Owner / Applicant Information

Seth Coffing
Bishop Luers High School
333 E. PAULDING RD.

FORT WAYNE IN 46816

Phone 2604561261

Email SCOFFING@BISHOPLUERS.ORG

Submitter Information

Timothy Callas
J & T Consulting, LLC
8220 Rob Lane

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3178894300

Email tcallas@jtconsult.us

Designer Information

Jack Daniel
MartinRiley Architects Engineers
221 W. Baker Street

Fort Wayne IN

Phone 2604227994

Email jdaniel@martin-riley.com

Project Information

BLHS Aux Gym & Renovation
333 E Paulding Rd

FORT WAYNE IN 46816

County ALLEN

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

Project Status [F] F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled

IDHS Issued Correction order? [No] Has Violation been Issued? [No]

Violation Issued by: NA

Local Building Official
Phone: [2604497672] Email: [joseph.hutter@co.allen.in.us]

Local Fire Official
Phone: [2604497672] Email: [jim.murua@cityoffortwayne.org]

Variance Details

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

2014 IBC -706.6.1

Conditions: An existing A-3/E Occupancy High School (not fire suppressed) of 91,262 sf of Type IIB construction will have an addition of 30,422 sf, Type IIB construction consisting of A-4 Occupancy Auxiliary Gym, weight room, locker rooms, performance stage, and support areas. The addition will be sprinklered throughout. The addition will be contiguous with the existing Gym exterior wall that is 4-hour rated construction (4-hour fire wall) consisting of multi-wythe masonry construction. Based upon the roof of the addition is at a lower elevation than the existing building this is considered a ¿stepped building¿ This requires the upper portion of the exterior wall to be 1-hour rated construction up to 15 feet above the lower roof. Openings within this area are required to be three-fourths (¾) rated. From the lower roof to bottom of windows is 8¿-3 1/4 ¿. The variance request is to not protect the windows based upon the addition with be fully sprinklered. Based upon existing building and addition allowable area a 4-hour fire wall is required to separate the addition from existing building.

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 addition will be protected with a fire suppression system throughout per NFPA 13, 2010 Edition.
2. The Wall between the addition and existing building is a 4-hour fire wall that extends 14 feet above lower roof. Code requires only 1-hour rated construction above lower roof. The existing door openings will be upgraded to 3-hour rated assemblies and other openings shown in photo will be removed and filled to match the 4-hour rating.
3. NFPA 80A-2012 Edition and 2027 Edition, section 5.6.3 states where exposing building is protected with a fire suppression system of adequate design for the hazard involved, no exposure hazard should be considered to exists.
4. With the 4-hour fire wall separation, addition provided with a fire suppression system, windows 8 feet from lower roof, no exposure hazard to existing openings and building, variance is not adverse to the safety and welfare of the occupants.

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: The owner's undue hardship involves the feasibility to remove and replace existing Gym windows with rated windows while no scope of work is proposed for this area. Additionally, based upon NFPA 80A there is no need to rate these openings based upon a fully sprinklered addition.