of Type IIB Construction, with masonry exterior walls and steel bar joist-metal deck-concrete floors and roof structure. The building has 1,460 sq ft of floor area on each floor level. Floors 2 and 3 will remain office use for at least the immediate future, with future potential development as hotel guest rooms or another condominium unit. The 1st floor is a small event meeting space with an occupant load of less than 50, and is classified as a B Occupancy.

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= 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 two (2) sets of stairs are separated by cast-in-place concrete construction, including stairs, landings, and a concrete wall between the two (2) vertical runs of concrete stair construction. One stair discharges directly to the exterior, and the other through a small 1st floor vestibule to the exterior.
2. The doors into the two (2) sets of stairs on each floor comply with the separation requirement per Sec. 1015.2.1 - a minimum of 1/3 of the overall diagonal.
3. The building will be protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system as described in the variance included in this filing.
4. Stairs will be upgraded to 2-hour construction (new doors, etc).
5. Other building upgrades include installation of a fire alarm system, elevator controls upgrade, and egress illumination and exit signage throughout.
6. A very similar variance was granted for an 8-story building in 2016 - Variance 16-08-33.

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: Imposition of the rule would prohibit any development of the building for other than office use.

