

Owner / Applicant Information

Lula Patton
Pike Township Trustee
5665 LAFAYETTE RD.

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46254

Phone 3172915801

Email LMPATTON@PIKEFIRE.COM

Submitter Information

Rebecca Foste
Thyssenkrupp Elevator
8665 Bash St.

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3178417455

Email rebecca.foste@Thyssenkrupp.com

Designer Information

Sanjay Patel
RQAW
10401 N Meridian St. Suite 401

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3178157261

Email spatel@rqaw.com

Project Information

Pike Township Headquarters Fire Station 61
4881 W 71st Street

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46268

County MARION

Project Type New ☒ Addition ☐ Alteration ☐ Existing ☐ Change of Occupancy ☐

Project Status ☒ F F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled

IDHS Issued Correction order? ☐ Has Violation been Issued? ☐

Violation Issued by: NA

Local Building Official

Phone:

Email:

Local Fire Official

Phone:

Email:

Variance Details

Code Name: ASME A17.1 2007
3.26.8

Conditions:

This is new Hydraulic MRL technology, which has not been adopted by the State of Indiana. Reference variance # 14-05-04
--

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

- 1

1=Non-compliance with the rule will not be adverse to the public health, safety or w
- 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:

This is new Hydraulic MRL technology, which has not been adopted by the State of Indiana. Reference variance # 14-05-04
--

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:

This is new Hydraulic MRL technology, which has not been adopted by the State of Indiana. Reference variance # 14-05-04
--

Variance Details

Code Name: ASME A17.1 2007
3.19.4.1, 3.19.4.4, 3.19.4.5

Conditions:

This is new Hydraulic MRL technology, which has not been adopted by the State of Indiana. Reference variance # 14-05-04
--

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

- 1

1=Non-compliance with the rule will not be adverse to the public health, safety or w
- 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:

This is new Hydraulic MRL technology, which has not been adopted by the State of Indiana. Reference variance # 14-05-04
--

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:

This is new Hydraulic MRL technology, which has not been adopted by the State of Indiana. Reference variance # 14-05-04
--

