Owner / Applicant Information

Josette Rider
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Northeast Indiana
1005 WEST RUDISELL BOULEVARD

FORT WAYNE IN 46807

Phone 2604561600

Email JOSETTE.RIDER@BBBSNEI.ORG

Submitter Information

Edwin Rensink
RTM Consultants Inc
6640 Parkdale Place

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email rensink@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Chris Stine, AIA
Design Collaborative
200 East Main Street

Fort Wayne IN

Phone 2604224241

Email cstine@designcollaborative.com

Project Information

Big Brothers Big Sisters North River
200 6th Street

Fort Wayne IN 46808

County ALLEN

Project Type New [ ] Addition [Y] Alteration [Y] Existing [ ] Change of Occupancy [Y]

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: [2604497131] Email: [joseph.hutter@co.allen.in.us]

Local Fire Official

Phone: [2604497131] Email: [jim.murua@cityoffortwayne.org]

Variance Details

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

1004.1.2, 2014 IBC

Conditions: The 2nd floor event space will have a posted occupant load of 300 in lieu of a calculated occupant load. The calculated occupant load is 449 when considering the entire floor area of the space. The variance request is to permit a posted maximum occupant load of 300. The variance is requested in order to permit the building to be evaluated per Chapter 16 as a Risk Category II versus Risk Category III. An attachment to the online variance filing which explains rationale for the variance based upon the 2012 IBC Commentary, a 2021 IBC code change, and the commentary to ASCE 7, 2010 Edition.

The project will convert the building for use as new headquarters for Big Brothers and Big Sisters, including gathering areas, offices, a 2nd floor event space, and related functions. The project also proposes an addition on the southwest corner of the building consisting of a stair and elevator with a small lobby. The addition will connect the 1st and 2nd floors and extend to serve a rooftop deck area. The east half of the building was constructed in 1896, with masonry exterior walls and wood floor and roof structure. The west half was added in 1929, with masonry exterior walls and concrete building structure. The building is evaluated per Chapter 34 as non-separated occupancies - A-2, A-3, B, and S-1 Occupancies. The building is Type IIIB Construction. The building 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. Per the attached floor plans, the space will be set up for a maximum of 288 in a table-and-chair setup. Request for up to 300 accounts for service staff.

2. The exception to this section in the model code (deleted in Indiana) permits an occupant load less than that determined by calculation where approved by the building official. The 2026 Indiana Building draft as proposed will retain the model code language permitting a reduced occupant load where approved by the building official.

3. The design, including existing building components comply with IBC requirements for seismic design per Sec. 1613.5.3, IBC, regardless of occupant load or Risk Category. Wind design will comply with Risk Category II.

4. Similar variances have been granted to permit an actual occupant load in lieu of a calculated occupant load under a variety of circumstances including 24-08-54, 25-01-09, 25-12-25, 24-06-18, 23-10-77, 25-01-09, 25-10-50, 24-08-17, 26-07-12, 25-04-72, 23-09-16, 22-12-04b, 23-04-07, 21-06-01a, 21-08-53j, 21-10-38b, 20-09-03a, 19-12-63a, 16-01-28, 23-04-7, 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.

[ ] 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:	Though compliant with IBC requirements for seismic design per Sec. 1613.5.3, the existing building does not meet requirements for wind design for a Risk Category III (but will for a Risk Category II as requested). A significant degree of structural bracing would be required for RC III, which cannot be easily accommodated in the existing construction. Of note, the existing building has performed well over time since constructed in 1896 and 1924 with no adverse incidents during all weather events over the 100+ year historical time frame.