



PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

SACRAMENTO VALLEY ASSOCIATION OF BUILDING OFFICIALS

Committee Chair: [Paul Klein](#) PH: 530-538-7541
 Vice Chair: [Mark Wood](#) PH: 530-757-5610

Committee Supported Responses

Code Review Committee Question/Survey for August-September

MEMBERS

- [Carey Boyd](#)
- [Jon Delling](#)
- [Ryan Devore](#)
- [Richard Essenwanger](#)
- [Alan Klee](#)
- [George Kellogg](#)
- [Don Little](#)
- [Steve Merck](#)
- [Michelle Menszer](#)
- [Dave Newman](#)
- [Gary Scott](#)
- [Robert Stetson](#)

Subject: Lobby/reception area in corridors

Background: Fire Marshall’s interpretation, dated 06/08/04:

“In a fully-sprinklered Group B Occupancy, can a reception room within a one-hour fire- rated corridor be provided with built-in wood/plastic laminated countertops, base and upper cabinets and ancillary seating for a receptionist(s)? If not, what is the definition of a reception room?”

No. Based on the description you provide to us, it appears that this use that more closely resembles an office that would be open to a fire-rated corridor. The California Building Code does not provide a definition of a reception room. However, Webster’s Dictionary defines “receptionist” as one employed to greet callers. No other function would be allowed.”

1. Given the Fire Marshall’s interpretation reprinted above, if your foyer, lobby or reception room is required to be constructed as a corridor per 1004.3.4.4 exception...

	YES		NO	
1a. Would you allow furniture?	11	92%	1	8%

Comments by Spokespersons

1a. Not enough info. However if for seating purposes and the required egress width is not reduced and a furniture floor plan is submitted than it may be acceptable.

1a. The consensus is that that particular Fire Marshall doesn’t live in the real world.

Code Review Committee Supported Response

1. Subject: Lobby/reception area in corridors:

Yes, it could be allowed because nothing in the code prevents furniture from being used in a corridor. It is the responsibility of the building official to determine when the use goes beyond that of a lobby.

Subject: Med. Gases in Non-OSPOD Buildings

Given: CPC section 1301.0 states “This chapter applies to special fixtures and systems that occur in health care facilities and to the special plumbing requirements in such facilities.” CPC 1302 states “The installation of medical gas and vacuum piping systems shall be in accordance with the requirements of this Chapter and/or the appropriate standards adopted by the Administrative Authority, for additional standards see Table 14-1.”...

2. For dental/medical air and vacuum in non-OSPOD B-occupancies, do you enforce:

	YES		NO	
2a. CPC Chapter 13 without modification?	9	69%	4	8%
2b. NFPA in lieu of Chapter 13?	3	23%	10	77%
2c. A combination of Chapter 13 and NFPA99?	2	23%	10	83%

2d. Does your Fire Department perform this review instead of the Building Department? 5 38% 8 62%

Comments by Spokespersons

2. All med gas goes to third party for review.

Code Review Committee Supported Response

2. Med. Gases in non-OSPOD buildings:

a) Yes, because the state adopts all chapters of CPC and the local jurisdiction can amend the policy as necessary.

b) No, (refer to 2a).

c) No, (refer to 2a).

Subject: Learning Centers

3. For Learning centers that provide all-day tutoring/study services to HS students in two-hour sessions, do you:

	YES		NO	
3a. Classify it as an E-occupancy?	11	79%	3	21%
3b. If you answered yes to 3.a., would you allow library reading room OL factor of 50 instead of the classroom OL factor of 20?	4	40%	6	60%

Comments by Spokespersons

3b. Only in the library area, not classroom areas.

3b. It would depend on the layout of the center.

Non-Jurisdictional Spokesperson: State Fire Marshal has no authority in B occupancy, if the furniture does not impede or impose on the required clear width for path of travel, why not?

Code Review Committee Supported Response

3. Learning Centers:

a) Yes, as per CBC 305.1, it would be classified as an E-occupancy. Buildings used for educational purposes for more than 12 hrs/wk or 4 hrs/day shall be classified as an E-occupancy.

b) No, because the occupancy resembles a classroom and the occupant load is 20 as per CBC table 10-a. However the Building Official can amend the occupant load factor for any given area as appropriate.

Subject: Residential Elevators

4. When an elevator extends more than two floors in a single family dwelling would you require:

	YES		NO	
4a. hour rated shaft?	14	100%	0	0%
4b. ventilation per section 3004?	10	71%	4	29%

Code Review Committee Supported Response

4. Residential Elevators:

- a) Yes as per CBC table 6-a.
- b) Yes, in accordance with section 3004

Subject: Code Review on Engineer Plans

5. What level of engineering Code Review do you require for a single-family dwelling that has been designed by and wet stamped by a licensed architect and engineer?

	YES		NO	
5a. Do you review design criteria (DL LL assumptions, seismic zone, wind speed...)	14	100%	0	0%
5b. Do you review formulas?	10	71%	4	29%
5c. Do you review math calculations?	9	64%	5	36%
5d. Do you review hold-down capacity?	14	100%	0	0%
5e. Do you review to ensure that design criteria (e.g. hold-downs, shear lengths, etc.) found on the plans is accurately transferred to the plans?	14	100%	0	0%
5f. Do you review vertical load path?	14	100%	0	0%

Comments by Spokespersons

5c.& 5d. It depends on the engineer and if there are errors in any of the formulas or design criteria.

Code Review Committee Supported Response

5. Code Review on Engineer Plans:

Yes, a comprehensive code review is an important part of the plan review process.