

Owner / Applicant Information

Jerry B Wade
Mad Paddle Brewery
301 WEST STREET

MADISON IN 47250

Phone 6122106420

Email JERRY@WADEFAMILY.COM

Submitter Information

Edwin Rensink
RTM Consultants Inc
6640 Parkdale Place

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email rensink@rtmconsultants.com

Project Information

Mad Paddle Brewery
301 West Street

Madison IN 47250

County JEFFERSON

Project Type New ☐ Addition ☐ 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:

Email:

Local Fire Official

Phone:

Email:

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
903.2.1.2, 2014 IBC

Conditions: This variance request is intended to supersede Variance 18-09-46, requesting modified dates for completion of the sprinkler system within the building. The request is to permit installation of the sprinkler system within the 1st floor tasting room and in the basement prior to occupancy of the Phase I area (original approval was for 11-1-18 completion), and to permit the balance of the building to be protected prior to occupancy of the Phase II portion of the building (original approval was for 12-31-18 completion).
This building is an historic structure built in the 1870's as a feed mill-grain elevator. The building has since been used for a variety of commercial and industrial uses. The building is 3 stories in height with a partial basement, and is of brick exterior wall and wood floor-roof construction. A 1st floor tasting area is being developed as part of the Phase I project. The Phase 1 area is a brew pub area on the 1st floor with a table-and-chair seating area for a calculated occupant load of 48. The Phase II portion of the project will develop additional portions of the building for brewery, distillery, restaurant and event use.

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. A maximum occupant load of 48 will be posted in the public portion of the 1st floor brew pub Phase I tasting area. Maximum travel distance will be approximately 50 ft to an exit. Two (2) exterior exits will be provided as indicated.
2. Revision of the date for Phase I sprinkler protection will not be adverse to safety, since the Phase I area will not be occupied until sprinkler protection is complete and operational in this area.
3. The remainder of the building will be unoccupied for any public use until sprinkler protection is complete throughout 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.

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.

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 original variance was requested based upon an anticipated opening date for Phase I in the September-October time frame. As of the filing date of this variance request, the space remains under construction. The remainder of the building will be sprinklered as part of the Phase II project - providing sprinkler protection in the unoccupied areas of the building prior to design and build-out of these areas would result in modification of the system to accommodate the new plan, thus adding unnecessary cost to the project.

Variance Details

Code Name: 2010 NFPA 13 Installation of Sprinkler Systems (675 IAC 28-1-5)

8.15.1.1

Conditions: The existing unoccupied rooftop structures associated with the historic grain elevator operation in the building will not be provided with sprinkler protection. Based upon their classification per NFPA 13 as ¿combustible concealed spaces¿, sprinkler protection is required.

This building is an historic structure built in the 1870's as a feed mill-grain elevator. The building has since been used for a variety of commercial and industrial uses. The building is 3 stories in height with a partial basement, and is of brick exterior wall and wood floor-roof construction. A 1st floor tasting area is being developed as part of the Phase I project. The Phase II portion of the project will develop additional portions of the building for brewery, distillery, restaurant and event use.

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 will otherwise be provided with sprinkler protection throughout as part of the Phase I and Phase II development of the building.
2. Heat detectors will be provided within the concealed space, connected to the building fire alarm system.
3. The space will be unoccupied and will not be used for any purpose, including storage.
4. There will be no utilities within the space other than very minimal lighting with wiring in steel conduit for purpose of maintenance.
5. Access to the space will be provided only for maintenance personnel (roof leak, etc.).

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: Sprinkler protection within the space will require the use of a fire pump, significantly increasing the cost of sprinkler installation in the building.

