

## Plan Review Committee Results for September 2005

	YES	NO	% Yes	% NO
1. Are elevators installed in a 2-story Type V-N building required to be enclosed within a 1-hour shaft?	32	16	67%	40%
2. Do you require Chapter 11B accessibility for a U-3 Ag building where employees work on the premises?	25	18	58%	42%

**Total Responses 45**

### Question #1 Comments

1. Elevators are installed per manufactures specification, typically require a one-hour shaft.
2. If a shaft is provided it needs to be one hour rated. But a shaft is not required per CBC 711.3
3. These are "knee jerk" answers. I haven't researched the code or discussed with the Building Official.
4. We believe requirements for a shaft enclosure UBC 711 and T-6a would apply.
5. Depends on the occupancy my friend!??!
6. C.B.C. Sec. 3002 and sec. 711.1 refers us back to Chapter 6 and Table 6-A. T 6-A requires 1-hour rating.
7. Question 1 doesn't indicate what the occupancy is and going to table 6a and to 304.6 and to 711 and Ch 10, it brought me back to Table 6a where it says it requires a 1 hr shaft.
8. A 1HR shaft is not required for openings through only one floor, however normal fireblocking and draftstopping provisions would still apply.
9. Ref CBC 711.3
10. The Handbook to the 1997 UBC makes it clear that the exception in 711.3 for shafts "...that are not concealed within building construction assemblies.." doesn't apply to elevator shafts.
11. Depending on occupancy.
12. You did not offer the occupancy type in the question, but for your typical B occupancy, no. The two stories can communicate with each other. See CBC 711.3, Table 6A-#3 and 3002.
13. Although, I believe most AHJ's do not require shafts under the conditions you specify it is hard to justify within the code. CBC section 711.3 conditions the use of an un-rated shaft, among other things, that it not be "concealed within building construction assemblies". This restriction seems to mean that the un-rated shaft would need to be out in the open and not adjacent or connected to building walls. Another argument for requiring rated shafts can be found in CBC section 711.6 where rated shafts are required for dumbwaiters in Type V construction. Dumbwaiters shafts seem that they would have the same level of hazard as an elevator.

14. A strict interpretation of Section 3002 allows the shaft to have the same fire-resistive rating as the main structure. Use would be the determining factor. A high occupant load might trigger the need for a one-hour shaft.
15. Not required if penetrating only one floor. Based on procedure adopted by building dept. based primarily on the lack of specific info from UBC with reference of language in the IBC.
16. We have extensively addressed those questions on the Building Code Discussions Group (BCDG). For background information, visit the BCDG and use the "find" tab to search the Q&A. <http://bcodes.infopop.cc/eve> regards,

### Question #2 Comments

17. The City does not have U-3 building. But, My experience with other cities (Many U-3 buildings)
18. Isn't the ag bldg still considered a U-1? 1113B states "reserved for future use" it is my interpretation based on Michael Gibbins interpretation that this occupancy is not mandated at this time.
19. The City has not adopted CBC Appendix Chapter 3 regarding U/Agricultural structures. There are not requirements in Chpt. 11B for U occupancies.
20. Accessible parking, restrooms, offices and lunch rooms.
21. No, there are no specific requirements under section 1113B thus dictating application of 11B Division I, II or III requirements.
22. Probably
23. Appendix Chapter 3 not adopted by our jurisdiction. Not adopted in Matrix Adoption Tables for local building official. BUT, if it was: Per Chapter 11, Section 1103B.1 and per 1101B.2 that refers us specifically to Section 1114B.1.1 for facility accessibility.
24. I was referred to Appendix Ch3. and could not find that Chap 11B would apply.
25. No accessibility requirements are listed for any 'U' occupancy in Chapter 11B.
26. U-3 does not appear to be in the CBC
27. Chapter 11B criteria should be applied if the jurisdiction formally adopted appendix chapter 3, division II
28. If we had such an occupancy, treat similar to F, CBC 1107B
29. CBC 101.17.11 Item 2 requires accessibility for all "commercial facilities", which is defined in CBC 204. The presence of employees on the premises of a nonresidential building makes it a commercial facility.
30. I can't find a U-3 occupancy in the CBC, but I would think the trigger for accessibility would be the employees. I am going on Vacation NOW for 3 weeks and could only devote a few moments to these questions.
31. No. You must first define the Ag building as "Commercial" before disabled access requirements come into play. Defining an Ag building as commercial would be a stretch since no (F-1 or F-2)

processing or manufacturing is typically done in true Ag buildings. The CBC does not require accessible parking, restroom facilities, etc. for farm fields, orchards, vineyards, etc. I see no difference between these and a true U-3 occupancy.

32. CBC 1103B states that "Accessibility to buildings or portions of buildings shall be provided to all occupancy classifications except as modified or enhanced by this chapter". The only other section that would "modify" the general requirement is 1123B ACCESS TO EMPLOYEE AREAS. This section could be applied to specific areas such as milking barns.
33. When physically (architecturally) possible, all employees should be provided with an accessible work place.
34. Ag Bldgs by definition are not a place of human habitation, a place of employment, or a place used by public that's why they are exempt from the accessibility requirements. If employees work on the premises then the building must be reclassified in the occupancy group other than U-1/U-3 (Ag Bldg.) that it most nearly resembles.
35. It depends on the use. If it for storing hay, then no, but I did a milking barn with a large office area attached that I did require ADA compliance.

#### **PRC Supported Response Question #1**

**YES**

- **If a shaft for an elevator is installed in a two story building that is wholly or partially concealed by walls, then the shaft must be rated a minimum of one-hour construction. Openings are not required to be protected unless otherwise required in the code. We believe the key concern is the prevention of smoke/fire from entering areas such as floor & attic areas where it may go undetected.**

#### **PRC Supported Response Question #2**

**YES**

- **Because CBC chapter 11B, section 1103B.1 specifically requires accessibility to buildings or portions of buildings for all occupancies unless otherwise exempted. (Section 1113B does not exempt U-3 occupancies). Access to the building entrance (could be from a parking area outside the building) and into the building is required. Additionally, the PRC notes that if there are specific work stations (see CBC 224) that they would be required to be accessible as defined in section 1123B. An example of this would be a hybridizing station in a greenhouse. It should also be noted that accessibility to buildings is not conditional upon jurisdictional adoption or lack of adoption of any part of the code.**

Thank You,

Paul Klein, C.B.O.  
Assistant Chief Building Official/PRC Chairman  
Yuba County Building Inspection Division  
915 8th Street, Suite 133  
Marysville, CA 95901  
Email: [pklein@co.yuba.ca.us](mailto:pklein@co.yuba.ca.us)  
Ph: (530) 749-5435