

Owner / Applicant Information

Dr. Zachary Papadakis  
Papadakis Wealth Preservation Trust  
430 E 86TH ST, APT 4C

NEW YORK NY 10028

Phone 8122344480

Email MCLINKENBEARD@CULPVENTURESLLC.COM

Submitter Information

Carrie Ballinger  
RTM Consultants, Inc.  
6640 Parkdale Place, Ste J

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173297700

Email ballinger@rtmconsultants.com

Project Information

7825 McFarland  
7825 McFarland Ln

Indianapolis IN 46237

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 Sec. 901.6

Conditions: 

The variance request is to not maintain (or remove) an existing sprinkler system in the building. Code requires existing fire protection systems to be maintained in accordance with the code of record.  The building is an existing medical office, classified as B Occupancy. The Type VB building was built in 1999 and has been occupied as medical offices since it was constructed.
--

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 building is within allowable area and height for B Occupancy without sprinklers. 2. A manual fire alarm system is existing throughout the building - not required by code. 3. Corridor smoke detection is existing throughout the building - not required by code. 4. The maximum egress travel distance to an exit is less than 100 feet - code permits up to 200 feet. 5. Sprinkler heads will be removed.
---

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of physical limitations of the construction site or its utility services.
--------------------------	---

<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
---	--

<input type="checkbox"/>	Imposition of the rule would prevent the preservation of an architecturally or a historically significant part of the building or structure
--------------------------	---

Facts: 

The existing building was constructed with an automatic sprinkler system as a trade-off to the requirement for rated corridors (see other variance request for corridor ratings). The sprinkler system was installed as a dry system throughout, which is now corroded and unable to be maintained without significant cost hardship. The estimated repair/replacement costs of the damaged piping in the sprinkler system is \$36,000. The estimated cost to completely remove the system is \$19,900, while the cost to remove just the sprinkler heads is \$9,800.
---

Variance Details

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

2014 IBC Sec. 1018.1

Conditions: Egress corridors (walls and doors) within a medical office building will not be fire-rated. Based upon occupant load of 30 or more in a non-sprinklered B occupancy, fire-rated corridor construction is required.

The building is an existing medical office, classified as B Occupancy. The Type VB building was built in 1999 and has been occupied as medical offices since it was constructed.

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: 1. A manual fire alarm system is existing throughout the building - not required by code.

2. Corridor smoke detection is existing throughout the building - not required by code.

3. The maximum egress travel distance to an exit is less than 100 feet - code permits up to 200 feet.

4. The building complies with NFPA 101, Life Safety Code, Sec. 38.3.6, exc. 2, which permits nonrated corridors in an office space where it is a ¿space occupied by a single tenant.¿ The building is occupied by a single tenant.

5. Similar variances have been granted for medical office buildings and tenant spaces, including 19-09-31, 19-08-70, 19-06-71, 17-08-56, 17-08-09, 16-07-27, 16-07-11, 16-06-61, 16-03-23, 15-06-54, 15-01-33, 13-03-45, 12-10-28, and 11-06-32 as well as for general office buildings and tenant spaces, including 18-02-29, 18-02-15, 17-05-40, 16-06-56, 13-03-36a, 13-03-36b.

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.

☒ Y 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 building was constructed with an automatic sprinkler system as a trade-off to the requirement for rated corridors. The sprinkler system was installed as a dry system throughout, which is now corroded and unable to be maintained without significant cost hardship. The estimated repair/replacement costs of the damaged piping in the sprinkler system is \$36,000. The building already has a fire alarm system and smoke detection that would not have been required by code and has been maintained and tested.

