Owner / Applicant Information
Renee C Harp
Graph Paper Dreams PO 158
1 6 136
RICHMOND IN 47374
Phon∈ 7038648624
Email RENEECHRISTINEHARP@GMAIL.COM
Submitter Information
Dennis W Bradshaw
Fire Protection & Code Consultants, LLC 1520 Main Street
1320 Main Sireet
Indianapolis IN
Phon∈ 3174865188
Email dennisb@fpccllc.com
Designer Information
Gerald C South
Maze Design, Inc. 124 South 8th Street
124 30uii1 oii1 3ii eet
Richmond IN
Phon∈ 7659621300
Email di@mazedesigninc.com
Project Information
Graph Paper Dreams 825 North E Street
023 NOTH E Street
Richmond IN 47374
County WAYNE
Project Type New Addition Alteration Existing Change of Occupancy Y
Project Status U F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled
IDHS Issued Correction order? No Has Violation been Issued? No
Violation Issued by: NA
Local Building Official
Phone: 7659837434 Email: ajordan@richmondindiana.gov Local Fire Official
Phone: 7659837434 Email: dgardner@richmondindiana.gov

Variance Details

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

3412.7, 2014 IBC

Conditions:

A portion of the first floor of an existing two story building is proposed to change occupancy and will be evaluated using Section 3412 of the 2014 Indiana Building Code in lieu of compliance with all of the requirements for new construction for the proposed change of occupancy. The code requires the final score to be zero or more in all categories in order to pass the evaluation. An existing 2,285 square feet M occupancy space on the first floor will be converted to an art gallery (A-3). The variance request is to permit an additional 5 points for the Fire Safety Score for the new A-3 occupancy.

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

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

- 1. An automatic fire alarm system will be installed throughout the building, this is not required for new construction.
- 2. A smoke detection system connected to the fire alarm system will be provided throughout the building, this is not required for new construction.
- 3. Emergency egress lighting and exit signs will be provided with emergency power.
- 4. The basement will not be occupied and will be for service of the building only. Height of the basement is extremely low making it unsuitable for use other than building service.
- 5. The maximum travel distance to an exit is approximately 66 feet, the code permits 200 feet for new construction.
- Similar variance request were granted for variances: 19-04-55, 18-06-38, 18-04-33, 17-12-29 and 17-04-61.

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.
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:	Imposition of the rule would prohibit this proposed project. The shortage of points is attributable to a scoring anomaly embedded in the Section 3412 scoring mechanics for this type of building and occupancy. There is very little credit given for an automatic fire alarm system.