

Owner / Applicant Information

Doug Todd
ProLogis
6650 TELECOM DR. STE. 250

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46278

Phone 3172285203

Email DTODD@PROLOGIS.COM

Submitter Information

bill Parnell
FE Moran
5208 Commerce Square Dr. Ste.A

Indianapolis IN

Phone 2173728678

Email bill.parnell@femoran.com

Project Information

M S Logistics LLC
3333 Pagosa Ct.

Indianapolis IN 46290

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? ☒ yes

Violation Issued by: LFD

Local Building Official

Phone: Email:

Local Fire Official

Phone: Email:

Variance Details

Code Name: 2014 IFC
901.8

Conditions: The building currently has 2 abandoned rack sprinkler risers that previously protected racks throughout the warehouse (those racks have been removed). there are currently 4 racks in place that are not protected with in-rack sprinklers.
Owner requests one of the following actions:
1 - One existing rack riser be used to protect existing racks, and other existing rack riser be removed or be allowed to remain in place.
2 - Both existing rack risers to be removed or be allowed to remain in place and storage lowered to 12 feet or below.

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: Option 1: if owner opts to protect the racks that are in place, only one of the existing rack risers is needed to protect those racks.

Option 2: If owner opts to assure all storage is below 12 feet, neither rack sprinkler riser will be needed for protection of the building, because the existing overhead sprinkler system is has a design density capable of protecting storage to 12 feet.

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 excessive cost to remove the existing abandoned rack sprinkler risers will be assumed by the owner.
It is our opinion that the abandoned risers should be allowed to remain in place regardless if they are needed to protect racks, so that the current tenant and/or any future tenant may have the option to install high piled rack storage into the space and utilize the existing abandoned risers for protection, at a much lower cost than it would be if new risers need to be constructed.

Variance Details

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

Indiana Fire Code Sect. 3207

Conditions: The building currently has 2 abandoned rack sprinkler risers that previously protected racks throughout the warehouse (those racks have been removed). there are currently 4 racks in place that are not protected with in-rack sprinklers.

Owner requests one of the following actions:

1 - One existing rack riser be used to protect existing racks, and other existing rack riser be removed or be allowed to remain in place.

2 - Both existing rack risers to be removed or be allowed to remain in place and storage lowered to 12 feet or below.

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: Option 1: if owner opts to protect the racks that are in place, only one of the existing rack risers is needed to protect those racks.

Option 2: If owner opts to assure all storage is below 12 feet, neither rack sprinkler riser will be needed for protection of the building, because the existing overhead sprinkler system is has a design density capable of protecting storage to 12 feet.

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 excessive cost to remove the existing abandoned rack sprinkler risers will be assumed by the owner.

It is our opinion that the abandoned risers should be allowed to remain in place regardless if they are needed to protect racks, so that the current tenant and/or any future tenant may have the option to install high piled rack storage into the space and utilize the existing abandoned risers for protection, at a much lower cost than it would be if new risers need to be constructed.

Variance Details

Code Name: 2010 NFPA 13 Installation of Sprinkler Systems (675 IAC 28-1-5)

Conditions: The building currently has 2 abandoned rack sprinkler risers that previously protected racks throughout the warehouse (those racks have been removed). there are currently 4 racks in place that are not protected with in-rack sprinklers.
Owner requests one of the following actions:
1 - One existing rack riser be used to protect existing racks, and other existing rack riser be removed or be allowed to remain in place.
2 - Both existing rack risers to be removed or be allowed to remain in place and storage lowered to 12 feet or below.

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: Option 1: if owner opts to protect the racks that are in place, only one of the existing rack risers is needed to protect those racks.

Option 2: If owner opts to assure all storage is below 12 feet, neither rack sprinkler riser will be needed for protection of the building, because the existing overhead sprinkler system is has a design density capable of protecting storage to 12 feet.

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 excessive cost to remove the existing abandoned rack sprinkler risers will be assumed by the owner.

It is our opinion that the abandoned risers should be allowed to remain in place regardless if they are needed to protect racks, so that the current tenant and/or any future tenant may have the option to install high piled rack storage into the space and utilize the existing abandoned risers for protection, at a much lower cost than it would be if new risers need to be constructed.

Variance Details

Code Name: 2010 NFPA 13 Installation of Sprinkler Systems (675 IAC 28-1-5)

Conditions: Building has 2 existing (abandon) risers that previously supplied rack sprinkler systems in the facility. Previous racking and sprinkler systems have been removed from the property, however some new racking exist that would need to be protected.
Owner of building is requesting removal of the existing abandoned rack sprinkler risers with the intent of lowering commodity storage to 12 feet or less.

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: If the commodity storage is lowered below 12 feet in height the need for in-rack fire sprinkler protection would be eliminated per NfPA 13.
Without the need for in-rack protection removal of the existing abandoned rack-sprinkler risers will hopefully be permitted.

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.

☐ 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:

