Owner / Applicant Information

Graham Bullmore
LEO@Carmel LLC
17501 BISCAYNE BLVD, #300

AVENTURA FL 33160

Phone 3054691275

Email GBULLMORE@ADVENIRAZORA.COM

Submitter Information

Edwin Rensink
RTM Consultants Inc
6640 Parkdale Place

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email rensink@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Louis Nequette
Nequette Architecture & Design
2227 2nd Avenue North

Birmingham AL

Phone 2053297085

Email louis@nequette.com

Project Information

LEO at Carmel
East 146th Street and Community Drive - SW Corner

Carmel IN 46033

County HAMILTON

Project Type New [Y] 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: 3175712444 Email: whohlt@carmel.in.gov

Local Fire Official

Phone: 3175712444 Email: cfdinspections@carmel.in.gov

Variance Details

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

3004.1, 2014 IBC

Conditions: Elevator hoistway venting will not be provided for the elevator serving the residential floors of the buildings 11, 12, and 13. An elevator with four (4) or more stops requires hoistway venting where the building contains an R Occupancy.

The buildings are 4 stories in height, and Type VA Construction. Building 11 is mixed-use, with commercial tenant spaces included on the 1st floor and R -2 Occupancy on all floors. Buildings 12 and 13 are R-2 Occupancy on all floors.

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 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 25-03-24, 25-03-10k, 25-01-05h, 25-01-37d, 24-07-05d, 25-05-61i, 24-03-60g, 23-04-29g, 22-05-19c, 22-04-36d, 22-02-27, 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 is 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.

Variance Details

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

1007.8, 2014 IBC

Conditions: The 2-way communication system will not be provided at elevator landings on the upper floors of each of the three (3) 4-story buildings. The system is required on each accessible floor that is one story above or one story below the level of exit discharge.

Building 11 is mixed-use, with commercial tenant spaces included on the 1st floor and R -2 Occupancy on all floors. Buildings 12 and 13 are R-2 Occupancy on all floors. The buildings 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 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. Cell phones are widely used for communication, and will provide a more readily available means of communication for the purpose intended.

2. Similar variances have been previously granted, including 25-05-61a, 25-05-33a, 25-04-06, 25-04-40b, 25-01-04, 25-01-05g, 25-01-19g, 25-03-24, 25-03-30b, 25-01-42, 25-01-91, 24-12-38a, 25-03-24, 25-01-42, 24-07-05h, 24-05-61g, 24-03-60h, 24-02-29f, 23-02-19a, 22-12-90e, 22-07-53d, 22-05-70d, 22-05-19d, 22-04-32d, 20-04-40, 20-04-39, 20-04-38, 20-04-10, 20-04-09, 20-02-54e, 20-01-57b, 19-09-69c, 19-09-68a, 19-09-47a, 19-07-45d, 19-07-23, 19-06-54d, 19-06-51c, 19-05-68, 18-08-43a, 18-06-60a, 18-03-32a, 17-10-13, 17-03-82d, 17-06-38d, 16-09-71d, 15-09-73, 17-02-52a, 17-06-52e, 17-09-62f, and others.

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: The 2-way communication system would likely never be used.