

Owner / Applicant Information

Seitz Troy  
General Hotels Corporation  
2501 SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL ROAD

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46241

Phone 3175561500

Email tseitz@hospitalityprojectservices.com

Submitter Information

Edwin Rensink  
RTM Consultants Inc  
6640 Parkdale Place

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email rensink@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Sam Miller  
Cripe Architects and Engineers  
3939 Priority Way South Drive

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3177066314

Email smiller@cripe.biz

Project Information

Home2 Suites  
9124 South Calumet

Munster IN 46321

County LAKE

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: The calculated occupant load for the pool is 84, based upon a pool area of 492 sq ft (at 50 sq ft per person), and a net deck area of 1,100 sq ft (at 15 sq ft per person). The variance request is to permit a posted occupant load of 49 in lieu of designing to a calculated occupant load for the purpose of Occupancy classification. The intended design is to classify the room as an accessory small assembly room with an occupant load of less than 50 occupants per Sec. 303.1.2, IBC. Classification as an A-3 Occupancy would require a 2-hour occupancy separation, whereas classification as a small assembly space per Sec. 303.1.2 permits classification as part of the R-1 Occupancy.

The project is a 4-story hotel, with typical guest amenities on the 1st floor including breakfast area, fitness room, and small indoor pool. The building will be of Type VA Construction.

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 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 layout of the space, an occupant load of 50 or more cannot be reasonably accommodated. The deck area is designed with seating for 16 occupants on the deck - see attached furnishing plan.

2. The occupant load factors for pools accommodate all types of pools, including large pools with sunning decks, etc. The actual occupant load in this case will be significantly less than the occupant load derived by calculation.

3. The building is protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system per NFPA 13R, with nonresidential areas including the pool protected as required per NFPA 13.

4. A similar variance (though for a different purpose) was granted for the indoor pool for the Home2 Suites project in Indianapolis - 15-08-11. Other variances have been granted for a posted occupant load for small assembly spaces, 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.
- 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: Hardship is providing a 2-hour occupancy separation for the pool given the wood-frame construction, which would be required given the 2-story height restriction for nonseparated R-1 and A-3 Occupancies. Additionally, glass door and sidelights are desired at the entrance to the pool for safety purposes.

Variance Details

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

3004.1, 2014 IBC

Conditions: Hoistway venting will not be provided for the elevators serving the upper floors of the 4-story hotel. An elevator with four (4) or more stops requires hoistway venting where the building contains an R Occupancy.

The project is a 4-story hotel, with typical guest amenities on the 1st floor including breakfast area, fitness room, and small indoor pool.

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 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:

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. Elevator hoistway vents, when opened, could potentially draw smoke and heat into the elevator hoistway.
4. The building will be protected with an automatic sprinkler system. Recent studies indicate that sprinklered buildings do not pose a threat for smoke and heat spread through elevator shafts.
5. Similar variances have been granted, including 20-02-54f, 20-01-57a, 19-12-63c, 19-10-48c, 19-09-69a, 19-09-68c, 19-08-96c, 19-07-17, 19-06-51b, 19-05-68, 19-04-53, 19-03-54c, 18-08-14c, 18-06-60f, 18-04-28, 18-04-25, 17-09-38b, 17-09-52, and 17-09-62d.

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:

Venting of elevator hoistways appears to be a vestige of decades-ago theories about smoke spread in nonsprinklered buildings. The intent of hoistway venting in previous codes is not clear. In addition to potentially drawing smoke into the hoistway from the building, hoistway venting also has a detrimental effect on energy conservation. In addition to potential adverse affects noted, hardship is the cost to install and maintain elevator vents.