Owner / Applicant Information					
Truitt Daeger					
333 N PENNSYLVANIA ST.					
SUITE 100 INDIANAPOLIS IN 46204					
Phon∈ 3179827214					
Email TDAEGER@TWGDEV.COM					
Submitter Information  Donna Willis					
thyssenkrupp Elevator					
8665 Bash Street					
Indianapolis IN					
Phon∈ 3178417321					
Email donna.willis@thyssenkrupp.com					
<u>Designer Information</u>					
Michael Thomas					
TWG Development, LLC 333 N Pennsylvania St.					
Suite 100					
Indianapolis IN					
Phon∈ 3175597002					
Email mthomas@twgdev.com					
Project Information					
Parker Place Indianapolis					
18 S Parker Street					
Indianapolis IN					
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?					
<u>Violation Issued by:</u> NA					
Local Building Official					
Phone: 3176709006 Email: planreview.class1@indy.gov Local Fire Official					
Phone: 3176709006 Email: margie.bovard@indy.gov					

Variance Deta	<u>ils</u>							
Code Name:	2: ASME A17.1 2007							
	3.26.8							
Conditions:	ASME A17.1 2007							
	This is new hydraulic MRL technology, which has not been adopted by the state of Indiana. Please reference variance #14-05-04.							
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: ASME A17.1 2007								
	This is new hydraulic MRL technology, which has not been adopted by the state of Indiana. Please 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.							
Υ	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:	ASME A17.1 2007							
	This is new hydraulic MRL technology, which has not been adopted by the state of Indiana.  Please reference variance #14-05-04							

Code Name:	Other Code (Not in the list provided)						
	3.19.4.1,3.19.4.4,3.19.4.5						
Conditions:	ASME A17.1 2007						
	This is new hydraulic MRL technology, which has not been adopted by the state of Indiana. Please reference variance #14-05-04.						
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:	ASME A17.1 2007						
	This is new hydraulic MRL technology, which has not been adopted by the state of Indiana. Please reference variance #14-05-04.						
<u>DEMONS</u>	TRATION 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.						
Υ	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:	ASME A17.1 2007						
	This is new hydraulic MRL technology, which has not been adopted by the state of Indiana. Please reference variance #14-05-04.						

Variance Details