Pikes Peak Regional Building Department

2880 International Circle Colorado Springs, Colorado 80910

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

February 6, 2019	9:00 a.m.
MEMBERS PRESENT:	Vice Chairman Steve Horner, Structural Engineer Micah Langness, Master Plumber Dan Rial, Mechanical Contractor Larry Bobo, Electrical Contractor Swagata Guha, Architect
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Chairman Chris Richardson, Building Contractor A or B Michael Finkbiner, Building Contractor D
OTHERS PRESENT:	Virjinia Koultchitzka, Regional Building Counsel Jay Eenhuis, Deputy Building Official – Plans John Welton, Deputy Building Official – Inspections Bert Warchol, Chief Building Inspector Jack Arrington, Chief Plumbing/Mechanical Inspector Dean Wemmer, Chief Electrical Inspector Linda Gardner, Executive Administrative Assistant

PROCEEDINGS:

Vice Chairman Steve Horner called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

1. CONSIDERATION OF THE JANUARY 9, 2019 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

A motion was made by Swagata Guha to **APPROVE** the January 9, 2019 Technical Committee Minutes as written, seconded by Larry Bobo; the motion carried unanimously.

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

Consent calendar items will be acted upon as a whole, unless a specific item is called for discussion by a Committee member or a citizen wishing to address the Committee.

a) 7113 Gardenstone Drive – David Self, homeowner, requests a variance to Section R310.2.2, 2015 International Residential Code, to allow a 46" window sill height in existing conditions, where a maximum of 44" is allowed per Code.

A motion was made by Swagata Guha to recommend to the Board of Review **APPROVAL** of the Consent Variance Request, seconded by Micah Langness; the motion carried unanimously.

3. ITEMS CALLED OFF CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no items called off the Consent Calendar.

VARIANCE REQUESTS

4. 1610 West Garden of the Gods Road, Plan C112110 – Adam Thesing, YOW Architects, requests a variance to Section 240.24(B), 2014 National Electrical Code, to allow access to electrical panels through an adjacent suite, where prohibited.

Adam Thesing appeared and stated this structure was being subdivided for current and future tenants to lease. He stated there was a closet that contains the electric panels for two of the units. He stated Suite 110 was a 24-hour use and Suite 100 was an 8 to 5 use. Mr. Thesing produced a letter from the property owner setting forth his intent for the space. Brad Taylor, property owner, stated he thought he had addressed the electric issues for Unit 110, but they have not had any need to access the panel. He stated he would be willing to change the access to the electrical panels when the tenant in Suite 110 changes. Dean Wemmer stated RBD staff does not take exception to this variance with the stipulation that the owner vacate that closet when the tenant in Suite 110 vacates the property. He stated since the issue was with Suite 110 and the business was open 24 hours per day, access to the Board of Review **APPROVAL** of the variance request, with the stipulation that if the tenant in Suite 110 was to move out of that space, provisions would have to be made to allow access to the electrical panels for Suite 100, seconded by Swagata Guha; the motion carried unanimously.

Jina Koultchitzka stated the Colorado Springs Fire Department had notified the Department that it does not oppose any of the variances on the agenda today.

5. 6775 Lange Circle, Permit M07035 – Allison Meggers, homeowner, requests a variance to Section R310.2.1, 2015 International Residential Code, to allow a net clear opening width on an egress window of 19 5/8", where a minimum of 20" was required per Code.

Allison Meggers appeared and stated the window in her basement bedroom would only open to 19 5/8", where a minimum of 20" was required per Code. John Welton stated the inspector's notes reflect that the window would open to a maximum of 19". He stated any variance other than 19 5/8" would have to be verified by an RBD inspector. A motion was made by Swagata Guha to recommend to the Board of Review **APPROVAL** of the variance request to allow a net clear opening width of 19", seconded by Larry Bobo; the motion carried.

6. 11195 Highway 83 – Pikes Peak Community College requests a variance to Section RBC312.4.6, 2017 Pikes Peak Regional Building Code, to appeal the decision or order of the Building Official regarding Numeric Address Change in accordance with RBC101.7.

Jina Koultchitzka stated this variance was an appeal of the Building Official's decision, and therefore, procedurally, in accordance with Section RBC101.7, 2017 Pikes Peak Regional Building Code. All parties testifying were sworn in.

Lorelle Davies, Pikes Peak Community College (PPCC or the "College"), appeared and stated the address for the north campus had officially been designated as 11195 Highway 83, which was not a problem until recently when the same address was designated in Franktown, Colorado. Therefore, the College was requesting that the address be changed to 11195 Interquest Parkway.

Jay Eenhuis stated Section RBC312.4.1, 2017 Pikes Peak Regional Building Code, provides RBD staff a reference point from which all numeric addresses are the zero hundred block. He stated approximately every mile travelled away from reference point zero shall result in an increase of 1000 numeric addresses. Based on the numerical grid, this specific property falls in the 2000 to 2100 range, as it is approximately 2 miles east of reference point zero. Mr. Eenhuis stated 2070 was the number proposed by the Enumeration department because Interquest generally runs in an east-west direction, whereas Highway 83 generally runs in a north-south direction. Ms. Davies stated they chose the Interquest Parkway address because it was easier to navigate for people searching for the location. Warren Epstein, PPCC, stated there were three different access points on to the PPCC campus. He stated the purpose for the address change was to make it easier for students and the public to find the College. Mr. Eenhuis stated Hwy 83 now ends at the intersection on Powers. He stated RBD had to consider further expansion of this area and having a building addressed 11195 on the north side of the street with a 2000 series number on the south side would be very confusing.

Ms. Davies stated PPCC would like to keep some type of continuity by changing the street name, but not the numeric address. She stated Hwy 83 and Interquest Parkway were the same road, which also makes it less confusing for people. She stated people were driving west to east down Interquest Parkway to get to PPCC due to access. Mr. Eenhuis stated the 2070 address number falls in line with the east-west numbering on Interquest Parkway. He stated the neighbor's address of 11195 is a Voyager Parkway address, which is a north south street. He stated the street name is typically based on the location of access to the property, and where the property fronts, however PPRBD has no authority over street naming, only the Enumeration of structures on the named street.

Steve Horner stated based on the existing addresses in this area, the address of 2070 Interquest Parkway appears to be a logical address. Swagata Guha stated she believes that keeping the address in line with other addresses in this area would be less confusing for people looking for this location. A motion was made by Swagata Guha to recommend to

the Board of Review **DENIAL** of the variance request for the reasons discussed, including, but not limited to remaining accountable for future expansion of the area and future addressing, seconded by Larry Bobo; the motion carried unanimously.

- 6.b. 1316 North Foote Avenue, Permit M05284 James Murphy, Murphy Building & Remodeling, Inc., requests variances to:
 - a) Variance to Section R305.1, 2009 International Residential Code, to allow a ceiling height of 6'7", where a minimum of 7'0" was required; and

Jim Murphy appeared and stated this was a basement finish and the existing ceiling height was 88" in most of the basement, with the exception of the bedroom and closet, which had a pre-existing beam with ducting and plumbing which were creating the low ceiling in this basement bedroom and closet of 6'6". He stated he dropped the entire ceiling in this area to 6'6" due to pre-existing conditions and to make it more aesthetically appealing. John Welton stated this permit was pulled under the 2011 Pikes Peak Regional Building Code, and it could have been classified as a soffit, had the entire ceiling not been dropped. Dan Rial stated most of the dropped ceiling was in the closet and approximately 5' of the bedroom; the remainder of the ceiling was pre-existing non-conforming. Mr. Murphy stated the finished height would be 6'5¹/₂" after floor coverings were installed. Swagata Guha stated she would suggest that the basement ceiling be reframed to turn the framing flat to gain a couple inches. Mr. Murphy stated if he did this, he could possibly obtain a ceiling height of 6'8". Mr. Welton stated RBD staff believes it may be difficult to achieve a 6'8" finished ceiling height by changing the framing. A motion was made by Swagata Guha to recommend to the Board of Review APPROVAL of a 6'7" finished ceiling height where a minimum of 7"0" was required, seconded by Dan Rial; the motion carried unanimously.

b) Variance to Section R311.7.4.2, 2009 International Residential Code, to allow the stair treads to be 10" from nosing to riser, where prohibited.

Mr. Murphy stated due to an existing beam, he had to replace the stairs, but was unable to get a Code compliant tread depth. He stated he would have a 6'8" head height over the stairs. Mr. Welton stated the Code requires a 10" deep tread, measured from the vertical plain of the nosing of the tread above to nosing, which would mean that a $11\frac{1}{2}$ " deep tread would be required. A motion was made by Swagata Guha to recommend to the Board of Review **APPROVAL** of this variance request to allow the stair treads to be 10" from nosing to riser, seconded by Micah Langness; the motion carried unanimously.

7. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no Unfinished Business.

8. **NEW BUSINESS**

John Welton stated recently RBD implemented an electronic variance submittal process which would improve upon efficiency and clarity of the variance requests. Mr. Welton demonstrated the new variance submittal process.

The meeting adjourned at 10:49 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

E N LORELE

Roger N. Lovell Regional Building Official

RNL/llg

Pikes Peak Regional Building Department (PPRBD) meeting agendas and minutes, as well as archived records, are available free of charge on PPRBD's website at <u>https://www.pprbd.org/Information/Boards</u>. Audio copies of the record may be purchased by contacting PPRBD at (719) 327-2989.