Owner / Applicant Information

Mike Daugherty
The Kelly Group
60 OLYMPIA CT

LAFAYETTE IN 47909 - 8590

Phone 7654741800

Email MIKE.DAUGHERTY@THEKELLY-GROUP.COM

Submitter Information

Elias Zamora
Titan Construction & Engineering Services Inc.
2675 N McKinley Ave

Rensselaer IN - 5182

Phone 7653509311

Email eliaszamora546@gmail.com

Designer Information

Steve Rust
Titan Construction & Engineering Services
2675 N McKinley Ave

Rensselaer IN -

Phone 7654649201

Email srust@titanconstructionservices.com

Project Information

26-295 Kelly Group Code Review
60 Olympia Ct

Lafayette IN 47909 - 5182

County TIPPECANOE

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

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

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

Violation Issued by: LFD

Local Building Official
Phone: 7658071000 Email: jpburks@lafayette.in.gov

Local Fire Official
Phone: 7658071000 Email: zsdague@lafayette.in.gov

Variance Details

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

2014 IBC Section 903.2.4

Conditions: In the 2014 International Building Code, Chapter 9 for Fire Suppression System, Section 903, states that an automatic sprinkler system needs to be provided when the fire area exceeds 12,000 square feet. This existing building has a square footage of 12,640 per Code Checks, and beacon.schneidercorp.com has it at 12,434 square feet. Titan Construction is requesting a variance to waive the requirement for an automatic sprinkler system.

The owner would like to apply the variance to the oven booth, but not the spray booth. The owner is planning on adding CO2 suppression inside of the spray booth.

On behalf of the owner, I would like this variance to apply to the square footage and the oven booth.

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: The building is a fabrication warehouse and an office, making this a mixed occupancy. The building has enough frontage, and it has large openings (docks, overhead doors, equipment access openings) that are required per Section 903.2.11.1. There are 6 Emergency Exits for the 9m800 square foot fabrication occupancy, and 3 exits for the 2,634 square foot office.

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.

[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: The most viable solution for this code failure is a firewall, which would cause operational problems for the fabrication of metals for Kelly Group. The firewall would need to be 52 feet in length, and at least 16 feet high of Concrete Masonry Block. This also would go right through an existing storage room, column lines, girts, and would require excessive costs to separate the mixed occupancies. A sprinkler system isn't the main option due to water damages to the fabrication in the event of a fire, and installation would also cause excessive costs.

Variance Details

Code Name:

2014 IBC Section 903.2.4

Conditions:

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: Additional Documentation uploaded.

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.
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: Firewall alternative to separate shared occupancies will cause limitations inside the building, as well a sprinkler application. Both of these systems would increase the costs necessary to be code compliant.