

Background on appeal was provided by Gary Bass.

The building plan was originally submitted with the upstairs area used as a residential unit and denied because of the sprinkler requirement. Plan was resubmitted with the upstairs area used office space. After Certificate of Occupancy was issued discovery was made that the area had been upfit to a residential area. Options were provided to contractor so that the area could remain as the area was intended to be used for. At that time meeting was turned over to Chairman Roland Harper.

An introduction of members present was held and Chairman Harper thanked everyone for attending this meeting.

Mr. Kippes shared concern that a dependable water source is not available to the site. Company prefers a Resident manager on site. Discussion was held on availability of public utilities to this site. Fire Codes were also discussed.

Mr. Kippes discussed the separation of the retail office and residential apartment upstairs with a 3-hour rated fire wall from the storage area. No one in apartment currently – discussion on sprinkler systems on well was held. Appeal was submitted at that time.

Tice mentioned that you can install a sprinkler system in a building with a well service – discussion was held.

Mr. Kippes stated that a caretaker resides on site – no one is currently in apartment. There is no plan of a resident on site until this issue is resolved.

The commercial code applies because of the apartment area – only one or two family dwellings do not require fire sprinkler system per fire code. Members discussed the plan and requirements for this facility.

Worley suggested that the owner provide alternative plans be presented to Board of Appeals that meet code requirements.

Harper requested that an alternative plan be provided to meet and satisfy the code requirements.

Worley made the motion to deny this appeal with Ransom seconding the motion was unanimous.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.