

Owner / Applicant Information

Amar Patel
Intech Hospitality, LLC
1125 EXECUTIVE CIRCLE
SUITE 220
IRVING TX 75038
Phone 2142083220
Email AMAR.PATEL@CWHMGMGT.COM

Submitter Information

Melissa Tupper
RTM Consultants, Inc.
6640 Parkdale Place
Suite J
Indianapolis IN
Phone 3173297700
Email tupper@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Matthew Amore
Cripe
3939 Priority Way S Drive
Suite 200
Indianapolis IN
Phone 3177066317
Email mamore@cripe.biz

Project Information

TRU Hotel - Intech Park
6725 Intech Blvd

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46278

County MARION

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

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

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

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)
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 hotel, R-1 Occupancy, of Type VA construction, and will be sprinklered.

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.

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

This variance has been granted numerous times.

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 two new elevators in the new hotel. An elevator with four or more stops requires hoistway venting where the building contains an R Occupancy.

The project involves a new 4-story hotel, R-1 Occupancy, of Type VA construction, and will be sprinklered.

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 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.

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.