

Owner / Applicant Information

Mary Cassidy  
Park Tudor College  
7200 N. COLLEGE AVE

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46240

Phone 3174152853

Email MCASSIDY@PARKTUDOR.ORG

Submitter Information

David Cook, RA, NCARB  
Ralph Gerdes Consultants, LLC  
5510 South East Street

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3177873750

Email dave@rgc-codes.com

Designer Information

William Payne, AIA  
Fanning/Howey Associates, Inc.  
350 East New York Street

Indianapolis 0

Phone 3178480966

Email wpayne@fhai.com

Project Information

Ayres Auditorium Lobby Renovation and Addition  
7200 N. College Ave

Indianapolis IN 46240

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)

InBC - 2014 Sec 507.4

Conditions: Due to existing conditions, a new addition of approximately 1600 sq ft to an existing high school, of approximately 133,000 sq ft, cannot use the unlimited area provisions for an E use group, which the existing school is designed under. The first condition is the building has less than the required 60 feet of open yard space for a small length of exterior the building. The distance to an adjacent school sprinklered school building is approx. 48 ft, and the wall length is approx. 42 ft. The second condition is the attic area over the auditorium is not sprinklered. The roof truss members are composite (steel web members, with wood top and bottom cords) with a wood deck. Code requires for an unlimited area E use group, to have both, 60 ft of open yard space around the building, and be sprinklered throughout when required by NFPA 13.

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. All of the existing school building (except for the attic area over the existing auditorium) is currently protected, and the new addition will be protected, throughout by an automatic fire suppression system per NFPA 13.  
2. The open yard space condition is approx. less than 48 ft, for a distance of 42 ft to an adjacent school, that is completely sprinklered by an automatic fire suppression system per NFPA 13  
3. The auditorium is separated from the classroom portion by an existing 3 hour fire barrier.  
4. The attic area of the auditorium does have a heat detection system, that will be maintained.  
5. The addition of approx. 1600 sq ft, or 1.2% of the overall existing building of approx. 133,000 sq ft.  
6. NFPA 80A - 2012 Edition, sections 5.6.2 and 5.6.3 state where exposing buildings are protected by an approved and maintained automatic fire suppression system...no exposure hazard should be considered to exist. Additionally, where the exposed buildings are protected by an approved and maintained automatic fire suppression system...the exposure hazard to the total exposed building and its contents should be considered to be substantially reduced.  
7. Many similar variances have been approved for similar school existing non compliance challenges. (CG Natatorium Addition 19-12-99, Westfield Middle School 18-02-21, CG Student Activity 16-07-51, CG HS Music 16-03-46, CG HS Renovations 14-07-49)

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 owner's undue hardship involves the cost and difficulty of the two existing conditions that would be costly, if not difficult, to achieve complete code compliance.

Variance Details

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

InBC - 2014 507.4

Conditions: (Variance on a Variance 99-3-11) An existing unlimited area high school was added onto, with this previous variance, to continue the unlimited area provisions. The existing condition, was the new addition in 1999 was due to the lowest level had portions of it's perimeter wall exposed above grade for a height that exceeded the 12 ft limit for a basement, by 8" at two door locations, thus making the entire building a three story building, instead of two (2) stories with a basement. The Code limits unlimited area E use groups building to a maximum of two (2) story.

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. All of the existing school building (except for the attic area over the existing auditorium, see additional variance) is currently protected, and the new addition will be protected, throughout by an automatic fire suppression system per NFPA 13.
2. The addition is approximately 1600 sq ft, or 1.2% of the overall approximately 133,000 sq ft. It does not affect the existing situation.
3. The auditorium, and its addition, is separated from the existing school by an existing 3 hour fire barrier.
4. The lowest level is in non compliance by the exposed perimeter of the existing basement exceeding the 12 ft allowed by just 8" at two door locations.
6. Previous similar variances for three story unlimited schools have been approved, one for this school 99-3-11, and Goshen HS 19-03-21, 14-08-53, and B96-9-19

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 owner's undue hardship is the fact they have an existing school, which received a variance for compliance, and requires another variance to maintain compliance. Additionally, the cost of providing 4 hour structurally independent fire walls between the addition and the existing to maintain compliance with a variance is not cost effective, given the existing 3 hour fire barrier.