Owner / Applicant Information

Robert Grossman
State of Indiana
402 WEST WASHINGTON STREET

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46204

Phone 3172323016

Email RGROSSMAN@IDOA.IN.GOV

Submitter Information

Derek Holman
RTM Consultants, Inc.
6640 Parkdale Pl Suite J

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email dholman@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

JEFFREY JUSTICE
Hafer PSC
21 Southeast Third St.

Evansville IN

Phone 8124224187

Email jjustice@haferdesign.com

Project Information

New Lodge Potato Creek State Park
25601 SR 4

NORTH LIBERTY IN 46554

County ST JOSEPH

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: 5742359554 Email: rjames@southbendin.gov

Local Fire Official

Phone: 5742359554 Email: libertytwpfd@yahoo.com

Variance Details

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

2014 InBC Section 708.4

Conditions: The sleeping unit separation walls and corridor walls do not fully extend to the deck above but terminate at the underside of the structural beams in several locations in the basement level . Code requires that fire partitions extend to the underside of the deck above or to a fire rated ceiling/floor assembly.

The project consists of the new Potato Creek State Park Lodge. The lodge will include banquet and conference facilities, a restaurant, office spaces, game room, library, gift shop, aquatic center and guest rooms. The area in question occurs in the basement level of the guest rooms. This area is of Type IIB construction, R-1 Occupancy and a total of 3 stories in height. The lodge is provided with automatic sprinkler protection throughout.

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. The beams will be provided with an intumescent coating providing a fire rating greater than that required for the fire partitions.

2. The fire partitions are only required to be provided with a 30-minute fire rating since the facility is provided with an automatic sprinkler system throughout.

3. A fire rated joint system will be provided where the fire partition meets the beam and where the beam connects to the deck above. The required fire rating will be continuous to the deck above.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

[Y] 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 walls in question have already been framed and drywalled. MEP systems are installed in the throughout the ceiling spaces creating difficulties in re-framing the walls. Imposition of the rule would require taking down several MEP systems and the current walls in order to re-frame the walls in way to go around the beams. The intumescent coatings being provided on the beams provide a greater fire rating than the required fire rating of 30 minutes. The required fire rating will be continuous to the deck above. The proposed design will not be adverse to public health or safety.