

DRAFT

BUILDING CODE REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES OF A MEETING BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS BUILDING CODE REVIEW BOARD

November 8, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Tom Hutchinson, Chair
Carl Baldassarra
Richard Bondarowicz
Scott Smith
Trustee Tinaglia

ADMINISTRATION PRESENT:

Jorge Torres, Director of Building & Life Safety
Mike Boyle, Permits Supervisor
Patty LeVee, Recording Secretary

SUBJECT: Reinstatement of Roof Permit Requirement

There being a quorum present, the meeting was called to order at 6:30pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**MR. BONDAROWICZ MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 21, 2020 MINUTES OF THE BCRB.
SECONDED BY MR. SMITH, THE MOTION PASSED.**

AYES: Mr. Bondarowicz, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Smith, Trustee Tinaglia

ABSTAIN: Mr. Baldassarra (absent from January 21, 2020 Meeting)

NEW BUSINESS

Reinstate Roof Permit Requirement

Chairman Hutchinson opened the meeting to discussion to reinstate the roof permit requirement.

Mr. Torres provided some history of roof permits. The base codes, the IBC and IRC does require a building permit for any type of roofing for residential or commercial. When the Building Codes were updated in 2019-2020, that was one item that was decided to be removed from the base code.

Mr. Torres explained he is asking the Board to reconsider reinstatement of the roof permit requirement for both commercial and residential. With understanding of the reasoning of why the permit was removed, due to the fact our Inspectors do not go on top of the roof and do

inspections. While true and for the safety of the Inspectors we plan to keep it that way. Mr. **Torres** expressed that he and staff feel that the contractor, as State licensed roofers, should be held accountable for their own actions. Once we issue the building permit, residential or commercial, to the State licensed roofer, we will hold them accountable that they certify that they installed the roof per manufacturer specifications and also by the Building Code. This creates two very important points – first, and most important is that we will have a record on file on who did the roof. This helps if property sells or the homeowner has any issues; we will have information of the actual permit and the certification of installation of the roof. Second, is that we want to make sure the contractors are honest contractors, they are legit contractors that are State approved for roofing, it is a State Statute. If you are not doing your own house, a State roofer has to do the roofing. If a homeowner wants to act as their own roofer, they may, and we will have them sign off on documentation stating they are acting their own general contractor and also sign that the roof will be installed from manufacture specification and by the Building Code. The applicant, or homeowner, would have to show proof that he actually lives there, such as a driver's license that has the same address where they are installing the roof.

Mr. Torres explained the fees would be strictly flat fee. For residential the flat fee would be \$75.00. For Commercial, we are looking at \$125.00 plus a plan review of \$70.00. This is large commercial, tear off, multi-family, industrial types of roofing. The intent to keep it simple and painless, not relating to construction value, a flat fee. We will consider this as an over the counter permit and not delay a project.

Mr. Boyle noted residential over the counter permit is literally issued back across if it is asphalt roof shingle replacement. **Mr. Torres** added, it is immediately as long as they have proof of the State roofing license. For Commercial, it will take 2-3 days as there is review of items that may be required. There will be guidelines on that.

Mr. Torres concluded this is important for these reasonings and is requesting the reinstatement of the roofing permit. He noted that also, with FOIA (Freedom of Information Act), when purchasing property, people ask when was the roof done and ask for the permit information. We respond that currently we do not require a roofing permit and therefore do not have that information. This change will benefit the residents of Arlington Heights.

Mr. Baldassarra asked about the releasing of information to anyone who requests a roofing permit to any particular property. **Mr. Torres** responded yes, through Freedom of Information Act, noting there are redactions of personal information.

Mr. Baldassarra commented on the memo from Jorge, noting page 2, "if poor workmanship was later found". He stated that this is not the job of the Village. **Mr. Torres** agreed, and stated it was part of the reasoning why they removed roofs from the permitting process, however, no, we do not check workmanship. We do, however, provide information to appropriate agencies if they need to follow through on who did the work, do they have certifications etc.

Mr. Baldassarra suggested, on the following paragraph, to change Driver License to Illinois issued identification or other approved documentation. **Mr. Torres** agreed.

Mr. Baldassarra inquired about charges of permits from other Villages. **Mr. Torres** stated it's pretty typical. Some charge percentages but we are trying to stay away from percentages, we are not here to make money of the roofing permits, we are offering a service. Being we are not inspecting it, it's a minimum fee.

Chairman Hutchinson asked if there was a reason why it is not a walk out permit for anything other than asphalt, for example cedar, metal or rubber roofing. **Mr. Torres** stated, residential is over the counter immediately. Commercial involves other things that need to be looked at, such as guards, tear offs, if rubber, how will it be done. We may have conditions, there could be other items to look at, like insulation and are they opening up the envelope to the roof.

Chairman Hutchinson inquired, that no matter what, if it is residential, they can walk out with their permit that day? **Mr. Torres** responded, 99% of the time.

Trustee Tinaglia asked Mr. Torres if he knew of other municipalities that do not have permits for roofing? **Mr. Bondarowicz** stated that this was highly unusual that this move was made. He discussed even suggesting the roofing contractor purchase a license with the Village, if it is not required yet, it is not a bad idea. Charge a fee and have the legitimacy of the contractor. Many communities also require a bond, similar to the State bond. It is another layer of protection. There are stories around town where older people have been very severely taken advantage of by contractors stating they were "roofers" and they were not. **Mr. Torres** responded this would be taken into consideration.

Trustee Tinaglia stated that the short answer is that the Village on an island the past year or so by being one of the only ones that do not have a permit for roofing. This is a step back into the right direction. Plumbers, electricians, HVAC are licensed. **Mr. Torres** said we do license them; however, we do not ask for a bond, it is something we can look into to add more of a security measure.

Trustee Tinaglia asked will they be licensed roofers. **Mr. Torres** responded that they will be State licensed and we will register them also as being licensed with the Village once a year. He will look into the bond situation further. **Mr. Baldassarra** asked who the bond is intended to protect. **Mr. Torres** stated, it is a performance bond and it protects the homeowner and the Village also.

Mr. Bondarowicz commented about the requirements of an insurance certificate as done in Glenview. It would name the Village as an additional insured. It is a very simple layer of protection that adds to the legitimacy of the contractor. **Mr. Torres** added, it can actually be done over the phone. **Chairman Hutchinson** stated he believes this is at no cost. He has never been charged for that. He does not believe electrical contractors are licensed by Arlington Heights, in other towns they pay that fee. Perhaps about half of the surrounding towns do

require a bond and a Certificate of Insurance, Arlington Heights is not one of those. **Mr. Torres** said he will definitely that a look at this.

There was brief discussion regarding mid-way inspections. **Mr. Bondarowicz** said this is a very bad idea. The Village opens themselves up a liability. What if the inspector does not show up in time, when did he show up and it rained, water gets in. **Mr. Torres** agreed and said we do not want to be involved in that, this could delay a project roof covering and the weather could turn on that same day, and here the contractor is waiting for inspection to cover the roof. However, we will require that certification letter stating the work was done per manufacture specification and our Building Codes.

Chairman Hutchinson summarized that there will be no inspection other than for commercial situations. For residential, there is no inspection, they need to send the letter certifying that they did the work according to manufacture and building codes. **Mr. Torres** added, also for commercial. For commercial we will not require an inspection, if there is another trade involved, we might not. It depends what the drawings show. If insulation removal and they open the envelope, that is a different arena.

Mr. Bondarowicz commented that we might want to confer with legal as to the letter stating the roof was completed per manufacturers specification. That would be a can of worms, because the manufacturers guideline for a shingle roof to be installed states that you would have an equalized air ventilation system on a structure, which does not exist virtually anywhere. If someone states the roof was installed according to manufacturers specifications and guidelines, the fine print on every manufacturer's warranty states, for instance, "a fully balanced ventilation system". It is almost impossible to do. **Mr. Torres** added that he is also aware that the manufacturer's specification is nationally for the entire Country and it is by region. Our region is different installation and different climate.

Mr. Bondarowicz suggested to state this as, per the stated specifications in the agreement with the owner or something similar. **Trustee Tinaglia** suggested words like manufacturer's standards, compliance etc. **Mr. Torres** stated that it is in the Code, the IBC and IRC does state per manufacturer's specification. He will discuss this with legal.

Mr. Smith asked what we would do if someone applies for a license to confirm that they are qualified to do roofing work. **Mr. Torres** responded that we would ask for the State Roofing License. If they show us the State Roofing License and complete another license application for us, and provide an ID, we will give them the license overnight/or immediately, the State License Roofing Certificate is the most important. If the homeowner acts as the contractor, there will be a form stating as such and we will have that on file. If something goes wrong down the line, we have the information and they showed us their State ID that they are the homeowner who lived in that house.

Mr. Bondarowicz clarified that what Arlington Heights was doing is that anybody could put a roof on. The word on the street was, if you want to do roofs, go to Arlington Heights, you do not need

a State license. To get a State license you need a particular type of insurance, with a particular code to get that insurance.

Mr. Smith asked, what do we do independently to confirm when we issue an Arlington Heights license. **Mr. Torres** replied, we check the State license to make sure it is active and current. Just giving us the license goes a long way. **Mr. Bondarowicz** stated that the State license is issued for a two-year period.

Trustee Tinaglia asked about the timing of reinstating. **Mr. Torres** stated that if approved by the Village Board, this could start at the beginning of the year or by February to give time to educate people by promoting, marketing and social media and get the word out that the roofing permit will be required. He estimates 60 days at most, after Village Board approval.

Mr. Bondarowicz motioned that the Village of Arlington Heights reinstate the requirement of a permit for roof work on residential and commercial structures in Arlington Heights, as presented by the Board. Seconded by Mr. Baldassarra, all were in favor.

Discussion

Mr. Torres commented on one of his goals as Director is more community engagement. There are quarterly stakeholder meetings, done virtually, that they will be invited to via an email with the agenda. The next meeting is December 8, at 9:00am. It is a dialog conversation with professional designers and contractors on how we are doing as a Village in the Building Department. This helps to know the Director better and know what the Village process in terms of Building. **Trustee Tinaglia** added that he attends these meetings and finds them valuable. **Mr. Torres** is connecting with different teams out in the work force on both sides of the fence.

With no further business, Chairman Hutchinson motioned to adjourn. Seconded by Mr. Tinaglia, all were in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 6:58 pm