#### DRAFT

### **BUILDING CODE REVIEW BOARD**

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

## May 11, 2022

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Richard Bondarowicz, Acting Chairman Carl Baldassarra Richard Bondarowicz Pat O'Gorman Trustee Jim Tinaglia

Other: Keith Moens

#### **ADMINISTRATION PRESENT:**

Jorge Torres, Director of Building & Life Safety Elliot Eldridge, Assist. Building Official Dave Roberts, Division Chief Patty LeVee, Recording Secretary

## SUBJECT: Removal of Amendments to the basic Building & Fire Code

There being a quorum present, the meeting was called to order at 6:02pm.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

MR. BALDASSARRA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 8, 2021 MINUTES OF THE BCRB. SECONDED BY TRUSTEE TINALIA, THE MOTION PASSED.

AYES: Mr. Baldassarra, Mr. Bondarowicz, Mr. O'Gorman, Trustee Tinaglia,

ABSENT: Mr. Hutchinson and Mr. Smith

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

**Acting Chairman, Bondarowicz'** inquired on how the implementation of the roofing permits was going? **Mr. Torres** responded that it is going very well. There have been no complaints, on the opposite there have been several positive comments thanking us for reinstating the roofing permit requirement for protection of the new homeowner/new residents. The feedback is all good, there are no issues at all.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Removal of Varied Amendments to the Municipal Codes**

**Mr. Torres** provided background stating that we use the ICC Building Codes, which is THE standard building Codes used internationally throughout the world, these Codes have been tested and challenged by different trades and different entities. Occasionally when we adopt the

new codes, we add amendments. Amendments are something extra than the base code. There are three amendments we are seeking recommendation to remove. From talking to staff and through different experiences and conversations with some of our contractors and design professionals, we found we need to review these again and make sure if they make sense or not. **Mr. Torres** added he is not questioning why it was adopted, it may have made sense at that point when this was included as part of our codes, but we feel that it is not necessary and actually does more harm than good for the property owner.

Mr. Torres stated the first code is from the IRC, which applies for residential, single-family homes. The base code only requires a thicker plywood for sheathing  $5/8^{th}$  if the spacing of the rafter is wider than the normal. However, the amendment as we added was that any kind of spacing for roofing sheathing requires  $5/8^{th}$ .

Mr. Torres continued, that being sensitive to the markets we have now, and that we do not judge the quality of the work nor how long the material lasts versus 1/2" versus 5/8th, we all know the thicker the better is more quality, but that is not our job. Our job is to make sure it meets the current building codes. That being said, we are seeking to go back to the base code and not require 5/8th for a detached garage plywood roofing, a 5/8th for a single-family home, just because whoever put that amendment thought it was better quality work. We all know that material grades, the higher the intensity, the more quality there will be and it will last longer. Mr. Torres agrees but stated that it not our job, our job is to make sure that the applicant does the minimum requirement of the base codes which have been tested already for many years through the ICC process.

**Mr. Baldassarra** stated that the language states, shall be a minimum of 5/8" and asked, are we changing this from ½". **Mr. Torres** explained that the base code already requires ½". We are going to take out, we are removing that amendment.

**Trustee Tinaglia,** for the benefit of the audience, stated that these codes are National Codes in a book all of us use daily. From time to time over his 30 years of business with different building official of the years, codes get added to and amended. What we are doing tonight is removing a few of those amendments that maybe do not make sense anymore. **Mr. Baldassarra** asked for clarification that these were our local amendments, and we are deleting them. **Trustee Tinaglia** stated yes, this is in Chapter 23.

**Acting Chairman Bondarowicz** suggested to discuss each code separately, and commented that as a builder, and also involved in the roofing industry, and worked in 70-80 different communities, this is an odd ball requirement. It is not typical for 5/8<sup>th</sup> plywood on a roof and with the cost of lumber where it is at, it is in a way doing a disservice. Ventilation is more important than the thickness of the plywood. **Mr. Torres** agreed, adding the key is also that, when do we inspect this, if it is 5/8<sup>th</sup> or not? What do you do when the shingles are already installed? We highly recommend for the Village Board to remove this amendment.

**Acting Chairman Bondarowicz** discussed voting on each code separately and called for a motion on this issue. **Mr. Baldassarra** moved to amend the Village Code to delete the requirement for

5/8" roof sheathing in Section R803.2.2.1. **Mr. O'Gorman** seconded the motion. All in favor, motion passed.

Mr. Torres introduced the next code item, taken from the IBC, Chapter 30, related to the elevator. Mr. Torres explained the base code has a standard size for the cabin of the actual elevator. For some reason or another we added an amendment to make one elevator wider than what the base code requires for it. He had spoken with the Fire Department on this issue and presented our recommendation. They reviewed it and agreed, they do not need that wide or big of an elevator cabin. Mr. Torres continued that this is important because if the applicant is required to create this type of elevator, it is a whole different scenario in terms of elevator type. That elevator type will be huge in terms of expenses and we do not have any use for that. Mr. Torres thanked the Fire Department for their collaboration, they agree the extra space of the elevator is not needed.

Acting Chairman Bondarowicz asked for comments. Mr. Baldassarra asked, was this an amendment that said every building had to have at least one elevator this size? Does the base Code, IBC 3002.4 state if the building is four stories or more, it needs to be this size, but not all buildings? Mr. Torres explained that what the amendment required is that the size of the elevator, any elevator, would have to be bigger than what is required. The base code already has the dimension, which satisfies all usage of all elevators, we do not need a wider or bigger elevator cabin. Mr. Baldassarra noted this is all about the size, and noted the language that will remain, requires that size in buildings four stories or more. Division Chief Roberts stated it requires the fit of the stretcher, as long as we can fit the stretcher, they are good. There are different configurations but the old language is more specific, they are fine with this.

With no further comments, **Acting Chairman Bondarowicz**, called for a motion. **Mr. Baldassarra** made a motion to approve to delete the requirement to the amendment of 3002.4 from the Village amendments. **Mr. O'Gorman** second the motion. All were in favor.

**Mr. Torres** next presented the Fire Code, Chapter 9 for existing building. The base code referenced standpipe with the regular Section 905, which is the whole purpose of how to install a standpipe. We are asking to remove the amendment that was added to the end of that paragraph. Basically, if someone wants to remove the hose from the standpipe, the different requirement is needed to remove this hose. **Mr. Torres** spoke with the Fire Department and they really do not trust those hoses and prefer having the hose removed and not have it there as a tool to possibly harm someone down the road. **Division Chief Roberts** stated the only person who uses this is someone not trained in fire fighting and this is something they do not particularly want. They have a rule to never use those hoses and prefer that civilians never use them either. **Mr. Torres** added that they are trying to make it easier for the property owner to remove the fire hoses, there is no purpose of having them there.

Acting Chairman, Richard Bondarowicz called for comments, there were none. Mr. Baldassarra moved to approve the proposed amendment to 905.12 of the Village amendments. Mr. O'Gorman second the motion. All were in favor.

## Discussion

Mr. Torres added that some of these items came through conversations at the stakeholders' meetings, held quarterly with some of our design professionals and general contractors. One caller, regarding one of these codes, expressed that just did not make any sense. He then did talk to other staffing and departments, and all were in agreement to correct and make these amendments more efficient. Mr. Baldassarra noted he spoke against one of these items long ago and it did not prevail and now finally it will.

**Mr. Torres**, on a separate note, thanked the Village for doing the proclamation for the month of May, making it Building Safety month for the Village. This makes everybody aware of how important building codes are.

Acting Chairman Bondarowicz in closing commented on how great this was, it is all common sense. It is common sense that will save money and save lives, it all works. Mr. Torres stated Building & Life Safety Department tries to be very practical, there are always ways we can improve things, and encouraged anyone at the table that sees anything that needs improvement or discussion to bring to his or Elliot's attention.

There was brief discussion that the Electrical Commission has been eliminated, noting Mr. Hutchinson (Chairman) from that Commission is now on the Building Code Review Commission.

With no further business, Acting Chairman Bondarowicz motioned to adjourn. Seconded by Trustee Tinaglia, all were in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 6:24 pm