IBC/IEBC Committee Hearing Agenda
May 23, 2019 2pm-5pm
City and County of Denver, Room 4i5

1. Roll Call and Introductions

2. Discussion and voting on IBC/IEBC Staff Block Vote packaged proposals
   (All proposals that are marked with an X on the summary spreadsheet)

3. Discussion and voting on Denver Building Code Administration provisions (DBCA)
   a. 15: Section 103.5
   b. 17: Section 131
   c. #318: Section 139
   d. (P14): Section 140.7
   e. (P15): Section 141.1 and .2
   f. (P153): Section 919
   g. (154): Section 919
   h. (P134): Chapter 27
   i. #470: Appendix S

4. Discussion and voting on All Gender/Gender Neutral Restroom Proposals
   a. #181: DB-IBC Section 2902
   b. (P111): IBC Sections 2902.1.4 and .7
   c. #320: IPC Section 403
   d. (P110): IPC Section 403.1.1 and .2

5. Discussion and voting on Chapter 1 Definitions for DBC-IBC and/or IBC
   a. #268: DBC-IBC Section 130.3

6. Discussion and voting on Chapter 2 of DBC-IBC and/or IBC
   a. (P12): DBC-IBC and IEBC Definitions
   b. (P31): IBC Definitions

Please note that any items that we do not get to in this hearing will be automatically transferred to the next scheduled hearing date and will be the first items on the agenda for that hearing.
Block Vote Proposals

Proposal # 104 (Block Vote Item)
Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # 105 (Block Vote Item)
Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # 96 (Block Vote Item)
Committee ok with this one.

Committee Discussion:
More to it than that. They are now covered in Chapter 1 of IEBC we prefer the way ICC Codes label them. Just deleting from our Chapter 1. Ok

It was decided by staff that this committee would hear IBC IEBC and DBCA no other committee hearing admin provisions.

Proposal # 109 (Block Vote Item)
Committee ok with this one.

Committee Discussion:
To delete Appendix Q all access control provisions, it can all be within Chapter 10, just a change to the cross reference.

Only thing new is the new reference to a different section instead of Appendix Q.

If Appendix Q removal not removed, we will correlate.

There is another spot in the text that references Appendix Q.

That will need to be correlated.

Proposal # 110 (Block Vote Item)
Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # 111 (Block Vote Item)
Committee ok with this one.

Committee Discussion:
By changing these to Chapter 2 instead of Appendix Q

There are portions of App Q that are life safety, some have to do with inspections, licensing and admin. If we get rid of Appendix Q life safety now covered in Chapter 10. Intent to put all admin provisions in Chapter 1 Admin of DBC. Just relocating those portions that are now displaced by the deletion of Appendix Q.

All just relocated text. From Appendix Q to Admin provisions. Not new text.

Outside of admin portion, Appendix Q does not address egress related if we bring to chapter 10 Means of Egress. Was it looked at b/c it’s an independent? Now it’s locked into egress provisions.

Proposals were to make a guide out of Appendix Q. When we get to Chapter 10, and this comes up we have the option to amend. Admin provisions that we are looking at would go in DBCA. Wouldn’t want in IBC Chapter 1.

Detailed analysis done to compare 2018 DBC with Appendix Q and we determined that we can eliminate the very minor amendments and revert to model code language.
Proposal # 97 (Block Vote Item)
Committee ok with this one.
Committee Discussion:
Editorial clean up definition. Removing definitions. A lot of these we have unnecessary definitions, terms already defined in IFC, other sections or other amendments that will capture this info.

Went through all new definitions contained in the proposal and why they were proposed to be changed.

Is residential unit defined?

In zoning code, it is defined. That’s why it was changed because it is already contained in zoning.

There may only be 1 place in Live Work provisions where this is mentioned.

Proposal # 98 (Block Vote Item)
Committee ok with this one.
Committee Discussion:
Delete Denver amendment. This item is in block vote and speaks only to the IBC. Companion amendment to cover IBC and IEBC approving this in the block approving the other Jerry Maly proposals it won’t conflict.
It was added as part of the model code last code cycle. Shouldn’t be different for Denver.

Proposal # 126 (Block Vote Item)
Committee ok with this one.
Committee Discussion:
These probably need to be correlated with previous proposals.

With this it would just add Former Chapter 59

I think it’s 2 separate ideas, one says go to zoning code, one says Former Chapter 59.

This one makes reference to both.

Dwelling unit, single unit dwelling, and the other one says residential unit.

We would have to decide what would be coming forward, b/c it’s changing the same section. Could take one over the other or combine and just bring over new location.

Language seems to change what this applies to.

That one doesn’t say dwelling.

Question about the parallel between single unit and residential unit.

He just combined it.

Cleans it up with one occupancy type.

In zoning code.

What I liked about 126 definition it helps as to where you go in this huge document for new zoning to see what a home occupation is. If it sends you to the zoning code, its overwhelming. Helps to focus where you find the definitions. Suggest 1st sentence from Eric and 2nd sentence from 126 and combine them. Make the 2 proposals in to one.

Shaunna – Better to pull them out and then 126 and 97 hear them together and then we can modify.
Need to make sure intent is clear on the record, will correlate at the end.

Denver Zoning Code Residential Unit in reference to amount of parking spaces required. Tandem parking for residential unit. Only twice in zoning code. So, it is not commonly used in the code.

Modification: Request to modify 97 to remove Home Occupation definition from proposal.
Modification vote 10-0 Passes

**Motion:** Motion to Table 126

**Proposal # 99 (Block Vote Item)**

*Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.*

**Committee Discussion:**

Problematic, Family Child Care Proposal. Request to remove from Block Vote and don’t hear it until the Family Child Care action in IRC.

**Proposal # 100 (Block Vote Item)**

*Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.*

**Committee Discussion:**

Could there be other products beside marijuana and hemp?

So, people growing tomatoes don’t have to comply with this?

Define the historic use and occupancy of Greenhouse used for marijuana or hemp in Denver.

Related to 2018 IBC new definition is very general no specific horticulture. Denver is trying to make it more specific to type of plant material in the greenhouse. Make sure it is looked at as a special occupancy.

Unclear why it is differentiated. This plant is considered more hazardous.

Misuse of the term Green house, plants get energy from walls and roofs of building. 90-95% are using lights and are dark, simulated light, fill spaces with Carbon Dioxide to generate plant growth, lots of other agricultural practices tailored to marijuana making it not a typical greenhouse.

Call them grow operations for a reason

New definition from IBC for greenhouse. Includes sun lit in the definition. It does include processing of the plant. That raises the hazard when you are processing that plant.

Has to be a specialized sun lit to be a greenhouse.

Agriculture Commercial Industrial, Added hazard.

Shouldn’t be called a greenhouse, should be a grow facility.

This is to re categorize those facilities as Grow operations.

May want to consider facilities or structures.

It’s the idea that there should be a broader range of plants.

We could have problems with those who use the sun lit environment instead of lights. It could cause problems.

As chair, based on the amount of conversation we need to pull this one.

Seems to be too narrow, other plants or other processes that would fall under that.

Really think about the processing. The problem is the processing within this structure.
Harvesting could be as well.

Pull #100 from the Block Vote.

**Proposal # 101 (Block Vote Item)**
Committee is ok with this one.

Committee Discussion:
Unnecessary already in IBC 1,2,3 already in the code. Denver has a policy on Personal Care Facilities.

Denver has lots of policies that will be unnecessary once language is brought into the code or updated after code adoption. We would revise a policy on this and remove the majority of the amendment.

Why wouldn’t we want to take policy and line it up with code and put it in the code? The issue is finding those policies they change, and the committee and we shouldn’t be taking out to create a policy we should be incorporating into the code.

4 A 4 B These are managed by the Fire Code, not actually defined in Fire Code, Fire dept operations documents. This is the only place that they appear. We can create a guide.

I think we should take policy and put it in the code. That was part of our charge.

The policies are dynamic sometimes written in the middle of the code cycle. If we codify them and some are from interpretation and, makes it hard for design companies to follow these policies.

There would be a gap because there isn’t a proposal to put this into the code.

Discuss whether this type of info belongs in the IBC. Like Eric was saying

Construction cannot put this into a document.

4 a and 4b is 10 pages, 3 columns, different care the residents require, we use that to determine the group occupancy. R or I occupancy

Follow logistics but you would review for permitting.

I Codes don’t use prompt slow or incapable of self-preservation.

If it’s in both occupancy types it would be under definition. We already have definitions for all this elsewhere.

Potential for contradicting.

**Proposal # 133 (Block Vote Item)**
Committee is ok with this one.

Committee Discussion:
Proponent- Means of Egress in previous building code amendment, this suggests reverting to IBC language. Egress requirements would depend on what section of the space you are in. Example =R2 unit smaller door inch this would allow a door to encroach and block the egress. Slightly more restrictive make it similar. Each portion complies.

Strike outs redirect to model code.

Egress residential or commercial.

Building Code, talks about means of egress in live work unit reads except as modified by this section, function served depending on your use of the space.

These provisions are in DBC because we knew that on national level these live work provisions had been
adopted, we wanted to get a jump on live work units in Denver. Were changed to satisfy fire concerns. Limits on hazardous materials. When it first appeared, it wasn’t in the model code.

Is live work in IRC?

Yes for 1 and 2 family or townhouse.

IRC bldgs. Don’t have occupancy classifications this is calling for R2.

Chapter 1 Scope IRC – The exception item 1 Live work units. So, to Masoud if it’s a residential home then it would be an R2.

R2 Live Work

Zoning won’t allow Live Work in Single Family Homes.

Fire rating for an R2 do they check bldg. for everything contained in that.

Proposal # 151 (Block Vote Item)

Committee is ok with this one.

Committee Discussion:

Purpose to recognize scissor stairs existence and allowance in existing buildings. Same language we currently have, just putting in the right spot.

Proposal # 82 (Block Vote Item)

Committee is ok with this one.

Committee Discussion:

Proposal to delete this table, Conflicts with the rest of the code.

Would every case be reviewed and case by case decision be made?

Would go by language instead of the table, which conflicts. Suggest from a volume perspective very few projects that this would even apply to.

Old recycled shopping center, now I want to convert, so now I have to bring those codes to current codes.

Yes, current code and provisions. Added square footage.

This table wouldn’t do you any favors.

In past this separation of 20 ft was good enough for unlimited area buildings. When we adopted UBC it changed to 40 60 ft. We needed to do something so exist buildings. Can continue to be used. No existing building code back then.

There shouldn’t be any reference to exist bldgs. In bldg. code. It should be IEBC.

You could design mods to IBC and or IEBC restrictive depending upon what you choose, but you could apply to each.

You could apply for modification.

Is there some table under current codes that you could build to for unlimited?

Yes, it’s the unlimited area building 20 ft yards. Depending on what you are looking to do if it’s not in line with current code you can potentially apply for admin modification.
Existing building. In Denver adding floor area within zoning allowance.

Most are type 1 bldgs.

How this table helps or hurts.

Continue unlimited 20 ft setbacks to 60 ft setbacks. Fire separation to separate boxes. Navigation.

No fire wall into unlimited buildings.

When someone wants a means of egress added, what equivalency would we use.

Been in the code a long time, when redevelop was popular, only option was to tear down, it’s in there to help to mod buildings instead of tear down for a new one that complies. If covered in IEBC and Admin Mod I think its fine.

We can debate but it doesn’t belong in IBC it belongs in IEBC. Existing bldgs. Should not be in IBC it’s confusing.

Need to Pull #82

**Proposal #12**
Request to pull for individual agenda.

**Proposal # 69 (Block Vote Item)**
Committee is ok with this one.

**Proposal # 56 (Block Vote Item)**
Committee is ok with this one.

**Proposal # 62 (Block Vote Item)**
Committee is ok with this one.

**Committee Discussion:**
Denver interprets code different from 2018, nowhere do we say what the opening is. Example: building extends out 5 ft beyond floor below, Denver looks at the edge as the opening, exterior. This is going to make it confusing as to what an opening is. This comes up on every other project. Go with IBC interpretation.

This is just fire separation distance, addressing openings may be separate from this. Model code doesn’t define openings.

If you go to commentary in 2018 proposals opening is set at back of bldg. does not drip edge.

The image in 2018 commentary Denver believes the image is incorrectly shown.

Is the question here that Denver treats an opening different from IBC

Committee – Yes

Why does Denver interpret differently?

What was submitted in 2018 drawing got put into commentary, this is what we mean from committee. The edge is not the opening the backside is the opening. It was decided by Denver.

Needs to be pulled out. Pull 62

Make sure you read reason statement.
Proposal # 67 (Block Vote Item)
Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.

Proposal # 64 (Block Vote Item)
Committee is ok with this one.
Committee Discussion:

Proposal # 63 (Block Vote Item)
Committee is ok with this one.
Committee Discussion:
Confused on non-drop out ceiling

Denver has a definition for drop out suspended ceiling fall from setting when exposed to heat.

Just looking to move the amendment. Relocation.

Doesn’t make sense to keep in Horizontal Assemblies, make sense in interior finishes.

Proposal # 60 (Block Vote Item)
Committee is ok with this one.
Committee Discussion:
Delete amendment to IBC not related to anything Denver has going on.

Involved with code writing, Type 2B bldg. 4 story noncombustible nonrated, allowed shafts to sit on top of floor assembly with this provision it continued to allow that. Shaft self-supporting, doesn’t add anything to safety of the bldg. Provision to still allow the shaft to sit on the floor but not self-supporting, floor is not rated mandate going to masonry or special system to allow you a continuous vertical for shaft enclosure. Deletion is going to add to the cost.

If floor is gone, major structural issue.

If shaft is coming down building is coming down.

Proposal # 58 (Block Vote Item)
Committee is ok with this one.

Proposal # 57 (Block Vote Item)
Committee is ok with this one.
Committee Discussion
Put in in the middle of the amendments have conferred on removing this between building and fire.

Proposal # 152 (Block Vote Item)
Committee is ok with this one.
Committee Discussion
Like previous, just to locate the allowance within DBC. Separate amendment proposals for each section.

Proposal # 179 (Block Vote Item)
Committee is ok with this one.
Committee Discussion

Proposal # 180 (Block Vote Item)
Committee is ok with this one.
Committee Discussion
Proposal # 142 (Block Vote Item)
Committee is ok with this one.

Committee Discussion:
Exception 4 incorporated in model code language. Simple re numbering.

Why is 7 needed. 6 already exempts fire rated constructions. 7 exempts conference or assembly room.

Moving 6 to 7.

If you have 100 + people that’s when 7 would kick in.

You could look at 6 and say already exempted.

Leave 6 and it covers everything. Exception to exception

Need to see other exceptions

Proposal # 143 (Block Vote Item)
Committee is ok with this one.

Committee Discussion:
Discrepancy building to building face to face. Should be face to face not fire separation distance. Not center line.

Allowing a great dimension to be used.

Proposal # 146 (Block Vote Item)
Committee is ok with this one.

Committee Discussion:
Same concept but stairs instead of balconies.

102 1101.1 Scope revised – 7 or more dwellings in a project.

Accessible Units Editorial

Proposal # 154 (Block Vote Item)
Committee is ok with this one.

Committee Discussion:
The exception is not new language just bringing it forward. Move to same section 1201.2 is deleting the Denver amendment which we don’t need, because we have model code language.

Small discreet projects is it defined?

Example of small discreet projects

Small screened in mechanical on historical building change of glazing.

No, we could pull it and modify, or we can leave up to the jurisdiction discretion.

First paragraph of IEBC –

This exception allows the bldg. dept to work with the design team.

Wouldn’t your staff be reps of your bldg. official. There is some discretion to be had in the bldg. official.

Building official statement had this been formatted correctly it wouldn’t be underlined and we wouldn’t be discussing because it’s already there, we are not adding anything, just moving.