

Owner / Applicant Information

Lisa Fast  
LISA & VERLYN FAST  
5074 EAST 550 SOUTH  
  
LAFAYETTE IN 47905  
Phone 6053104871  
Email LISAFASTSTAMPS@GMAIL.COM

Submitter Information

Patrick Grimes  
Cube & Company  
302 Ferry Street  
  
Lafayette IN  
Phone 7652694321  
Email pgrimes@cubeandco.com

Designer Information

George Wahl  
The Wahl Architecture Studio, LLC  
101 North 6th Street  
  
LAFAYETTE IN  
Phone 7654295880  
Email kurtw@wahlarch.com

Project Information

AGRICULTURAL EXHIBIT HALL  
5074 E 550 S

LAFAYETTE IN 47905

County TIPPECANOE

Project Type New ☒ Y Addition ☐ Alteration ☐ Existing ☐ Change of Occupancy ☐

Project Status ☒ F F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled

IDHS Issued Correction order? ☐ Has Violation been Issued? ☐

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)  
2014 IBC Table 1004.1.2

Conditions: 

The calculated occupant load per Table 1004.1.2 is over 425 persons based on 15 sf per person.

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: 

The owners will self-impose the maximum load for the entire building to 297 persons.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

Y

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: 

With only 2 exits required for the occupant load, a total of 5 code compliant exits will be required for the building. A monitored fire alarm will be installed throughout to assist with early notification and evacuation of the building.

Variance Details

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

2014 IBC 903.2.1.2

Conditions: A sprinkler system will not be provided in the event building and the occupant load will be limited to 297. The above code requires a fire sprinkler system when the occupant load for a Group A-2 occupancy exceeds 100 persons.

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 monitored fire alarm with full smoke and heat detection, horn/strobes and pull stations will be installed (not required).  
2. Five code compliant exits will be provided out of the space (2 required).  
3. An adjacent pond on the property will be provided with fire department access and a dry-hydrant for fire department use.  
4. Fire extinguishers will be installed at all exits.  
5. Similar variances have been approved in the past.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

☒ Y

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 hardship is the excessive cost of installing a fire sprinkler system which would require the installation of a water storage tank and fire pump. The nearest fire hydrant to this property is over 2 miles away. The installation of the fire alarm along with the other proposed additions will provide an adequate level of safety and cost approximately 1/5 the cost of the fire sprinkler system.

This is similar to 19-02-34 and 19-02-39

