

Owner / Applicant Information

Michael Rabinowitch
Bottleworks District, LLC
525 THIRD STREET
SUITE 300
BELOIT WI 53511
Phone 3176396151
Email MICHAEL.RABINOWITCH@WOODENMCLAUGHLIN.COM

Submitter Information

Edwin Rensink
RTM Consultants Inc
6640 Parkdale Place
Suite J
Indianapolis IN
Phone 3173297700
Email rensink@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

William Browne, Jr, FAIA
Ratio Design
101 South Pennsylvania Street
Indianapolis IN
Phone 3176334040
Email bbrowne@ratiodesign.com

Project Information

Bottleworks West Elm Hotel
831 Massachusetts Avenue

Indianapolis IN 46204

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? ☒ yes

Violation Issued by: LBD

Local Building Official

Phone: Email:

Local Fire Official

Phone: Email:

Variance Details

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

Table 3412.7, 2014

Conditions: The variance request is to permit an additional 5.1 points for the Means of Egress and General Safety Columns in Table 3412.7. The additional points are requested due to a late discovery of a discrepancy in the calculation of maximum travel distance, which affected the score for the Travel Distance parameter. This in turn resulted in a shortfall of 5.1 points in two (2) of the three (3) Columns in the Table. Maximum travel distance was originally stated as 130 feet. The actual maximum travel distance based upon final design is 243 feet. The project will involve renovation of the Coca-Cola administration building for use as the West Elm Hotel. The development will include the following components:

- ¿ Basement valet parking and hotel back of house functions
- ¿ 1st floor commercial retail spaces, hotel lobby, and hotel restaurant
- ¿ 2nd floor hotel guest rooms and meeting rooms
- ¿ 3rd floor addition - hotel guest rooms

The original building was constructed in 1930, with subsequent additions in 1940 and 1946. The building was used for Coca-Cola bottling operations and administrative functions.

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 travel distance of 243 feet is within the limit (250 feet) for new construction.
2. The building will be protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system per NFPA 13.
3. The building will be provided with a fire alarm system throughout.
4. Corridors will be provided with smoke detection - not required otherwise by code.
5. Building elements (columns, floors, and roof) throughout are predominantly cast-in-place concrete.
6. Variance requests have been granted previously to permit additional points to achieve an overall passing score in a variety of circumstances, including 18-06-38a, 17-04-61b, 17-04-58, 16-08-28, 15-04-64a, 15-12-27c, 15-04-60b, 11-08-22, 10-01-34), and others.

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: Imposition of the rule would jeopardize the success of the project. All available means of protection (sprinklers, fire alarm, detection, etc.) have been committed to the project. By way of a quirk in the evaluation, no points credit are given for the fire alarm system, and only 2 points and 4 points respectively for an NFPA 13 sprinkler system in the 2 Columns of Table 3412.7 affected by this variance.

