Owner / Applicant Information Joshua Limbil						
438 BEVILLE						
INDIANAPOLIS IN 46201						
Phone 3172238236						
Email FATHER2FATHER2019@GMAIL.COM						
Submitter Information						
DeWayne Keeylen						
Father-to-Father Construction LLC 3420 N. Broadway Street						
3420 N. Broadway Street						
Indianapolis IN						
Phon∈ 3172238236						
Email Father2father2019@gmail.com						
Project Information						
Beville House						
438 Beville Ave						
Indianapolis IN 46201						
County MARION						
Project Type New Addition Alteration Y Existing Change of Occupancy						
Project Status U F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled						
IDHS Issued Correction order? No Has Violation been Issued? yes						
<u>Violation Issued by:</u> LBD						
Violation Issued by: LBD Local Building Official						
Local Building Official Phone: 3172238236 Email: planreview.class1@indy.gov						
Local Building Official Phone: 3172238236 Email: planreview.class1@indy.gov Local Fire Official						
Local Building Official Phone: 3172238236 Email: planreview.class1@indy.gov						

Variance Deta	<u>ills</u>						
Code Name:							
	R302.1(1)						
Conditions:	No operable windows are allowed within three feet from a property line per R3021(1). Both sides of the residence are within three feet of the property line according to the mapping system.						
DEMOI	NSTRATION 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:	About half of the windows wet already framed but you could see were the original windows were. With the understanding that this home is very old and the standards were different when the home was built; the upstairs windows were about 18¿ inches from the ground which was a safety hazard. So the windows that were installed were installed today¿s standards. The original size of the windows installed there would be an issue due to the windows being 18¿ inches from the floor. We were informed of new requirements which halted the progress of the job. Windows cannot be changes on a house that is within 3 foot of the property line, previous windows are a hazard for persons residing in the home. Currently, the windows have been changed and the variance is needed so windows can be replaced with the existing size windows so upstairs bedroom can be considered bedrooms.						
DEMONS	STRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:						
Y	Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of physical limitations of the construction site or its utility services.						
Υ	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.						
Υ	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 only other option is to tear down the home and rebuild it more than 3 feet from the property line which is an exceptionally difficult hardship. The owner doesn¿t possess the financial resources to rebuild an existing structure to meet the current window requirement. Additionally, the owner of the home is the owner of the vacant lot attached to the property so, he can assure any structure built will move further away from existing structure.						

Variance Details

Code Name: 2020 IRC

Table R302.1(1)

Conditions:

No operable windows are allowed within three feet from a property line per R302.1(1). Both sides of this residence are within three feet of the property line according to the mapping

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= 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:

The windows; placements are original to the home; s build date; therefore, the windows were not moved or enclosed due to the rooms being bedrooms. The replacement windows are safer due to new window materials. Additionally creating a smaller window encasement created a safer placement of the window from the floor to window measurement.

The owner is remodeling an existing structure for home rental; therefore enclosing the windows would prohibit rental capacity. Additionally relocating the walls of the home to be in compliance with the code would require the structure to be rebuilt rather than remodeled or rehabilitated. The process of rebuilding to be in compliance would create a financial burden the owner could not incur.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

Υ	Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of physical limitations of the construction site or its utility services.
Υ	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.
Υ	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 windows; placements are original to the home; s build date. The windows were not moved or enclosed due to the rooms being bedrooms. The owner is remodeling an existing structure for home rental; therefore enclosing the windows would prohibit rental capacity. Additionally relocating the walls of the home to be in compliance with the code would require the structure to be rebuilt rather than remodeled or rehabilitated. The process of rebuilding to be in compliance would create a financial burden the owner could not incur. As checked above the imposition of the rule would result in undue hardship because of excessive costs.