



CODE REVIEW COMMITTEE

SACRAMENTO VALLEY ASSOCIATION OF BUILDING OFFICIALS

Committee Chair: Bob Stetson PH: 916-781-6600
 Committee Vice-Chair: Bob Risk PH: 209-366-7200

Code Review Committee Question/Survey for May 2008 and Committee Supported Responses

Subject: Occupancy Classification for Attached Single Family Dwellings (Condominiums)

1. Given: A single structure over four deeded parcels has one owner-occupied dwelling unit per parcel.

1a. Is the Occupancy Group R-2?	YES	NO
	6 37%	10 63%
1b. Is the Occupancy Group R-3?	YES	NO
	12 70%	5 29%
1c. Are the dwelling units subject to Chapter 11A requirements?	YES	NO
	8 50%	8 50%

Comments by Spokespersons

- We would require a merger of parcels to one parcel where the building would be an R-2, or, a break between the units for R-3. However, based on the description given, we would require area separation walls and parapets at the common wall lines to keep the structures designated as R-3 if a merger of the multiple lots was not effected.
- At least 10% or minimum one unit must comply.
- At least 10% of multi-story units on the ground floor in apartment buildings without an elevator that consist of at least three units, or condominiums with four or more units, must have:
 - an accessible route to primary entry level of unit
 - at least one accessible bathroom or powder room on the primary level
 - all rooms on primary entry must be served by an accessible route and comply with applicable accessibility requirements.
 - (For buildings with an elevator, the story of the unit that is served by the elevator is considered the ground floor and must comply with these requirements)
- 1102A.1 item 2 applies
- Meets definition of Covered Multifamily Dwelling in CBC.
- 1c. Since the structure has individual property lines and ownership, each unit would be treated as a single family dwelling on its own property in our jurisdiction.
- More information concerning the parcel lot line location is required to attain the correct answer. However with the minimum info I would say an R-3.
- 1e: Is the design based on a Zero lot line?

- Any wall located on a lot line between adjacent buildings, which is used or adapted for joint service between the two buildings, shall be constructed as a fire wall in accordance with Section 705. Party walls shall be constructed without openings and shall create separate buildings. [705.1.1 Party walls]
- Don't understand the question.

Code Review Committee Supported Response

The answer is based on the criteria for a Townhouse.

In terms of construction requirements, the occupancy group is R-3 if it fits the definition of a “townhouse”, which according to Section 2.02 is a single-family dwelling unit constructed in a group of three or more attached units extending from foundation to roof with open space on at least two sides. If it doesn't fit the definition of a townhouse (e.g. each unit does not have open space on two sides), it would be an R-2. However, in either case it must follow the accessibility requirements of 11A based on definition of covered multifamily dwellings (see Sections 1107A.3-C and 1101A.1).

Subject: Allowable Area and Fire Rating for Exterior Wall Openings in R3 Occupancies

2. Footnote C to Table 704.8 relates to the maximum area of openings in exterior walls of R-3's that have a fire separation distance more than 3 feet but not more than 5 feet. Does the footnote allow:

2a. Up to 10% unprotected openings and up to 15% protected openings?

YES		NO	
6	37%	10	63%

2b. Up to 25% unprotected openings and up to 25% protected openings?

YES		NO	
4	25%	12	75%

2c. Unprotected openings and protected openings combined not to exceed a total of 25%?

YES		NO	
15	83%	3	19%

Comments by Spokespersons

- 2a) Why would someone protect 15% of their openings when they are allowed 25% unprotected?
- 704.8 equation applies - total openings combined must be equal or less than 1.
- The specific requirement of footnote c supersedes the generic requirements of the table.
- The actual amount of Protected and Unprotected openings must be less than $A/a + A_u/a_u \leq 1$, per 704.8. So there never can be 25% protected and 25% unprotected at the same time.
- If what you mean by deeded parcel is a true property line.
- It appears that footnote C is an exception to the 2nd sentence found in the narrative of 704.8. (i.e. there is an unequal trade-off between protected and unprotected openings if the formula is used.) We believe the intent of Footnote C is to allow 25 percent of the wall area to be openings (protected and/or unprotected) similar to the allowance of openings at 3 ft from property line as per 2001 CBC table 5-A.

Code Review Committee Supported Response

- 2a. No
- 2b. No
- 2c. Yes

This was confirmed by ICC. The total area of all openings is limited to 25%. They can be unprotected, protected or a combination, but the total is still limited to 25%.