

Owner / Applicant Information

Russell Louderback  
White Legacy Properties LLC  
701 EAST 83RD STREET

MERRILLVILLE IN 46410

Phone 2194722407

Email RLOUDERBACK@WHITELODGING.COM

Submitter Information

Edwin Rensink  
RTM Consultants Inc  
6640 Parkdale Place

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email rensink@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

David Rausch, AIA  
David J Rausch Studio  
170 South Main Street

Zionsville IN

Phone 3178734970

Email david@davidrausch.com

Project Information

JW Marriott Lobby and HV Restaurant Renovation  
10 South West Street

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?  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)

1004.1.2, 2014 IBC

Conditions: A posted occupant load of 49 maximum will be provided in the private dining space created as part of the renovation in lieu of a calculated occupant load. Based upon an area of 964 sq ft and an occupant load factor of 15 sq ft per person for less-concentrated assembly use, the calculated occupant load is 65. The exception to this section in the model code (deleted in Indiana) would permit an occupant load less than that determined by calculation where approved by the building official. Per the attached exhibits, the room will be arranged in a variety of configurations for either dining options or as a boardroom meeting space.

The project scope involves renovation of the 1st floor restaurants and lobby, as well as other exterior improvements to the building. The building is classified as Type IA Construction (with high rise reductions per Sec. 403.2.1.1, IBC), with an NFPA 13 sprinkler system installed throughout.

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

1

1=Non-compliance with the rule will not be adverse to the public health, safety or welfare.

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. Based upon the proposed configurations of the space per the attached exhibit, actual maximum seating count will be 42. The potential configurations include a large dining table with 24 seats, 4-tops and 4-tops/2-tops configurations with 40 seats, round tables with 40 seats, and a board room configuration with 42 seats.
2. The design intent of a private dining room is to create a particular dining experience, as opposed to maximizing the number of seats in a public dining area. A high end private dining room experience includes oversized furniture, aisles, and accessory tables that occupy a disproportionate amount of floor area.
3. The exception to Sec. 1004.1.2 in the model code (deleted in Indiana) would permit an occupant load less than that determined by calculation for areas without fixed seats where approved by the building official.
4. Maximum egress travel distance to an exterior exit is approximately 73 feet - code permits up to 250 feet. The building is protected with a sprinkler system throughout per NFPA 13.
5. Similar variances have been granted previously for a posted occupant load in areas without fixed seats a variety of circumstances, including 19-12-63a, 18-08-28, 18-07-37b, 18-03-66, 17-06-24b, and 16-01-28.

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 require a 2nd means of egress from the space, which cannot be easily accommodated based upon the configuration of the restaurant space.

Variance Details

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

Table 601, 2014 IBC

Conditions: The structural frame and roof deck for the approximately 450 sq ft exterior patio canopy will not be fire-rated. A fire-resistive rating is required by virtue of being considered additional building area to the existing Type IA building. Based upon Type IA Construction (with high rise reductions per Sec. 403.2.1.1, IBC), a 1-hour rating is required for the roof and supporting structure.

The project scope involves renovation of the 1st floor restaurants and lobby, as well as other exterior improvements to the building. The building is classified as Type IA Construction (with high rise reductions per Sec. 403.2.1.1, IBC), with an NFPA 13 sprinkler system installed throughout.

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

- 1 1=Non-compliance with the rule will not be adverse to the public health, safety or welfare.
- 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 canopy will be provided with sprinkler protection per NFPA 13, utilizing dry sidewall sprinklers.

2. The canopy is an open-air structure without surrounding walls on two (2) adjoining sides.

3. Based upon the open-air nature of the structure and the provision of automatic sprinkler protection, the lack of a fire rating for the structure will not be adverse to safety.

4. A similar variance was granted for a covered patio on the Indianapolis Downtown Marriott-17-10-35.

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.

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 require fireproofing of exterior structural elements, which would be a costly and unnecessary expense based upon the lack of hazard. Additionally the design intent is for exposed structure, as is typical for exterior patio canopies.