

Owner / Applicant Information

Brian Sheehan
City of Rushville
330 NORTH MAIN STREET

RUSHVILLE IN 46173

Phone 7655615193

Email BSHEEHAN@CITYOFRUSHVILLE.IN.GOV

Submitter Information

Edwin Rensink
RTM Consultants Inc
6640 Parkdale Place

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email rensink@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Steve Savoi
Performance Services
4670 Haven Point Boulevard

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3178191370

Email ssavoie@PerformanceServices.com

Project Information

Taff Building Renovation
309 North Main Street

Rushville IN 46173

County RUSH

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: 7659323065

Email: FIRECHIEF@CITYOFRUSHVILLE.IN.GOV

Local Fire Official

Phone: 7659323065

Email: firechief@cityofrushville.in.gov

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
706.1.1, 2014 IBC

Conditions: An egress will be installed in the party wall on the 2nd floor level between the Taff Building and the adjoining building to the south. Openings are not permitted in party walls.

The existing building is 2 stories in height plus a basement, has 6,300 sq ft per floor, and was constructed in 1895. The building has been occupied historically for a variety of commercial/retail uses. The 2nd floor is occupied as a single-family dwelling unit on the east end, with the west half currently a Business Occupancy use. The small partial basement (900 sq ft) is for service of the building only. The building is constructed with masonry exterior walls, with wood frame floor and roof construction. The building is classified as Type IIIB Construction. The current project will develop the 1st floor as a brewery with a public seating area. The 2nd floor is planned to be a tech incubator space, classified as B Occupancy per the Indiana Building Code (IBC). The 1st floor will be classified as A-2 and F-2 Occupancies per the IBC.

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 door will be 3-hour rated, as required for openings in a 3-hour rated wall.
2. The wall is a multi-wythe brick masonry wall which completely separates the two (2) properties.
3. Similar variances have been previously granted, including 19-01-55a, 17-03-65b, 15-04-60a, 15-02-11c, 18-08-71, 18-04-45, 17-03-49c, 17-09-19b, and 15-07-27a.
4. The building will be protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system per NFPA 13.

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: The opening is proposed in order to provide the 2nd required exit from the 2nd story of the building.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
Table 3412.7, 2014

Conditions: The building will be evaluated using Sec. 3412, IBC, for the change of occupancy. The variance request is to permit additional points 1.3 for the Fire Safety Score column in order to achieve an overall passing score.

The existing building is 2 stories in height plus a basement, has 6,300 sq ft per floor, and was constructed in 1895. The building has been occupied historically for a variety of commercial/retail uses. The 2nd floor is occupied as a single-family dwelling unit on the east end, with the west half currently a Business Occupancy use. The small partial basement (900 sq ft) is for service of the building only. The building is constructed with

basement (700 sq ft) is for service of the building only. The building is constructed with masonry exterior walls, with wood frame floor and roof construction. The building is classified as Type IIIB Construction. The current project will develop the 1st floor as a brewery with a public seating area. The 2nd floor is planned to be a tech incubator space, classified as B Occupancy per the Indiana Building Code (IBC). The 1st floor will be classified as A-2 and F-2 Occupancies per the IBC.

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 throughout with an automatic sprinkler system per NFPA 13.
2. The building will be provided with a fire alarm system, which is not required by the rules for new construction for the building, based upon an occupant load of less than 300 in the A-2 Occupancy.
3. Similar variances have been previously granted previously for buildings protected with an automatic sprinkler system, including 18-06-38, 17-12-29, 16-08-28, 16-08-08, 16-04-48, 15-12-27, 15-09-72, 15-04-64a, 11-08-22, and 10-01-34.

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 shortage of points is attributable to a scoring anomaly embedded in the Sec. 3412 scoring mechanics for this type of existing building, where the positive points otherwise obtained for allowable area are limited to ½ of the Fire Safety score - coupled with very minimal points given (in this case 2 points) for installation of a sprinkler system. This anomaly imposes requirements on certain buildings that exceed the requirements for new construction.