



PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

SACRAMENTO VALLEY ASSOCIATION OF BUILDING OFFICIALS

Committee Chair:
Vice Chair:

[Paul Klein](#)
[Mark Wood](#)

PH: 530-538-7541
PH: 530-757-5610

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](#)

Plan Review Committee Results for June 2006		
Subject: Accessibility for 2 story office/retail buildings	Yes	No
GIVEN: A two story building is proposed that will have shops on the first floor and offices on the second floor.		
CBC 220 [For HCD 2, DSA/AC] SHOPPING CENTER is one or more sales establishments or stores.		
1. Is this a "shopping center" by definition and require an elevator to the second floor office spaces?	11 (92%)	1 (8%)
2. If this were an existing non elevatored building with shops on the first floor and offices on the second floor and a hair dresser wanted to occupy a suite on the second floor. The construction valuation is over the current threshold amount. Would you require an elevator?	4 (36%)	7 (64%)
3. Would you apply the disproportionate cost formula per 11B?	9 (75%)	3 (25%)
4. Does it make a difference if is a boutique that wants to occupy the second floor?	1 (9%)	10 (91%)
5. Does a proposed two story government office building require an elevator regardless of the size?	7 (58%)	5 (42%)
Subject: Landing Material for Single Family Dwellings		
6. CBC section 1003.3.1.6 requires that a level floor or landing be provided on each side of all doors. Does your jurisdiction allow finish grade as meeting this requirement, provided that the finish grade material complies with the 1/4" per foot slope requirements?	6 (46%)	7 (54%)
Subject: Water Heater Change Outs and T-24 Energy Compliance		
7. Does your jurisdiction verify that the California Energy Standards Commission (CESC) minimum requirements for water heaters change outs at final inspection by way of a completed CF-6R form (Installation Certificate) being posted and/or made available to the field inspector?	4 (31%)	9 (69%)
Subject: Window Change Outs and T-24 Energy Compliance		
8. Does your jurisdiction require a permit for like for like size window/fenestration change outs?	7 (54%)	6 (46%)
9. For like for like window/fenestration change outs does your jurisdiction verify California Energy Standards Commission (CESC) minimum requirements at final inspection by way of a completed CF-6R form (Installation Certificate) being posted and/or made available to the field inspector?	5 (38%)	8 (62%)
Total Spokesperson Responses		13 out of 41
Total Responses		14

Comments by Spokespersons

#1 Defer Keith Long/Architect, outside plans examiner

- 1- The definitions does not indicate that the whole building or just the floor be considered shopping center, however, in new construction a elevator is required.
We would apply the unreasonable hardship exception.
 - 5- Only less than 3 stories and 3000sq' per story.
 - 6- We require a masonry landing on the exterior due to winter rain washing out the landing area.
 - 7- Hard enough to convince them to get a permit as is.
 - 8-like size to the consumer can also be one that is inset into the existing frame and then be in violation of the egress requirements.
 - 9-Usualy upgrading to a better quality window.
-

1. I'm calling it a shopping center to be safe -- I would need to review plans & square footage to make a final determination.
 2. Would need to see all cost figures. An elevator could kill the project.
 3. See #2 above.
 5. Projects funded w/public monies must comply with ADA -- unless it was a very small building, second floor access would be required.
 6. We require concrete, wood or equal all-weather, durable surfaces for landings.
 7. We don't require that the CF-6R be posted, but we do require that the entire installation comply with T-24 standards.
 9. We don't require the CF-6R for window change outs, but we do require high-efficiency windows (U factor of .35 or better) to meet the standard set by our City's electrical utility company.
-

Question #2 was a little tricky as "vertical access" is what we would require. Not necessarily by an elevator.

#1 would be no if each space was privately owned.

#3 would be a maybe, depending on situation & location.

#7-9. We have determined that in most if not all cases the energy compliance would be better than existing.

#2 Must have more information

Comments by Non Jurisdictional Spokespersons

None

PRC Supported Response Question #1 thru #4

By definition the shops on the first floor are a shopping center, however the building is not a shopping center. The definition says that a shopping center is “one or more sales establishments or stores” therefore only the store(s) would be a shopping center and require vertical access, if necessary. An elevator to the second floor should be encouraged but is not required (see CBC 1103B.1 exception 3.1). The Building Official should require a deed restriction on the second floor that would disallow M occupancies, professional offices of health care providers...

If a Hair Dresser wanted to occupy a suite or suites on the second floor of an existing building that was originally approved and exempted by the exception 3.1 then vertical access is now required and must be provided or a the Hair Dresser must provide a “reasonable portion of the ...accommodations” on the first floor. It may be possible to make findings of a hardship if there is no space available on the first floor, the cost of construction is a disproportionate to the cost of the project and some method of equivalent facilitation is provided. Such as advertising “no addition charge for in-home appointments”. If the original building pre-dates exception 3.2 it would be reasonable to allow disproportionate cost provisions as described in 1134B.

These requirements are the same no matter what the use is as long as it isn't the professional office of a health care provider or a passenger vehicle service stations.

Access to publicly funded buildings is required despite the area on the second floor. As a Title II entity, your City should have an ADA Coordinator who is responsible for ensuring program accessibility.

PRC Supported Response Question #5

YES

CBC section 1103B.1 ex:3 is applicable to privately funded buildings only. The PRC agrees that a proposed 2 story government building would not qualify for this exception and vertical access is required.

PRC Supported Response Question #6

YES

The PRC agrees that the code language as presently written for Group R, Division 3 occupancies only, does not specifically prevent the use of finish grade as a landing. The PRC does recommend that each jurisdiction seriously consider the reliability of grade when used for a landing. Consideration should include local climatic conditions such as snow or rain that may deteriorate a grade made landing to a point that the landing would not

comply with CBC sections 1003.3.1.6 & 1003.3.1.7. The PRC also recommends that each jurisdiction should have a policy defining acceptable materials for us as landings for Group R, Division 3 occupancies.

PRC Supported Response Question #7

YES

The PRC agrees that the new 2005 energy standards requires such documentation for all water heater change outs. The PRC also recognizes that it is difficult enough to persuade homeowners and contractors to pull permits for water heater change outs and that this requirement may deter the permit process that much more. The PRC recommends that the Building Official balance the significance of energy savings with the life safety of a water heater not installed properly.

PRC Supported Response Question #8

YES

As you can see the response to this question was approximately 50-50. It has always been a delicate issue. Not requiring permits for life-for-like does not give the average consumer enough information and often results in windows replaced in the same framed opening that have less net clear opening than before the change. Some things to consider when contemplating these issues are 1.) egress windows were not required prior to the adoption of the 1970 UBC 2. which allowed min. 5 square feet, no dimension less than 22 inches and a max. of 48 inches off the finished floor. 2.) 1976 UBC changed to 5.7 square feet 24 inches tall by 22 wide minimum, and 44 inch sill height. 3.) The current Historical Building code allows 3.3 square feet and 18 inch minimum height and width. 4.) Does your jurisdiction not want to approve the replacement of a non-operational single hung wood window that was not required to meet egress at the time it was built with one that is slightly smaller, more efficient and works.

PRC Supported Response Question #9

YES

An important new requirement for 2005 energy requirements is that replacement windows must meet the U-factor and SHGC requirements of Package D, even if the fenestration area does not increase (see 2005 Residential Compliance Manual 8.3.3) A permit and inspection is the only way to ensure that this state requirement is met. A CF-6R is not technically required but some form of documentation should be retained by the Building Department.