Owner / Applicant Information

Kasey Combs
Eli Lilly & Company
1200 KENTUCKY AVE.

INDIANAPOLIS IN 46285

Phone 8779986466

Email COMBS_KASEY@NETWORK.LILLY.COM

Submitter Information

Christine Ruiz
Kone Inc.
5201 Park Emerson Drive

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3177162916

Email christine.ruiz@kone.com

Project Information

Eli Lilly BLDG 31 N Trc Pass
45 McCarty St.

Indianapolis IN 46285

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: 3173277526 Email: planreview.Class1@indy.gov

Local Fire Official

Phone: 3173277526 Email: VANDERWAL_JEFFREY@LILLY.COM

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)

2007 IN elev code 2.15.9.2 (a)

Conditions: The existing elevator hoistway was originally constructed with a 48-inch-deep pit and a 32-inch toe guard and has operated safely in this configuration for many years. The proposed modernization will not alter the existing hoistway dimensions or pit depth. Replacement of the toe guard is required due to its age and the elevator consultant¿s recommendation. Given the existing pit depth, KONE requests approval to install a replacement toe guard of the same 32-inch length, maintaining the existing apron coverage and dimensional configuration.

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: Requiring compliance through excavation of the existing pit would create an undue hardship due to the excessive cost of modifying an existing building structure that was originally designed and constructed with a 48¿ pit depth. Achieving compliance would require demolition of the existing pit floor, excavation below the current foundation level, potential structural engineering analysis, groundwater and waterproofing considerations, reconstruction of the pit floor, and associated project delays.

The requested variance allows the modernization to proceed while maintaining an equivalent level of safety and avoiding extensive structural alterations that would impose an unreasonable financial burden on the building owner. The cost of excavating and reconstructing the pit is excessive relative to the benefit achieved and would significantly increase the overall project cost.

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: To fully comply with the current code requirement (insert ASME 17.1 2007 code citation), the existing 48¿ pit would need to be excavated an additional 16 inches or more throughout the pit area, requiring substantial demolition, excavation, concrete removal, structural review, waterproofing modifications, disposal, and reconstruction work.

Estimated additional cost to achieve compliance: $150,000 - $200,000.