

Owner / Applicant Information

Daniel Kramer
Citizens Energy Group
2700 S. Belmont Ave.

Indianapolis IN 46221

Phone 3179271033

Email dkramer@citizensenergygroup.com

Submitter Information

Scott Perez
Arxtheon Consulting, Inc.
6015 Orchard Hill Lane

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3175202558

Email scott@arxtheon.com

Project Information

383 S. Emerson Avenue
383 S. Emerson Avenue

Indianapolis IN 46219

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: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
2014 IFC, Sec. 901.6

Conditions: Existing building of approximately 1,100 sf has a non-working fire suppression system. Local IFD has indicated a requirement to repair the system so that it is operational, or removed from the property.

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: Existing building has two means of egress for the tenants which provide egress from the building during an emergency. The sprinkler system is not required for a building of this size. It is unknown why a sprinkler system was installed for this building in the past. The owner would like to keep the system in place in order to have for possible tenant use. The owner would like water service to the system shut off to eliminate possible faulty alarms, etc. for the LFO.

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.

☐

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 existing tenant is in place and the cost to remove the system would require excessive costs to the Owner as well as disrupt the tenant.

The system is not required by code for a building of this size. The Owner would like to keep the system for a future tenant that may want, or require, a sprinkler system. The costs associated to fix the system at this time are cost prohibitive and as the system is not required, it would be addressed in the future if the need arises. The water serving the system needs to be shut off to prevent leaks and false alarms.