Owner / Applicant Information						
Dave Dazey						
EVAPAR						
9000 N KENTUCKY AVE						
EVANSVILLE IN 47725						
Phon∈ 8128679900						
Email DDAZEY@EVAPAR.COM						
Submitter Information						
Roger Lehman						
RLehman Consulting						
1220 N Red Bank Rd						
Evansville IN						
Phone 8125890331						
Email rlehmanconsulting@gmail.com						
Designer Information						
XXX						
Phon€						
Email						
Project Information						
Office Mezzanine Expansion 9000 N Kentucky Ave						
7000 N Kentucky Ave						
Evansville IN 47725						
County VANDERBURGH						
Project Type New Addition Y Alteration Existing Change of Occupancy						
Project Status U F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled						
Violation Issued by: NA						
Local Building Official						
Phone: 8124367868 Email: rbeane@evansville.in.gov						
Local Fire Official						
Discuss 01040/70/0						
Phone: 8124367868 Email: nick.adams@mccutchanvillefire.org						

Variance Deta	<u>iils</u>						
Code Name:							
Conditions:							
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= 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:							
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.						
	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:							

## Variance Details

Code Name: 12-4-12 Existing Buildings; Additions or Alterations

2014 IBC Table 706.4

Conditions:

Existing Type II F1/S1/B Building is over allowable area and the section of the building containing the 2nd floor office expansion area is only separated from rest of the S1/F1 building by 2 hr. fire barrier in lieu of 3 hr. fire wall.

F1/S1 areas are used to assemble new electric generators to customers specifications.

	90% of components are steel or iron.						
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:	F1 and S1 Areas are very close to F2/S2 requirements but a small amount of plastic parts and a small supply of wet cell storage batteries prevent classification as F2/S2 which would not be over area and would be able to meet unseparated use requirements.  Motor testing room is also separated by 2 hr fire barrier.  Area is staffed by trained workers familiar with exiting and conditions of space.						
DEMON	STRATION 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.						
Υ	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.						
Υ	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:	constructing a self supporting wall in this area would be very difficult as the building is in use and cannot be shut down.  Project is only considered an addition because an existing 1500 sq ft office mezzanine area is being expanded to add 3-4 more offices.  Adding free standing wall and parapet would cost about 25% of the whole project budget.						