

Owner / Applicant Information

Michelle Bodem
United Technologies Carrier
7310 WEST MORRIS STREET

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46231

Phone 3174815743

Email MICHELLE.BODEM@CARRIER.UTC.COM

Submitter Information

Dennis Bradshaw
Fire Protection & Code Consultants, LLC
1520 Main Street

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3174865188

Email DBradshaw@FPC-Consultants.com

Designer Information

Scott Jones
ARSEE Engineers
9715 Kincaid Dr., Suite 100

Fishers IN

Phone 3175945152

Email sjones@arsee-engineers.com

Project Information

Carrier Warehouse Wall
7310 West Morris Street

Indianapolis IN 46231

County MARION

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)
1016.2, Table 1016.2, 2014 IBC

Conditions: An existing fully sprinklered manufacturing facility will have some areas with egress travel distance of 395 feet. The code allows a maximum of 250 feet travel distance in a fully sprinklered building. A variance was previously granted for a travel distance of 395 feet, but a new proposed wall will cause the egress routing to change, but still within the 395 feet limit.

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. The existing building is protected with an automatic fire suppression system per NFPA 13.
2. The building is a high bay structure (24' above the floor to the deck). Accumulation of smoke in this area above the floor will allow occupants sufficient egress from the building.
3. Occupants will be manufacturing personnel who are familiar with the equipment layout and the path of egress.
4. The facility is used for the manufacturing of air conditioning and refrigeration units and will have a limited amount of combustibile materials.

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: The owner's undue hardship is the desire to provide a wall between the manufacturing area and storage area and the fact that the proposed wall causes a rerouting of the current egress paths.