

DRAFT

BUILDING CODE REVIEW BOARD

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

March 21, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT:

ADMINISTRATION PRESENT:

John Carrato, Chairman
Carl Baldassarra
Richard Bondarowicz
John Scaletta (Trustee)
Scott Smith
Steve Touloumis, Director of Building Services
Charley Craig, Assistant Building Official
Don Lay, Fire Safety Supervisor
Bernie Lyons, Deputy Fire Chief
Patty LeVee, Recording Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Darin Flaska DVM- Owner – Arlington Animal Hospital
Anita Kuhnle DVM- Owner – Arlington Animal Hospital
Manuel Govea, Associate for Linden Group Architects
Kyle Fread, Project Executive, RWE Management
Jason Sanderson, Construction Manager
Mark Grimm, Key Systems Fire Alarm Detection
Michael Matthys, Fleming Group Architect

SUBJECT:

Continuance of February 27, 2017 meeting seeking a variance from Chapter 23, Section 23-402 (amended 903.2); and Chapter 27, Section 27-102 (amended 903.2) of the Village of Arlington Heights Municipal Code requiring all new buildings and structures to be equipped with automatic sprinkler systems pertaining to Arlington Animal Hospital at 412 W. Algonquin Road.

There being a quorum present, Chairman Carrato called the meeting to order at 6:35pm. All stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CARL BALDASSARRA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 27, 2017 MEETING, SECONDED BY TRUSTEE SCALETTA, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Sanderson introduced that at the last meeting there were questions regarding what was the existing fire alarm panel at the building, and noted it is actually a burglar alarm that has some smoke detectors on it. They went back and looked at what was there and decided it is not an NFPA compliant panel. Mentioning the drawings, he pointed out the separation between the remodeled area versus non-remodeled area. They tried to investigate that wall as best they could without getting destructive because that wall is drywall. They moved the ceiling tiles and looked above to see if the wall did go all the way up to the underside of the structure. It is a CMU (Concrete Masonry Unit) wall and does go all the way up to the underside of the structure.

Mr. Sanderson stated the doors were another question mentioned and currently they are not rated. They investigated the existing building to a certain level and then spoke with fire alarm contractor, Mark Grimm, to see what options they had as far as putting in a fire alarm panel. They are proposing putting in a fully addressable fire alarm system that would meet the NFPA 72. He referred to plans and noted they are expecting to get a one hour rating out of that wall being that it is CMU. They will put new doors in as part of the remodeling project, with closers on them and making sure that they give a one hour rating.

Mr. Matthys stated they have brought two options, that being (1) to put a fully addressable system, which is something that they would be really interested in doing anyway. It is something that will help protect the building and provide the Fire Department with the best information they can give them. And then the option of making that wall rated one hour wall with new doors. They would like the Board to entertain this without them doing that because the wall does have penetrations that they will have to fire stop, they have some duct penetrations which will require additional fire dampers. If that is something the Board wants to see in order to accept not doing the sprinklers, they are certainly willing to do it. As Mr. Sanderson stated, the door frames and the doors on the first floor, besides rating the door one hour, they could put a rated two hour wall. They could rate the doors without the classification that it is one hour rated wall so that all the penetrations would have to be rated as well. Those two items are on the table for the Board to tell them today if that is something that either one of those or both would allow them to obtain a variance from the sprinkler requirement.

Mr. Baldassarra asked if they were going to install detection throughout every space of the building, protect the entire square footage of this space; every room, everywhere.

Mr. Matthys agreed and mentioned the NFPA they referenced. **Mr. Baldassarra** stated that the NFPA tells how to install it, not where to install it. It needs to be clear

that where you are installing is throughout, that you are doing the entire structure covered by smoke detection.

Mr. Matthys replied affirmatively, including the unremodeled areas. It is remodeled areas and new areas.

Mr. Baldassarra noted they are proposing Type IIB construction for the addition and asked if the existing structure was Type IIB. **Mr. Matthys** stated the existing structure is Type IIB and it is correct they are proposing Type IIB for the addition.

Mr. Baldassarra thought there was testimony last time that it had a wood deck, a plywood deck or was it a metal deck. **Mr. Sanderson** understood that it was metal decking that had plywood above it to nail the shingles to.

Mr. Baldassarra then asked how the fire alarm system would be monitored. **Mr. Grimm** answered, Emergency 24 Central Station.

Mr. Smith asked if the block wall did or did not go up to the ceiling. **Mr. Sanderson** replied it does. **Mr. Matthys** noted it goes to a steel beam. If they create a one hour wall, that beam would be required to be sprayed.

Mr. Baldassarra asked if the roof was rated. **Mr. Matthys** said it is not.

Trustee Scaletta asked for clarification that all 6,700 square feet will be covered under the new panel. It was acknowledged it would be. He asked what part of this was the original building when first built. **Mr. Sanderson** responded essentially everything other than the addition. This was built as a 6,100 square foot building. **Ms. Kuhnle** said they opened November 4, 1993.

Trustee Scaletta asked that if the Petitioner is stating it is a fire rated wall, we would be able to determine that based on the plans, if we have the plans. **Mr. Touloumis** said he would have to confirm if we have those plans.

Mr. Matthys stated he is not saying it is a fire rated wall; it is an 8 inch block wall. It is not classified as a rated wall. They would have to do additional work to classify it as a fire rated wall. They do have the existing drawings and can clearly state it is not a fire rated wall and as Mr. Sanderson said, the doors are not rated.

Trustee Scaletta asked staff that if at the last meeting they approved the addition as is and agreed that they did not have to put in a sprinkler system, would they have been required to put this in? **Mr. Lay** answered, no, they would not. It is not required because of the use. **Mr. Touloumis** said it is being added is an alternative not something that would have been required. It is being added to offset sprinklers not that it would have been there any way because it was needed.

Trustee Scaletta asked that if they had a sprinkler system, there would have to be a panel of some kind. **Mr. Touloumis** said, yes.

Mr. Bondarowicz asked if the wall that separates the addition from the remodeled area, is that a one hour wall? The reply was no, it is not.

Mr. Lyons thoughts were the same as at the initial meeting. With a variance it is important to the Fire Department that there is zero square footage with sprinklers, but with that comes the responsibility to use our judgment on variances. Being under 600 square feet, using non-combustible materials, it is not near any exposures, with the addition of what they are planning to do with improving detection, improving the alarm panel and possibly improving separation, they would not oppose a variance.

Mr. Carrato called for a motion to approve the variance based on their revised alternates.

MR. BALDASSARRA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR ALTERNATES TO THE SPRINKLER SYSTEM PER OUR VILLAGE ORDINANCE SECTION 23-402 AND SECTION F903.2 OF THE FIRE CODE PROVIDED THE FOLLOWING: THAT THE EXISTING CONSTRUCTION AND NEW ADDITION IS OF TYPE IIB CONSTRUCTION AND THAT A FIRE ALARM SYSTEM IS INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH NFPA 72 THROUGHOUT THE FACILITY AND THAT THE FIRE ALARM SYSTEM BE MONITORED OFF SITE BY AN UL LISTED CENTRAL STATION.

Mr. Baldassarra went on to say he does not know how the committee feels about the wall. It is a 6,700 square foot building, breaking it in half does not seem all that important. **Mr. Lay** said he would agree that because typically you would do that for a separation and a use. This is not a separation; it is the same use on either side. You are not really accomplishing any added benefit by making that a rated wall. It is not required in the code, so this is a judgment call.

Mr. Carrato summarized, that what we are saying is you are not going to have to upgrade the door or do anything with the vent system. **Mr. Lay** said that is correct.

Mr. Baldassarra stated he did not propose that in the motion but it is something he wanted discussed. **Chairman Carrato** agreed that it is not necessary.

TRUSTEE SCALETTA SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50pm.