Owner / Applicant Information

Dr. Grant Nesbit
Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township
6501 SUNNYSIDE ROAD

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46326

Phone 3174237575

Email GRANTNESBIT@MSDLT.K12.IN.US

Submitter Information

Edwin Rensink
RTM Consultants Inc
6640 Parkdale Place

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email rensink@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Sarah Hempstead
Schmidt Associates
415 Massachusetts Ave

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3172636226

Email shempstead@schmidt-arch.com

Project Information

McKenzie Center for Innovation & Technology
7250 East 75th Street

Indianapolis IN 46256

County MARION

Project Type New [ ] Addition [Y] Alteration [Y] 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: 3173275544 Email: planreview.Class1@indy.gov

Local Fire Official

Phone: 3173275544 Email: david.carpenter@indy.gov

Variance Details

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

507.4, 2014 IBC

Conditions: The expanded building will not have 60 feet of separation for 11% of the building perimeter. 11% of the perimeter will have 42 feet of frontage along the east side of the site. Code requires 60 feet of space surrounding a building designed as unlimited area.

The project scope involves additions on 2 stories totaling 190,000 sq ft, and renovation of remaining existing area of 105,800 sq ft. Project scope also includes demolition of 50,200 sq ft of existing area. The project will create the McKenzie Center for Innovation & Technology, which will significantly expand career training opportunities. The building currently serves as the McKenzie Career Center. The original building was constructed in 1995, with additions in 1997, 2003, and 2016. The building is classified as Type IIB Construction and will be protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system.

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 building (existing and new) will be protected throughout with a sprinkler system per NFPA 13.

2. Existing fire access roads will be maintained around the perimeter of the building, including along the east side.

3. NFPA 80A, Protection of Buildings from Exterior Fire Exposures, states in Sec. 5.6.3 that where exposing buildings are protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system, no exposure hazard is considered to exist.

4. Based upon automatic sprinkler protection in the building, the minimum 42 feet of frontage, and fractional perimeter of the building lacking 60 feet of frontage, the proposed expansion of the building will not be adverse to safety.

5. Similar variances have been approved for lack of 60 feet of separation for school buildings, including 26-06-71, 25-02-23a, 20-02-06, 20-03-14, 16-01-19, 18-05-30, 18-02-21, 16-07-55, 16-07-59, and 16-07-60.

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: Hardship is the restricted site from east to west. The proposed construction cannot be placed on the site to meet the 60 feet of frontage based upon configuration of the site and maintaining existing building configuration.

Variance Details

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

1016.2, 2014 IBC

1010.2, 2014 IBC

Conditions: Maximum egress travel distance from the new 2nd floor addition will be 295 feet, exceeding code limit of 250 feet. See plan exhibit for location of areas exceeding 250 feet travel distance.

The project scope involves additions on 2 stories totaling 190,000 sq ft, and renovation of remaining existing area of 105,800 sq ft. Project scope also includes demolition of 50,200 sq ft of existing area. The project will create the McKenzie Center for Innovation & Technology, which will significantly expand career training opportunities. The building currently serves as the McKenzie Career Center. The original building was constructed in 1995, with additions in 1997, 2003, and 2016. The building is classified as Type IIB Construction and will be protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system.

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. Five (5) egress stairs will be provided from the 2nd floor, leading to multiple exterior exits in all directions on the 1st floor.

2. The existing building is protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system. The addition will also be sprinkler-protected.

3. The Indiana Building Code prior to adoption of the International Building Code in 2003 permitted egress travel distance of up to 325 feet in a sprinklered E Occupancy.

4. Similar variances have been granted for schools to permit travel distance of up to 325 feet and beyond since 2003, including 07-07-29a, 07-09-10, 08-03-13, 09-09-20, 12-09-18, 13-10-22, 14-01-64, 14-02-32, 16-07-51, 17-03-71, 18-02-28c, 18-07-43, 19-01-33, 20-04-32a, 20-06-85a, 21-03-33a, 21-10-52, 22-02-24b, 22-05-75, 23-03-55b, 23-05-61, 23-07-48a, 23-06-15, 24-06-18, 24-08-63, 25-01-81, 25-07-04, 26-01-05, 26-06-33, and 26-06-71.

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: Due to site restrictions and functional needs, the addition is situated as proposed. Based upon the proposed configuration of the addition along the south end of the existing building, it is not feasible to meet the 250-ft limit for the portion of the 2nd story as indicated.