

Owner / Applicant Information

Maeghan Hobbs  
BWI Development  
5902 E. 34TH ST.

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46218

Phone 3173771790

Email MHOBBS@BWILLC.COM

Submitter Information

Melissa Tupper  
RTM Consultants, Inc.  
6640 Parkdale Place

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email tupper@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Robert Bray  
American Structurepoint, Inc.  
7260 Shadeland Station

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3175475580

Email rbray@structurepoint.com

Project Information

Sweet Galilee at the Wigwam  
Intersection of W. 14th St. and John St.

Anderson IN

County MADISON

Project Type New ☒ Addition ☐ Alteration ☐ Existing ☐ Change of Occupancy ☐

Project Status ☒ U F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled

IDHS Issued Correction order? ☐ Has Violation been Issued? ☐

Violation Issued by: NA

Local Building Official

Phone: 7656486057

Email: tfisher@cityofanderson.com

Local Fire Official

Phone: 7656486057

Email: cravensd@cityofanderson.com



Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)  
2014 IBC, 1018.6

Conditions: The variance request is to permit the lounge area on the 4th floor to be open to the corridor in new assisted living facility, I-1 Occupancy. The code requires corridors to be 1-hour fire-resistive construction and does not permit them to be interrupted by intervening rooms except for foyers, lobbies, and reception rooms. Area is shaded on the attached drawing.

The project involves a new 4-story assisted living facility. The building is classified as I-1/A-2/A-3/B Occupancies. The building is Type VA construction and sprinklered throughout with an NFPA 13 sprinkler 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 building is protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system per NFPA 13.  
2. The proposed design will exceed the requirements of Sec. 32.3.3.6, NFPA 101, Life Safety Code for Residential Board and Care Occupancies, which only requires sleeping rooms to be separated.  
3. Smoke detectors tied to the fire alarm system will be provided in areas open to the corridor, this is not required by NFPA 101 or the IBC.  
4. Similar variances have been granted in the past, including: Renovations to Glasswater Creek of Plainfield (18-04-12), Georgetowne Place (16-01-12), Canterbury Nursing & Rehabilitation Center (15-10-16), St. Vincent House (15-09-09), The Vue (15-06-42(b)), Mainstreet Assisted Living Facilities in Dyer (14-04-53(b)), Crown Point (14-03-25(b)), and Terre Haute (13-12-09(c)).

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 owner wishes to provide an open and inviting appearance to these areas for the residents of the assisted living facility.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)  
2014 IBC, 1018.1

Conditions: The wall enclosing the atrium will also serve as the corridor wall at the 2nd floor. The variance request is to permit the wall to be constructed as a smoke partition with windows in a gasketed frame and protected by a sprinkler in lieu of fire-rated corridor construction.

The project involves a new 4-story assisted living facility. The building is classified as I-1/A-2/A-3/B Occupancies. The building is Type VA construction and sprinklered throughout with an NFPA 13 sprinkler system.

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

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 in accordance with NFPA 13.
2. A fire alarm system will be installed throughout the building.
3. Smoke detection will be provided throughout the corridors and areas open to the corridor.
4. Protecting the opening as required for an atrium is not adverse to public health, welfare, or safety.
5. A similar variance was granted for Glasswater Creek of Plainfield, 18-05-65(a).

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 hardship is the cost to provide rated openings in wall that is protected as required for an atrium in a building protected throughout with an NFPA 13 sprinkler system. The owner wishes to maintain the openness of this portion of the building to help make the assisted living facility feel less institutional.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)  
2014 IBC, 714.4.1.2

Conditions: The variance request is to permit the ceiling membrane of the 1-hour rated horizontal assemblies to be interrupted with the double wood top plate of a wall assembly that is sheathed with Type X gypsum wallboard as permitted in the 2015 edition of the International Building Code. The current edition permits the ceiling membrane of a 1-hour rated horizontal assembly with the double wood top plate of a wall, but the wall is required to be rated.

The project involves a new 4-story assisted living facility. The building is classified as I-1/A-2/A-3/B Occupancies. The building is Type VA construction and sprinklered throughout with an NFPA 13 sprinkler 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

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: A double wood top plate wall assembly sheathed with Type X gypsum board has been determined to be an acceptable level of protection when penetrating the ceiling membrane of a 1 or 2-hour rated horizontal assembly per the Significant Changes to the International Building Code 2015 Edition, see attached.

What is proposed is not adverse to public health, safety, or welfare based upon the reasoning for the change in the code.

This variance was granted for 19-06-27, 19-02-27, 18-12-16 and 17-08-41(g).

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: The hardship is the difficulty in the constructability of the project. The floor and wall assemblies are constructed prior to the insulation of drywall using normal construction methods. In order to comply with code either the drywall would have to be hung on the ceilings before the interior walls are constructed or all of the interior walls would have to be upgraded to 1-hour rated assemblies when not otherwise required by code.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)  
2014 IBC, 3004.1

Conditions: Hoistway venting will not be provided for the elevator in the new apartment building. An elevator with four or more stops requires hoistway venting where the building contains an R Occupancy.

The project involves a new 4-story assisted living facility. The building is classified as I-1/A-2/A-3/B Occupancies. The building is Type VA construction and sprinklered throughout with an NFPA 13 sprinkler 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

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 2015 International Building Code has eliminated the requirement for venting of elevator hoistways.  
2. Reference to hoistway venting has been eliminated from the 2010 Edition of the ASME A17.1, Safety Code for Elevators and Escalators.  
3. Similar variances have been granted in the past including Lawrenceburg Multi-Family Housing (19-07-48(a)), The Kent (19-07-17), Dillon Hall Renovation (19-04-53(b)), DePauw University Residence Hall - Phase I (19-03-46(a)), Kinser Flats (19-03-70(b)), and Samaritan Senior - 75th Street (18-11-27(c)).

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:

It is a cost hardship to install and maintain the elevator vents when this requirement has been deleted from newer editions of the building and elevator code.

Variance Details

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

2014 IBC, 508.2.3

Conditions: The variance request is to permit the community room, A-3 accessory occupancy, to be located on the 3rd floor of the new 4-story assisted living facility. The height of the accessory occupancies cannot exceed the tabular values in Table 503, without increases, which is 2 stories based upon Type VA construction. Area is highlighted on attached floor plan.

The project involves a new 4-story assisted living facility. The building is classified as I-1/A-2/A-3/B Occupancies. The building is Type VA construction and sprinklered throughout with an NFPA 13 sprinkler 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

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 assembly area is approximately 4.3% (1,039 sq.ft.) of the 3rd floor area - less than the permitted 10% accessory occupancy area permitted.

2. The building is protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system per NFPA 13.

3. The building has a fire alarm system throughout.

4. Based upon the accessory nature of the assembly area and automatic sprinkler protection throughout, the location of the assembly area on the 3rd floor will not be adverse to safety.

5. Similar variances have been granted in the past including: St. Vincent Health Administration Office (17-11-36), Ball State University Health Professions Building (17-03-43), Project Refresh (16-08-29), Blue & Company Expansion Tenant Finish (16-05-51), and Cityscape Flats (15-05-44).

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 the location of the accessory assembly areas on the 3rd floor.

