

Pikes Peak Regional Building Department

2880 International Circle
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80910

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

June 6, 2018

9:00 a.m.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Michael Finkbiner, Building Contractor D

OTHERS PRESENT: Virginia Koulchitzka, Regional Building Counsel
Jay Eenhuis, Deputy Building Official - Plans
John Welton, Deputy Building Official - Inspections
Dean Wemmer, Chief Electrical Inspector
Linda Gardner, Executive Administrative Assistant

PROCEEDINGS:

Chairman Chris Richardson called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

1. **CONSIDERATION OF THE MAY 2, 2018 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**, which require a correction of the record with regard to Variance No. 9.b. as to the address of the property (as submitted in the variance application). The address needs to be corrected from 366 10th Street, Calhan to 488 10th Street, Calhan.

Jina Koulchitzka stated RBD was informed recently that the address for Variance No. 9.b. of 366 10th Street, Calhan, Colorado, was incorrect, and it should have been 488 10th Street, Calhan, Colorado. She stated this correction had been made in RBD's records, and had been reflected in the May 2, 2018 Technical Committee Minutes. A motion was made by Steve Horner to **APPROVE** the May 2, 2018 Technical Committee Minutes, with the correction as noted in the June 6, 2018 Technical Committee Minutes, seconded by Larry Bobo; the motion carried unanimously.

2. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

- a) 5069 Spotted Horse Drive, Permit L37005 – Douglas Hoffman, homeowner, requests a variance to Section R310.1, 2009 International Residential Code, to allow a 50" window sill height in existing conditions where a maximum of 44" above the floor is allowed, with the stipulation that a step is permanently installed under the windowsill with a 6" rise and a minimum of 11½" tread and the full width of the window opening.

A motion was made by Swagata Guha to **APPROVE** the Consent Calendar Variance Requests, as worded, seconded by Dan Rial; the motion carried unanimously.

VARIANCE REQUESTS

3. 4090 Briargate Parkway, Permit K97667 – Alain Belanger, FKP/Cannon Design, 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, where a maximum height of 15' is allowed.

Alain Belanger appeared and stated he was requesting a variance for the ballasted roof on this structure above the 15' that was allowed per Code. He stated he had attached a report from CCP, which noted that Colorado Springs was in Category B and not Category C. He said Category C only allowed 15' maximum roof height for a ballasted system. He stated a Category B would allow a ballasted roof up to 55'. Mr. Belanger stated currently the roof height is proposed to be 32'. He stated his client is proposing a 1¼" or above ballasts, which was above the 50 year recurrence on the wind gusts. He stated the majority of the ballasts were 2" to 4", and they were colored ballasts.

Jay Eenhuis stated Exposure C is the minimum Exposure Category in the Pikes Peak Regional Building Code, and Exposure B had been amended out of the International Building Code ("IBC"), so all locations within RBD's jurisdiction was a minimum Exposure C. He stated, in looking at that specific area through the definition of the IBC, if we put Exposure B back into play, there were portions of the structure on the north and south that could be classified as Exposure B; however, from the east and west, it was fairly open land, including John Venezia Community Park, which in RBD staff's opinion, should be classified as Category C.

Mr. Belanger stated the ballast roof was 32' above grade on the north and east faces of the building, and the low side was 48' above grade because it was one story below grade on that side of the building. He stated the reasoning behind this variance was to allow the structure to withstand wind gusts. He stated the ballasts do vary in size. Mr. Belanger stated according to the CCP report, the highest wind gusts were expected to occur every 50 years.

Steve Horner asked if there were different stone sizes around the perimeter of this ballasted roof, or was it the same size throughout. Mr. Belanger stated there were different sizes based on the color of the roof because the dark color was for the 2" to 4" ballasts, and the light color was for the 1¼" to 3" ballasts. Mr. Horner stated his experience had shown that there was larger perimeter rock for higher uplift forces on a ballasted roof. Mr. Belanger stated the south face was above 60', but it did not have any ballasts on that section of the roof. Steve Horner stated Colorado Springs had downslope winds, and going from a Category C to a B was approximately a 40% reduction in windspeed.

Chris Richardson suggested removing the Categories B and C from the variance request to allow a roof height of up to 48', and RBD staff agreed with that suggestion. Mr. Horner stated if the roof was designed for a ballasted roof, there should be an allowance for stone sizes as well. Mr. Belanger stated he would like to **POSTPONE** this variance request for 30 days, so he could revise his roof plan, showing the ballast sizes on the revised plan.

4. 250 South Union Boulevard – Mira Theisen, Perkins & Will, on behalf of USOC, requests three (3) variances:

Swagata Guha stated she had done a great deal of work for USOC, but she was not involved in this project and asked whether anyone had any issues with her voting on this variance request. There were no objections raised.

Chairman Richardson read an email from Doreen Withee with the Colorado Springs Fire Department (“CSFD”), dated June 5, 2018: “CSFD granted a variance last month to omit sprinklers under the 2009 IFC. Along with that variance, there was a limit placed on the occupant load of 400, no temporary increase would be allowed, and no vendors would be allowed to set up inside the velodrome during events. They would also enter into the CSFD’s A2 annual permit program.”

- a) Sections 507 and 507.5, 2009 International Building Code, to allow open yard provision to be reduced for approximately 6.4% of the existing dome perimeter.

Mira Theisen appeared and stated USOC would like to change the veladome (“dome”) from a temporary status building to a permanent status building; it would like to keep the dome up year round in lieu of the 180 days that it currently had as a temporary building. She stated she had been working with RBD staff to change the occupancy of the building from an A5 outdoor structure to an A4 structure, which subjected USOC to the Codes for an A4 indoor athletic facility.

Jay Eenhuis stated the land in which this project is located was owned by the City of Colorado Springs and was told the Zoning authority would be the City Parks Department. At this time, no plans have been submitted for review of this project, but when submitted, a Zoning review and approval will be required before the project is permitted. It will be the City of Colorado Springs’ determination as to whom that specific agency will be. Ms. Theisen stated the dome was currently used as a training facility, and the average number of people in the dome was 40 to 45 people. She stated on occasion, there had been an occasional Christmas party in the center of the structure, and USOC could have up to 400 occupants. She stated there was currently a manual fire alarm system in the structure, which was acceptable with CSFD. She stated there was a grand stand building that sat on the west side of the dome and encroached on the 60’ open yard

criteria; it sat within 7½' of the existing dome. She stated the grand stand supports the dome by providing restrooms and support amenities for the athletes and staff inside the dome.

Mr. Eenhuis stated RBD staff takes no exception to this variance request for the small percentage of space that does not have a 60' yard. A motion was made by Swagata Guha to recommend to the Board of Review **APPROVAL** of the variance request, seconded by Larry Bobo; the motion carried unanimously.

- b) Section 912.5.1, 2009 International Existing Building Code, to allow existing dome height to remain, listed as 80'6" AFF on original drawings, to remain with the dome as a permanent building.

Ms. Theisen stated the dome exceeded the maximum height of 55' allowed by Code, as it was 80'6". Mr. Eenhuis stated RBD staff takes no exception to this variance request because with the higher space, it gave more room for the smoke to accumulate before affecting the occupants on the floor. A motion was made by Swagata Guha to recommend to the Board of Review **APPROVAL** of the variance request, seconded by Dan Rial; the motion carried unanimously.

- c) Table 1016.1, 2009 International Building Code, to allow an exit distance exceeding 200' from the most remote point in the building, where prohibited.

Ms. Theisen stated the dome had four emergency exits, but the travel distance exceeded 200' from the most remote point in the building to the closest exit. She stated the current exit distance was approximately 261'. She stated the entire dome was 490' long and 241' wide. She stated they were unable to add additional exits due to the slope of the track. Mr. Eenhuis stated RBD staff takes no exception to this variance request. He stated with the dome becoming a permanent A4 structure, in lieu of an A5 structure, all of the permanent requirements of the Code would need to be met before USOC receives their certificate of occupancy, which would include a posted occupant load. He stated there was a path in the Code that allowed RBD to use an actual load vs. a calculated load. He stated in previous discussions, USOC arrived at an occupant load of 299 because that was appropriate for the plumbing fixture count, means of egress, etc.; and occupants loads that exceeded 299 would require a temporary use permit and specific fire watch. A motion was made by Swagata Guha to recommend to the Board of Review **APPROVAL** of the variance request because use is limited and the risk is minimal, if not none, conditional on limiting the occupant load to 299 occupants, seconded by Larry Bobo; the motion carried 4:1. Steve Horner opposed.

- 5. 97 Norman Drive, Permit L43767 – Kenneth Gestes, Gestes Roofing, Inc., 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.

Kenneth Gestes appeared and stated he checked the roof slope before reroofing this house, but the structure was 50 years old, and there were some variations to the slope. He stated he had given the homeowner a ten-year warranty for materials and labor. He stated he installed ice and water shield over this entire section of the roof.

Chairman Richardson read the June 1, 2018 email from Michael Finkbiner to the Licensing Committee and RBD staff approving this variance request, based on information he received from the applicant, which reflected that ice and water shield had been installed on this portion of the roof; the contractor had notified the homeowner that the manufacturer's warranty was voided due to the current construction; and the contractor had extended his warranty for ten years for labor and materials for this roof. Mr. Gestes stated he had also supplied a letter of approval from the homeowner. A motion was made by Steve Horner to recommend to the Board of Review **APPROVAL** of the variance request, seconded by Micah Langness; the motion carried unanimously.

6. 6785 Fielding Circle, Permit K43085 – Robert Pond, ACE Construction & Exteriors, 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. *This item was postponed from the May 2, 2018 Technical Committee meeting so the applicant could obtain additional documentation for the Technical Committee's review.*

Edward Hamel appeared and stated he submitted the documentation to RBD that was requested during the May 2, 2018 Technical Committee meeting. Chairman Richardson read the June 1, 2018 email from Michael Finkbiner approving this variance request, contingent upon receiving documentation that two layers of underlayment or one layer of ice and water shield had been installed on the roof, and the contractor provided documentation that the homeowner had been notified that the manufacturer's warranty for materials was voided due to the current construction. A motion was made by Steve Horner to recommend to the Board of Review **APPROVAL** of the variance request based on the submittal of the requested documentation, seconded by Larry Bobo; the motion carried unanimously.

7. 6763 Gold Drop Drive, Permit K90719 – Dream Team Construction requests a variance to Section R311.3, 2009 International Residential Code, to allow a landing outside an exterior door to be less than the 36" required by Code.

Micah Langness recused himself from Item 7.

Albert Wills appeared and stated this was a covered porch on a Challenger Homes' master plan, which was shown as an option. He stated the homeowner did not choose the option until after the house was built. He stated the stairs were off this deck running into the setback, so he turned the stairs. Mr. Wills stated he used a low profile door. He stated there was no landing outside of this exterior door. John Welton stated Code would allow an 18"

landing as long as it was not more than 30” above grade, and there was another exterior door in the home that does have a Code compliant landing. Albert Wills stated he would like to **WITHDRAW** his variance request, and he would correct the issue.

8. 3311 Bishop Pine Point, Permit L15954 – Robert Schmidt, Precision Electric, Inc., requests a variance to Section 210.12, 2014 National Electrical Code, to install regular 15 amp. breakers in place of arc fault breakers, with the condition that a notarized letter be required from the record owner, Pamela J. Keller Trust, recognizing that it understands and acknowledges that the AFCI breakers were being replaced due to incompatibility with the lighting control system.

Robert Schmidt appeared and stated he installed a Lutron Lighting system with nine circuits in this home, which was not compatible with the arc fault breakers. Larry Bobo stated we have had numerous examples of this same issue with lighting control systems in the past. Dean Wemmer stated this variance was due to the lighting control system; therefore, the breakers do not need to remain with the property should the home be sold. A motion was made by Larry Bobo to recommend to the Board of Review **APPROVAL** of the variance request, and the breakers do not need to remain in the panel should the home be sold, seconded by Dan Rial; the motion carried unanimously.

9. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- a) Further Update of Variance for Pavilion at the El Paso County Fairgrounds, if needed (as already addressed in Item No. 1 above).

Jina Koulchitzka stated this issue was discussed at the commencement of the meeting.

10. **NEW BUSINESS**

- a) Code Adoption

Jay Eenhuis stated the new Codes were officially adopted on June 1, 2018.

- b) RBD’s Open House

Jay Eenhuis stated RBD would be having an open house on June 14th and 15th, and there would be a class on the new Codes given during RBD’s open house.

- c) Curbs on Rooftops

Dan Rial asked if 18” curbs were now required on rooftops; it was his understanding that they were using them in Denver. He stated he believed it was because the insulation in

roofs was getting thicker. He asked if mechanical contractors in El Paso County were required to use 18” curbs. Mr. Rial said Code stated that the unit was required to be 3” above a surface. John Welton stated the roof insulation should not impact the curb in most cases. He stated 14” curbs were allowed in El Paso County.

d) Consent Variance Requests

John Welton stated there were a number of Consent Variance Requests that would no longer be required due to the new Code adoption. He stated RBD staff would be transmitting the list of consent variance requests to the Committee members for their input with regard to which consent variances to retain. He stated the arc fault breaker variances would remain on a case by case basis because such were governed by the State Electrical Board. He stated he would like the Committee to make a determination on this issue during the July 3, 2018 Technical Committee meeting.

e) Plan Submittals Under the New Codes

Jay Eenhuis stated plans may be submitted to RBD until December 1, 2018 under the 2009 Codes or the 2015 Codes.

The meeting adjourned at 10:39 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger N. Lovell
Regional Building Official

RNL/llg