Owner / Applicant Information					
Mark Tarner					
The South Bend Development Corporation					
3300 Sample Street					
South Bend IN 46619					
Phon∈ 5749930156					
Email mtarner@sbchocolate.com					
Submitter Information					
Timothy Callas					
J & T Consulting, LLC					
8220					
INDIANAPOLIS IN					
Phon∈ 3178894300					
Email tcallas@jtconsult.us					
<u>Designer Information</u>					
Tyler kelsey					
Kelsey Architecture and Design, Inc.					
105 East Jefferson BLVD					
South Bend IN					
Phon∈ 5748556230					
Email tkelsey@kaad-studio.com					
Project Information					
SBCC Factory and Museum					
24672 US 20 HWY					
South Bend IN 46628					
County ST JOSEPH					
Project Type New Y Addition Alteration Existing Change of Occupancy					
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: 5742359554 Email: cbulot@southbendin.gov					
Local Fire Official  Phone: F7432F0FF4 Fmail: fredrigu@couthbondin.gov					
Phone: 5742359554 Email: frodrigu@southbendin.gov					

## Variance Details

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

2014 IBC 706.1

Conditions:

A new Chocolate production, food service, warehouse (storage does not exceed 12 feet) and museum building of Type IIB construction, 60,000 sf, kitchen and process area will be separated (refer to drawing with close spaced sprinkler water curtain design per NFPA 13 Section 11.3.3.1 in lieu of the required 4 hour fire wall. The reason for the separation is based upon allowable per Table 503 as the building has mixed uses including A-2 and A-3 Occupancies. The separation provides allowable area compliance on both sides of the separation. See variance supplemental sheet

## 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

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 be protected throughout with an automatic fire suppression system per NFPA 13, 2010 Edition.
- 2. The kitchen area will be separated from process area with close spaced sprinklers maximum 6¿-0¿ on center designed as water curtain that will be hydraulically designed to provide a discharge of 3 gpm per lineal foot of water curtain, with no

sprinklers discharging less than 15 gpm. Sprinklers will be located to protect full length and height of metal wall that separates kitchen and process area.

- 3. Building will be provided with an automatic fire alarm system per NFPA 72
- 4. Variances have been approved in the past for this issue as follows: 15-04-61, 19-07-56, 14-05-39, 16-11-51, 14-10-54, 15-04-66 and others.

## 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.
Υ	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 owner's undue hardship involves the wall that separates the kitchen and process area has double acting doors, process piping and other manufacturing systems that penetrate the wall that would render a fire wall useless.