

Owner / Applicant Information

Sajid Chaudhry  
Cardinal Hotels LLC  
224 FLORENCE AVE

GRANGER IN 46530

Phone 5742207714

Email SAJID@IGHOSPITALITY.COM

Submitter Information

Sally Taylor  
Otis Elevator Company  
2463 Crowne Point Drive

Sharonville IN

Phone 5133264470

Email Sally.Taylor@otis.com

Designer Information

Gary Frank  
Arch Grp III  
201 S Nappanee St

Elkhart IN

Phone 5742930008

Email architecturalgroupiigf@comcast.net

Project Information

Holiday Inn Express  
1635 Veterans Parkway

Granger OH 47130

County CLARK

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

Project Status ☒ F 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)

Conditions: Installation of Machine-Roomless Gen2 Elevator at Holiday Inn Express in Jeffersonville, IN.

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: There are new technology components used in machine-roomless Gen2 elevator approved under ASME A17.1-2010 elevator code; however, Indiana currently has adopted an amended ASME A17.1-2007 code. The new technology requires the variance for this project are the Coated Steel Belts used on Gen2 type elevator system. The State of Indiana has been provided engineering data on each component to verify there have been no safety compromises with this new technology. Indiana accepts the installation of the Gen2 elevator; however, they require a variance be secured on every installation. Once placed on the agenda, the variances are approved under block vote.

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:

Variance Details

Code Name: 1989 NFPA 61B Elevators and Facilities Handling Bulk Raw Agricultural Commodities (675 IAC 13-1-21)

Conditions: Installation of Machine-Roomless Gen2 Elevator at Holiday Inn Express in Jeffersonville, IN.

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: There are new technology components used in machine-roomless Gen2 elevator approved under ASME A17.1-2010 elevator code; however, Indiana currently has adopted an amended ASME A17.1-2007 code. The new technology requires the variance for this project are the Coated Steel Belts used on Gen2 type elevator system. The State of Indiana has been provided engineering data on each component to verify there have been no safety compromises with this new technology. Indiana accepts the installation of the Gen2 elevator; however, they require a variance be secured on every installation. Once placed on the agenda, the variances are approved under block vote.

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:

