Owner / Applicant Information
Michael E Millikan
359 W BAKER STREET
FORT WAYNE IN 46802
Phon∈ 2604332763
Email MMILLIKAN60@GMAIL.COM
<u>Project Information</u>
Building at 359 W Baker St
359 W Baker St
Fort Wayne 46802 County ALLEN
Project Type New Addition Alteration Y Existing Change of Occupancy
Project Status U F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled
IDHS Issued Correction order? yes Has Violation been Issued? yes
<u>Violation Issued by:</u> LFD
Local Building Official
Phone: 2604271478 Email: john.caywood@co.allen.in.us
Local Fire Official Phone: 2604271478 Email: Andrea.Burton@cityoffortwayne.org

## Variance Details

Code Name: 2014 IFC

901.6.1

"Further research needed in reference to fire alarm system (currently not working, may not be required). Fire Marshall will be notified. Future discussion will occur." Conditions:

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

	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.
DEMONS	STRATION 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:	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.

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