Owner / Applicant Information	
Piotr Kissel	
BHJ USA Inc.	
81 E. INDUSTRIAL BLVD.	
LOGANSPORT IN 46947	
Phon∈ 4026595074	
Email PKISSEL@BHJUSA.COM	
Submitter Information	
Melissa Tupper	
RTM Consultants, Inc.	
6640 Parkdale Place	
Indianapolis IN	
Phon∈ 3173297700	
Email tupper@rtmconsultants.com	
<u>Designer Information</u>	
Charles Stafford	
C. R. Stafford & Associates	
748 East Bates	
Indianapolis IN	
Phon∈ 3176301871	
Email dstafford@crs-arch.com	
Project Information	
Addition to BHJ USA Inc.	
81 E. Industrial Blvd.	
or E. maastrar biva.	
Logansport IN 46947	
County CASS	
Project Type New Addition Y Alteration Existing Change of Occupancy	
Project Status U F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled	
IDHS Issued Correction order? Has Violation been Issued?	
Violation Issued by: NA	
Local Building Official  Phone: F747524201   Free ill.   decompar@citruflegenement arg	
Phone: 5747534381 Email: doconnor@cityoflogansport.org  Local Fire Official	
Phone: 5747534381 Email: firechief@cityoflogansport.org	

<u>Variance Details</u>		
Code Name:	Other Code (Not in the list provided)	
	2014 IBC, 507.3	
Conditions:	The variance request is to permit the existing building and additions to be unlimited in area and have less than 60 feet of open yards on the South side of the building. The distance between the South wall of the addition to the property line will vary from approximately 27 feet at the east end to approximately 51 feet at the west end.	
	The existing building is Type IIB Construction, 1-story, and 67,890 sq.ft. The additions will be Type IIB Construction, 1-story, and 32,738 square feet. The existing building is sprinklered throughout, per NFPA 13. The additions will be sprinklered throughout, per NFPA 13.	
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 additions will be protected throughout by an automatic sprinkler system per NFPA 13. The existing building is sprinklered throughout per NFPA 13.	
	2. The existing building has a fire alarm system throughout which will be extended into the additions.	
	3. A fire department access road will be provided around the building.	
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:

The hardship is the cost and difficulty involved to provide a 4-hour fire wall between the addition and existing building.