

Owner / Applicant Information

Erica Wehrmeister

2001 W. 86TH ST.

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46260

Phone 3173382345

Email ERICA.WEHRMEISTER@ASCENSION.ORG

Submitter Information

Christine Ruiz

Kone Inc.

5201 Park Emerson Dr. Suite O

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3177880061

Email christine.ruiz@kone.com

Project Information

St. Vincent Hospital

2001 W. 86th St.

Indianapolis IN 46260

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
2.15.9.2, 2.19.2(b)

Conditions: This is a 3 car bank, 614, 615, 616.

Elevator 616 is currently in use and has a 36" toe guard with a pit depth of 57". Elevator 614 and 615 were blank hoistways with no elevators installed. Currently we are installing new elevators to 614 and 615. We would like to maintain the same conditions to all 3 elevators. Elevator 614 and 615 have a pit depth of 57", and a buffer of 31" with 9" of compression.

Existing conditions. Pit depth is not deep enough to fit new toe guard.

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= 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:

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.

☐ 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: