

Owner / Applicant Information

Teresa Gascho
Smoot Construction INC C/O Lee & Associates
10201 NORTH ILLINOIS STREET
SUITE 275
INDIANAPOLIS IN 46290
Phone 3172181060
Email TGASCHO@LEE-ASSOCIATES.COM

Submitter Information

Timothy J & T Consulting Callas
J & T Consulting, LLC
8220
Rob
Indianapolis IN
Phone 3178894300
Email tcallas@jtconsult.us

Project Information

Retail Center
2204 E. 25th Street

Indianapolis IN 46218

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)
2014 IFC 901.6

Conditions: An existing M Occupancy of approximately 6,000 square feet has an existing sprinkler system that hasn't been tested, maintained or inspected for many years. The system is antiquated and beyond repair. The building appears to have been constructed in the 1970s. Code of record and all subsequent codes would not have required a sprinkler system for this structure. Current code requires sprinklers when the fire area exceeds 12,000 square feet.

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 retail (M Occupancy) and does not require a sprinkler system being less than 12,000 square feet.
2. The building has a suspended ceiling the request is to remove the heads the ceiling will conceal the remaining sprinkler piping so that the building would appear not to be sprinklered. The riser will be removed to the floor and FDC will be either removed or have a sign posted "out of service".

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 involves they recently purchased the building as is. This area is very depressed and the cost removing the entire sprinkler system could possibly exceed 50% or more of the value of the building.