

Minutes – Regular Meeting
BUILDING CODES ADVISORY COMMISSION
Held on Thursday, March 21, 2013 at 5:30 p.m.
In Room 215 of the Oak Park Village Hall

ROLL CALL AND CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Commissioners, Hudson, Kelly, Liles, Maynard, Nussbaum and Visteen
Chairman Gilchrist
Staff Liaison Witt

Guests: Mike Fox, local property owner
Dave King, David King & Associates, Inc.

QUORUM: The meeting was called to order at 5:46 p.m. and a quorum was declared.

AGENDA

A voice vote was taken and the agenda was approved as written.

MINUTES

Minutes from the meetings held on 01/22/13, 02/21/13 and 03/07/13 were reviewed and approved with minor corrections.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Fox indicated that he attended the last couple of public hearings on the proposed code amendments and he appreciated the time involvement that the commission has made in working on the code upgrades. He indicated that the biggest issue for him is the proposed requirement for sprinklers (in existing buildings). He indicated that a lot of his buildings would be impacted by the sprinkler requirements, noting an enormous cost for bringing in a new water main, installing a fire pump, rpz valves, associated demolition and drywall work to install sprinklers and system testing.

Member Hudson asked how many of Mr. Fox's buildings had single spaces that were over 3,500 square feet in area (the proposed fire sprinkler threshold). Mr. Fox indicated there were about 10, including the hotel lobby, Poor Phil's, and 200-212 Marion.

Dave King indicated he has been "selling this town" for thirty years and it's getting tougher due to high taxes, lack of parking, tickets and zoning. He said it took Weight Watchers six months to get through zoning. Mr. King said it takes two times longer to get building permits in Oak Park than in other towns. He represents 30 to 40 percent of the office space in Oak Park. He felt there are other towns that people can go to that with no sprinklers and no parking tickets. All that said, he did thank the commission for their time and efforts working on the codes.

Mr. King indicated that Oak Park should do something like Forest Park where they require sprinklers in spaces over 2,500 square feet if the cost of the renovation is more than 75 percent of the replacement cost of the building. He felt it to be OK if the State requires sprinklers because that would be a statewide requirement, not just local to Oak Park. He said we should not change the existing fire sprinkler requirements.

Mr. King indicated that he has a couple of spaces over 3,500 square feet that would probably cost about \$250,000 to upgrade with fire sprinklers. He felt that since occupants of office and retail space are awake and not cooking these spaces are least likely to catch fire. He indicated he loses deals based on the per capita of doing business in Oak Park. He asked that there be no changes to the sprinkler code.

Member Hudson stated that the commission is grateful for the business community and their contribution in keeping taxes as low as they are in Oak Park. He indicated there were open meetings where no one from the business community has shown up, but that the commission has considered the business community in working on the proposed code upgrade.

Mr. King asked if the business community goes to hell, who is going to buy a house? He recommended a threshold of 75 percent or 50 percent of replacement value for requiring sprinklers.

Mr. Fox indicated he did not understand the push for sprinklering commercial buildings.

The commission thanked Mr. Fox and Mr. King for their input and they both then left the meeting before further discussion of the agenda topics.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no non-agenda public comments.

REGULAR AGENDA

The following items were discussed.

1. A Fire Department memorandum dated May 16, 2013 and written by Fire Chief Ebsen was reviewed. The memo outlined Chief Ebsen's revised recommendations pursuant to input received at recent public hearings regarding the proposed fire sprinkler code upgrades. It was noted that the commission previously voted to not approve incorporating work on MEP systems into cost or area threshold for requiring sprinklers.
2. Member Nussbaum asked if we are overreaching in our proposed requirements. Member Hudson responded that Oak Brook requires fire sprinklers in spaces over 1,000 square feet. Member Nussbaum indicated there is a different climate in Oak Park, the buildings are older here.
3. Member Nussbaum moved to incorporate the Fire Departments memo into the proposed amendments. Prior to voting on the motion, the phrase "building footprint" as used in Chief Ebsen's memo was discussed. Options to revise this phrase included using the floor area to equal the footprint of the building, another being the just the fire area. Level 3 Alterations in the IEBC deemed the area to be the aggregate area of the building. Member Kelly indicated he liked the floor area to be defined as the aggregate area of the building. A motion was made by member Nussbaum to define the floor area to be the area of the building floor on which work was being performed. All members voted aye except member Kelly who voted nay. The motion passed.
4. The motion regarding incorporating the Fire Department memo was voted on and approved unanimously with the following exceptions. Reference to the "building footprint" should be changed to be the area of the building floor for which work was being performed and work being performed on MEP systems shall not be used to determine the requirement for sprinklers. The commission requested that Witt mention to Chief Ebsen the IEBC exception

for not requiring a fire pump. If the Chief wanted fire pumps to be required, the matter would need to come back in front of the commission for discussion.

5. The 49-page matrix of the proposed code amendments was reviewed individually by the commissioners prior to the meeting. Corrections to the content were noted to include:
 - a. Item 24: change strikeout/underlining for the 90 and 180 days.
 - b. Item 36: In the fourth line, add a period after the word professional. Under Rationale for Change, add the work be in the second line between the words to and prepared.
 - c. Item 40: change strikeout/underlining for the 90 and 180 days.
 - d. Item 77: Under Rationale for Change, add "which is not included in the State code.
 - e. Item 91: Modify Section 2104.1.7 to reflect the commission's previous discussion related to use of water repellent products in the masonry and mortar.
 - f. Item 187: Under Rationale for Change, the work not is misspelled.
 - g. Item 190: Can't see all the text, the cell needs to be expanded.
 - h. Item 21: Change "non-hard-wired" to "plug and cord".
 - i. IBC Section 508.4: Change to require a 1-hour fire-resistance rating between B, M, F-1 and S-1 uses unless the adjacent uses are similar to each other.
6. Member Hudson discussed the issuance of Certificates of Occupancy where a change of use occurs. He indicated that Section C101.4.4 of the IECC requires compliance with the code where a change in use occurs that would increase the demand for either fossil fuel or electrical energy. Therefore, a Certificate of Occupancy should be required so that the space can be determined to be compliant with the State's Energy Code.
7. Member Nussbaum recommended that the IMC Section 1206.8 be revised to add "Steam condensate pipe shall be pitched to the boiler or condensate receiver". The recommendation was voted on and unanimously approved.
8. A motion to approve the 49 page document outlining the proposed amendments was made, voted on and approved based on incorporation of the items discussed at the meeting.
9. Witt indicated that a status update would be forwarded to the Board for the April 1 meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. A Certificate of Appreciate was presented to member Maynard for his completion of his first year of service on the commission.
2. The commission presented a copy of a letter they wanted to forward to the Board of Trustees and asked Witt to review same for technical issues only.
3. The next meeting was set for April 18, 2013 at 5:30 p.m. (regular meeting).

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting. A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved. The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

By: Stephen Witt
Staff Liaison,
Building Codes Advisory Commission