

Owner / Applicant Information

Jason Chupp  
New Horizon Conversions  
8324 W 800 N

NAPPANEE IN 46550

Phone 5746462121

Email NEWHORIZONS.2010@YAHOO.COM

Submitter Information

Carrie Ballinger  
RTM Consultants, Inc.  
6640 Parkdale Place, Ste J

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email ballinger@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Mark Barr  
Barr Design Group  
502 S Main St

Goshen IN

Phone 5745346531

Email mark@barrdesigngroup.com

Project Information

New Horizon Conversions  
8324 W 800 N

Nappanee IN 46550

County KOSCIUSKO

Project Type New ☐ 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:

Email:

Local Fire Official

Phone:

Email:



Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)  
2014 IBC Section 508.4.2

Conditions: The area of an S-1 Occupancy storage addition plus F-1 Occupancy existing woodworking facility will exceed the allowable area based upon the sum of the ratios for separated occupancies without sprinklers. The allowable area for the S-1 Occupancy is 15,750 sf, the actual area is 6,000 sf. The allowable area for the F-1 Occupancy is 14,875 sf, the actual area is 12,728 sf. The sum of the ratios is 1.23; code requires the sum of the ratios to be a maximum of 1.

The project involves a 6,000 sf storage addition to an existing 12,728 sf woodworking facility that was given a permit in 2007 without sprinklers. The building is Type VB construction, and has a total of approximately 18,728 sf.

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 2-hour fire barrier will be provided between the S-1 Occupancy storage addition and existing F-1 Occupancy production facility. Table 508.4 for separated occupancies does not require a rated separation between S-1 and F-1 Occupancies.

2. The building has 50-60 feet of open space surrounding it.

3. A dust collection system in accordance with NFPA 664 is provided in the F-1 production area to reduce the fire hazard in that area.

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.

☐ 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: It would be a cost hardship to provide sprinklers as this building is located in a rural area. Estimated cost to sprinkle the building is over \$300k. The storage addition was constructed in 2018 and mistakenly permitted as an agricultural addition (under previous owner who has since passed away). The existing woodworking facility was given a permit in 2007 without sprinklers. The purpose of the variance is to legalize the existing building and addition, by the new owner that inherited the non-compliance.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)  
2014 IBC Section 903.2

Conditions: An automatic sprinkler system is required in buildings containing wood working operations that exceed 2,500 square feet and for F-1 or S-1 Occupancy fire areas over 12,000 square feet in accordance with Sections 903.2.4 and 903.2.9, respectively. The variance request is to permit a dust collection system in accordance with NFPA 664, 2012 Edition, Standard for the Prevention of Fires and Explosions in Wood Processing and Woodworking Facilities, along with a 2-hour fire barrier separation between F-1 and S-1 Occupancy areas. in lieu of

along with a 2-hour fire barrier separation between F-1 and S-1 occupancy areas, in lieu of an automatic sprinkler system throughout the building.

The project involves a 6,000 sf storage addition to an existing 12,728 sf woodworking facility that was given a permit in 2007 without sprinklers. The building is Type VB construction, and has a total of approximately 18,728 sf.

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 code requires an automatic sprinkler system specifically for woodworking facilities over 2,500 square feet because of the potential amount of combustible dust that could be generated during woodworking operations. A dust collection system in accordance with NFPA 664 is provided, which reduces the potential amount of combustible dust in the air.

2. A 2-hour fire barrier will be provided between the S-1 Occupancy storage addition and existing F-1 Occupancy production facility.

3. The building has 50-60 feet open space surrounding it.

4. Based upon addition of a 2-hour fire barrier between the storage addition and production facility, and provision of a dust collection system in the production area, the lack of a sprinkler system will not be adverse to safety.

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:

It would be a cost hardship to provide sprinklers as this building is located in a rural area. Estimated cost to sprinkle the building is over \$300k. The storage addition was constructed in 2018 and mistakenly permitted as an agricultural addition (under previous owner who has since passed away). The existing woodworking facility was given a permit in 2007 without sprinklers. The purpose of the variance is to legalize the existing building and addition, by the new owner that inherited the non-compliance.