| Owner / Applicant Information                                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Joel Zimmerman  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 525 3rd St  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Suite 300   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beloit WI 53511   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phon∈ 6083628981  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Email joel.zimmerman@hendricksgroup.net                             |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Submitter Information   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Donna Willis  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| thyssenkrupp Elevator   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8665 Bash Street  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indianapolis IN   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phon∈ 3178417321  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Email donna.willis@thyssenkrupp.com                                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Designer Information  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kristin Dufek   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eppstein Uhen Architects (EUA)                                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 333 E. Chicago St.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Milwaukee WI  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phon∈ 4142918142  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Email kristind@eua.com  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Information   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bottleworks Building 17<br>856 Carrollton Ave.                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 630 Carrollion Ave.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indianapolis IN 46202   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County MARION   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Type New Addition Alteration Existing Y 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: 3173275544 Email: planreview.class1@indy.gov                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Local Fire OfficialPhone:3173275544Email:margie.bovard@indy.gov     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| Variance Deta  | <u>ils</u>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Code Name:   | 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  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| <u>Variance Details</u>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Code Name:   | ASME A17.1 2007  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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  | 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: 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  |  |  |  |  |  |  |