

Pikes Peak Regional Building Department

2880 International Circle
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80910

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

July 3, 2018

10:00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Chris Richardson, Building Contractor A or B
Larry Bobo, Electrical Contractor
Steve Horner, Structural Engineer
Michael Finkbiner, Building Contractor D
Micah Langness, Master Plumber
Dan Rial, Mechanical Contractor
Swagata Guha, Architect

MEMBERS ABSENT:

OTHERS PRESENT: Roger Lovell, Regional Building Official
Virginia Koulchitzka, Regional Building Counsel
Jay Eenhuis, Deputy Building Official - Plans
Jack Arrington, Chief Plumbing/Mechanical Inspector
Matt Matzen, Permit Supervisor
Linda Gardner, Executive Administrative Assistant

PROCEEDINGS:

Chairman Chris Richardson called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

1. CONSIDERATION OF THE JUNE 6, 2018 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Steve Horner stated he would like to make a correction to the Technical Committee Minutes, i.e., Item 3, 5th paragraph down should state “approximately 40%,” instead of “22%”. A motion was made by Steve Horner to **APPROVE** the June 6, 2018 Technical Committee Minutes, with the noted correction, seconded by Larry Bobo; the motion carried unanimously.

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

- a) 1103 Willow Bend Circle, #A, Permit L47071 – Jerry Charles Hecht Revocable Trust, homeowner, requests a variance to Section R310.1, 2009 International Residential Code, to allow a 47” window sill height in existing conditions where a maximum of 44” above the floor was allowed.
- b) 544 Shady Crest Circle, Permit L57192 – Mark Leiker, M. J. Leiker Construction Co., requests a variance to Section R310.1, 2009 International Residential Code, to allow a 47” window sill height in existing conditions where a maximum of 44” was allowed.

A motion was made by Michael Finkbiner to recommend to the Board of Review **APPROVAL** of the Consent Calendar Variance Requests, seconded by Swagata Guha; the motion carried unanimously.

VARIANCE REQUESTS

3. 4090 Briargate Parkway, Permit K97667 – Mike Whitley, Children’s Hospital Colorado, requests a variance to Table 1504.8, 2009 International Building Code, to allow aggregate to be used at a maximum roof height of up to 55’ based on an engineering report authored by CCP, a Colorado Licensed Professional Engineer. *This variance request was postponed for 30 days during the June 6, 2018 Technical Committee meeting so the applicant could revise the roof plan to show the ballast sizes on the revised plan.*

Michael Whitley, Senior Project Manager for Children’s Hospital Colorado, appeared and stated he had submitted the additional documentation that the Committee requested last month. He stated there were three different roof levels, i.e. Level 3, Level 4, and Level 5, which were unballasted; Level 3 was at 32’, Level 4 was at 48’, and they were both intended to have stone ballasts. He stated 12’ around the parapets and in the corners, there would be 2½” diameter stone; and on the interior there was 1½” diameter stone. Steve Horner stated in comparing the CPP reports from last month to this month, they have changed the height from 32’ to 48’. Mr. Whitley stated the helicopter landing pad was on grade approximately 200’ from the building. He stated the maximum height of the structure would be 48’. He stated there was a 5’ high parapet around both roofs, so their hope was that the stones would not leave the roof. He stated the ballasts did not serve any structural purpose. He stated they planned to place precast 3” pavers on top of the membrane around the perimeter and from the roof access to the mechanical units.

A motion was made by Steve Horner to recommend to the Board of Review **APPROVAL** of the variance request to allow ballasts on a roof up to a height of 55’ in Exposure C in this jurisdiction based on the fact that 1½” diameter stone would be used in the interior, with 2½” diameter stone around the perimeter, and it was a fully adhered membrane, seconded by Micah Langness; the motion carried unanimously.

4. 2283 San Marcos Drive, Permit K76590 – Lee Miller/San Marcos Properties, LLC, homeowner, requests a variance to Section R905.2.2, 2009 International Residential Code, to allow asphalt strip shingles to be installed on a roof pitch less than 2:12.

Lee Miller stated he was the owner of San Marcos Properties, LLC and was the managing member of the LLC. He stated this roof was replaced due to the 2016 hail storm. He stated he measured the slope on the patio cover and came up with a 2.1:12 slope, and when he failed his inspection, he discovered that his first measurement was inaccurate, and it was actually a 1.5:12 pitch. He stated the roof was over a patio cover, and he sheathed over the

roof with Densdeck, plus two layers of synthetic felt, and Class 4 shingles. A motion was made by Michael Finkbiner to recommend to the Board of Review **APPROVAL** of the variance request pending verification from an RBD inspector that there were two layers of synthetic felt over this roof, seconded by Larry Bobo; the motion carried unanimously.

5. 6729 Stockwell Drive, Permit L40541 – William Neaves, S2 Contracting, requests a variance to Section R310.2, 2009 International Residential Code, to allow a horizontal projection of 30” for an egress window well where a minimum of 36” was required.

William Neaves stated one of the bedrooms in this basement finish had a pre-existing window well that was 30” deep. He stated there was a tree and water lines for the sprinkler system that prohibit digging out a Code compliant window well. Mr. Neaves stated the window was 4’ x 4’. He stated this house was built in December 2000. Jay Eenhuis stated under the Uniform Building Code, a 30” window well was acceptable. He stated RBD staff did take exception to this variance request because it was a life safety issue. A motion was made by Michael Finkbiner to recommend to the Board of Review **DENIAL** of the variance request due to life safety issues, seconded by Swagata Guha; the motion carried unanimously.

6. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- a) Future Consent Calendar Item(s) Discussion

Jay Eenhuis stated Item 1 was now acceptable in the new Code; the section codes have changed in Items 2 a and b; only the year would change in Item 3, i.e. 2015 IRC; Item 4 would be deleted because it was a City of Colorado Springs ordinance; Items 5 and 6 would be removed because the products were now listed with the ICC and the variance would no longer be required; Item 7 was no longer necessary; and Item 8 would now fall under the Alternative Materials and Methods procedure. Roger Lovell stated if there was a variance request regarding solid wood roofing, CSFD would like to be involved. He stated the 2009 IBC did not address a condition where you have an unvented attic and spray foam was used; however, the 2009 IRC did address this issue. He stated this issue had been resolved in the new codes.

Mr. Eenhuis stated Section R905.2.2, International Residential Code, to allow asphalt strip shingles to be installed on a roof slope less than 2 units vertical in 12 units horizontal (2:12) where prohibited, with the stipulation the structure was unenclosed, with ice and water shield fully adhered as the underlayment per R905.1.2 and the contractor, in writing, assumes liability of the manufacturer’s warranty, with the following potential stipulations: A minimum threshold of roof slope; and written verification from the property owner acknowledging the property owner was aware of warranty and code issues. Mr. Eenhuis inquired whether there was a slope threshold the Committee would feel comfortable with two layers of felt versus fully adhered ice and water shield. Michael Finkbiner stated a 1:12 pitch should be the minimum slope with

self-adhered underlayment. He stated he would also like to require a notarized letter from the homeowner on company letterhead. Jina Koulchitzka stated by requiring the letter be on company letterhead, the homeowner would only be approving what the contractor had written in the letter; and the Committee should consider foregoing the letterhead requirement. Mr. Finkbiner stated this issue would not be a consent variance unless all of the required documentation was submitted to RBD prior to the Technical Committee meeting. Swagata Guha asked RBD staff about the issue of pre-fabricated roof covers, and Mr. Eenhuis stated they would not be considered unless they were detached and less than 200 square feet. He said if they were larger than 200 square feet and attached to the house, they must be engineered.

Mr. Eenhuis stated another issue was the bottle filling stations in lieu of high/low drinking fountains. He stated RBD had a request recently for a beverage service station in lieu of the high/low water fountain, and this was processed under the Alternative Materials and Methods procedure. The Committee determined that the bottle filling stations should be a consent variance item.

Mr. Eenhuis stated a potential mechanical variance to allow basement finishes in houses permitted prior to June 1, 2018, to obtain combustion air by means of following Section 305.4.2 of the 2011 Pikes Peak Regional Building Code. Jack Arrington stated this was the 6-inch outside air duct that ties into the return drop on the furnace within 12' of the blower, which were seen on most homes built in the past 20 years or more. He stated in the new Code it was make-up air only and not combustion air in an existing basement. The Committee determined that this issue should be a consent variance.

Swagata Guha stated she had an issue with the tamper resistant electrical receptacles because they were so difficult to use. Mr. Lovell stated this issue was a State Electrical Code issue, and RBD could not change the Code to make it less restrictive; it could only change the Code to make it more restrictive. He stated RBD could grant variances to the State Electrical Code provided it had an equally good or better form of construction. He stated the issue with the tamper resistant electrical receptacles was that there was not an alternative to the tamper resistant outlet. Mr. Finkbiner stated he did not think this should be a consent variance; it should be heard on a case by case basis.

Dan Rial requested information with regard to mechanical licensees doing large commercial jobs, and Mr. Arrington stated this would be a licensing issue, and should not be a variance request. Ms. Koulchitzka stated all license requests were examined thoroughly by RBD staff prior to placing such on the Licensing Committee's consent agenda, excepting certain license applications, which for different reasons required an in-person appearance before the Licensing Committee. Mr. Lovell stated the request could be made, but it would be on a case by case basis.

Mr. Arrington stated the consent variance regarding chimney liners would no longer be a consent item; it would be heard by the Committee on a case by case basis. Mr. Lovell stated RBD staff had concerns regarding life safety issues with regard to this variance request, and removed it from the consent variance request list.

Mr. Lovell stated RBD staff would send the Committee an updated Consent Calendar Variance List to be voted on next month.

7. **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no New Business to discuss.

The meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger N. Lovell
Regional Building Official
RNL/llg