

Owner / Applicant Information

Michael E Millikan

359 W BAKER STREET

FORT WAYNE IN 46802

Phone 2604332763

Email MMILLIKAN60@GMAIL.COM

Project Information

Building at 359 W Baker St
359 W Baker St

Fort Wayne 46802

County ALLEN

Project Type New Addition Alteration Existing Change of Occupancy

Project Status U F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled

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

Violation Issued by: LFD

Local Building Official

Phone:

Email:

Local Fire Official

Phone:

Email:

Variance Details

Code Name: 2014 IFC
901.6.1

Conditions:

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

2

1=Non-compliance with the rule will not be adverse to the public health, safety or welfare.

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 system in question was in the building located at 359 W Baker St, Ft. Wayne, IN at the time of purchase but had been disconnected by the previous owners. This system was put in place by the previous owners as a combination burglar/security/fire unit. It has been non-functional since the time of purchase, December 2000. All other aspects regarding the fire safety for the building located at 359 W Baker St are up to code.

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 system in question is over 19 years old, it was disconnected by the previous owners and has not been functional since. The cost to make the system in question in working order would be an extreme financial hardship.