Owner / Applicant Information

Scott Rheams
Hix Snedeker
805 TRIONE ST

DAPHANE, AL 36526

Phone 2283262235

Email SCOTT@HIXSNEDEKER.COM

Submitter Information

David Alderink
Core States Group
111 3rd Avenue South

Minneapolis IN

Phone 7636149783

Email dalderink@core-states.com

Designer Information

Jennifer Hauser
Jennifer A Hauser
135 Water Street Suite 201

Naperville IL

Phone 2245853955

Email jhauser@core-states.com

Project Information

Zabys Restaurant
2235 Southport Commons Dr

INDIANAPOLIS MN 46217

County MARION

Project Type New [ ] Addition [ ] Alteration [ ] Existing [ ] Change of Occupancy [ ]

Project Status [F] F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled

IDHS Issued Correction order? [No] Has Violation been Issued? [yes]

Violation Issued by: LBD

Local Building Official

Phone: 3173626197 Email: brian.schellenberg@indy.gov

Local Fire Official

Phone: 3173626197 Email: ContactIFD@indy.gov

Variance Details

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

507.9

Conditions: In this restaurant establishment, there is a 2 1/2" metal stud filled with mineral wool in the cavity behind the hood wall which complies with the code per the inspector, it still does comply with the "zero-tolerance".

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:

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

[Y] Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of physical limitations of the construction site or its utility services.

[Y] 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: