

Owner / Applicant Information

Ryan Gallmeyer  
NOS Innovation Partners II LLC  
941 N MERIDIAN ST

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46204

Phone 3179741234

Email RYAN.GALLMEYER@BUCKINGHAM-CO.COM

Submitter Information

Edwin Rensink  
RTM Consultants Inc  
6640 Parkdale Place

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email rensink@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Kelly Davis, AIA  
Oz Architecture  
3003 Larimer Street

Denver CO

Phone 3038615704

Email kdavis@ozarch.com

Project Information

CityWay II Building B1  
231 Virginia Ave

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46204

County MARION

Project Type New ☒ Y 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)  
1009.10, 2014 IBC

Conditions: The vertical rise between landings for individual stairs (13 total) within individual dwelling units accessing the unit rooftop terrace will exceed the permitted 12 ft distance - actual will be a maximum of 12 ft, 1.5 inches.  
  
The units involved are on the 4th floor of the Type VA apartment building.

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 building will be protected with a sprinkler system per NFPA 13R.  
  
2. The minimal increased height of 1.5 inches between landings is an increase of approximately 1% beyond code maximum of 12 feet, and 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.

☒ 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: Due to some issues with the roof waterproofing discovered during initial construction, the roof decks had to be raised a few inches from the original design and one riser was added to each of the stairs. Imposition of the rule would significantly impact the design of the building, resulting in loss of loss of rentable space in the affected units.