



CODE REVIEW COMMITTEE

SACRAMENTO VALLEY ASSOCIATION OF BUILDING OFFICIALS

Committee Chair: Don Little PH: 916-774-5336
Vice Chair: Bob Stetson PH: 916-683-3340

Code Review Committee Question/Survey for May Results and Committee Supported Responses

Subject: Egress from Dwelling Units to the Public Way

Given: A typical single family dwelling has a driveway and front yard that exceeds a 1 in 8 or 12.5% slope as required by CBC Section 10. The only paved access from the sidewalk to the front entry/exit door is the driveway.

1a. Would your jurisdiction consider the driveway as part of the means of egress for the dwelling?

	YES		NO
19	61%	12	39%

1b. Would your jurisdiction consider the driveway as a ramp and a violation of CBC section 1003.4 for ramp slope?

	YES		NO
8	26%	23	74%

Comments by Spokespersons

- Our City Standards require a max slope of a driveway of 10% at the sidewalk transition. Hillside lots are addressed on a case by case basis. I have checked with our Engineering Division and was told typically they will not allow any slope greater than 2 to 1 (22 1/2 degrees).
- As described, the dwelling does not have an adequate exit discharge. Unless there is an area of safe dispersal on the property, there must be a stairway or ramp, with 12 1/2% slope or less, that leads from the exit to the public way.
- In a very similar situation we made the builder provide compliant steps and sidewalk from the front entry to the public sidewalk. The driveway was not compliant.
- I would argue that I have met the requirements of the code by providing an "exit court or yard" that leads directly to the public way, for which there are no slope requirements. The driveway is not required by code, is not a ramp nor intended to be used as one, and therefore not required to meet the requirements of a ramp. The exit discharge may include various components as described in CBC 1006. These components are detailed later in the section. Nowhere in the section does it mandate the use of any of them. Only three general components apply to all: they can not reenter the exit access, they must be sufficiently open to prevent the accumulation of smoke, and they must be of a minimum width. Adherence to a maximum slope is only required if one builds a ramp. If the designer chooses to use an exit court or yard (CBC 1006.3.5.1) as the exit discharge, they must comply with the specific requirements found in 1006.3.5 along with the three general requirements mentioned earlier. There are no requirements for slope. Should the designer choose to use any of the other components of an exit discharge, the requirements for construction of those components would apply. Now, if the building was one that required access, then of course, a compliant ramp would be required.
- I wouldn't get too excited about a SFR as long as they could get to a safe distance such as the yard.

Code Review Committee Supported Responses

Egress from Dwelling Units to the Public Way

Although Chapter 10 of the CBC requires an exit path from any occupied portion of the building to the public way, it is the opinion of the Committee that the intent is met by providing an exiting path for the occupants to grade level in the yard. Jurisdictions may establish different practical positions depending upon their topography and size of lots.

Subject: Property Line Wall in a Shell Building

Given: A proposed 19,000 sq. ft. unconditioned/unoccupied office/retail shell building of type VN construction. Due to the location on the property, 2 of the exterior walls are required to be of one-hour construction. The building is fully sprinkled to obtain the allowable area.

2a. Would your jurisdiction allow the shell building to be constructed and finaled without the interior fire protection on the 2 required one hour exterior walls? (I.e. No 5/8 type X drywall on the interior)

YES		NO	
4	13%	27	87%

2b. Would your jurisdiction allow the interior fire protection be deferred to the tenant improvement permits?

YES		NO	
8	26%	23	74%

Comments by Spokespersons

- Building may be finaled but not approved for occupancy.
- No final & no C/O without compliance.
- We would allow a temporary occupancy with a bond. No occupancy would be allowed to any portion of the building until required fire walls are approved.
- The one-hour walls protect both of the adjacent properties -- they must be complete before final inspection.
- We would probably not allow deferral of the fire protection system -- but we would consult with the fire department before making a final decision.
- Low head fire heads may be deferred but the uppers would need to be in place.
- No deferral for sprinklers.

Code Review Committee Supported Responses

Property Line Wall in a Shell Building

It is the opinion of the Committee that fire resistive walls need to be constructed before the building is finaled and not deferred to tenant improvements.