Owner / Applicant Information

Kevin Bate
WTEC, LLC
777 TERRACE AVENUE, SUITE 101

HASBROUCK HEIGHTS NJ 07604

Phone 2134404641

Email SChiasson@wtecenergy.com

Submitter Information

Melissa Tupper
RTM Consultants, Inc.
6640 Parkdale Place, Suite J,

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email mtupper@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Sam Miller
Cripe
9339 Priority Way West Drive

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3177066314

Email smiller@cripe.biz

Project Information

WTEC Crossdock Warehouse Expansion
1851 Technology Drive

Washington IN

County DAVIESS

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

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

IDHS Issued Correction order? [ ] Has Violation been Issued? [ ]

Violation Issued by: NA

Local Building Official

Phone: 3172724438 Email: akostelac@dhs.in.gov

Local Fire Official

Phone: 3172724438 Email: STEVEN.WALDEN@WASHINGTON.IN.US

Variance Details

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

2014 IBC, 507.4

Conditions: The code permits the area of a Group B, E, F, M or S building no more than two stories above grade plane of any construction type, to be unlimited where the building is provided with an automatic sprinkler system throughout in accordance with NFPA 13 and is surrounded and adjoined by public ways or yards not less than 60 feet in width. The request is for the existing building and addition to be unlimited in area with less than 60 feet in width on all sides. The South side of the existing building is 15-16 feet from the property line.

The project involves an addition approximately 81,000 square feet to the existing building. The existing facility is approximately 59,000 square feet and 2-stories. The building is classified as a B, F-1, S-1 Occupancy.

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. There is a railroad right of way to the South of the property line that is nearly 80 feet wide. The addition has over 60 feet of frontage on all sides.

2. The existing building is fully sprinklered and the addition will be fully sprinklered in accordance with NFPA 13.

3. NFPA 80 A, Recommended Practice for the Protection of Buildings from Exterior Fire Exposure section 5.6.3 state no exposure hazard exists between buildings which are properly sprinklered for the hazard involved.

4. Based upon lack of any fire exposure to other properties or buildings, automatic sprinkler protection, and the nearly 80 foot railroad right of way, the lack of 60 feet to a property line on the south side of the existing building will not be adverse to safety. Similar variances have been approved for lack of 60 feet of separation under a variety of circumstances, including 25-02-34, 24-07-07, 23-12-84, 23-05-03, 22-01-28, 23-05-24, 20-02-06, 19-10-23, 16-09-35a, 16-01-19, 18-05-30, 18-10-32, 18-05-52c, 18-07-42a, 18-02-21, 16-07-55, 16-07-59, 15-11-36, and 16-07-60.

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.

[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: The owner's undue hardship involves trying to maximize the site to meet the building's area and programming needs. Building a 254 foot long 4 hour wall at the existing exterior wall to technically allow the required 60 foot of frontage is not reasonable given there is a railroad right of way nearly 80 feet wide on that side of the building.