



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
DIVISION OF FIRE, EMERGENCY AND BUILDING SERVICES
OFFICE OF THE STATE BUILDING INSPECTOR



Office of the State Building Inspector 2009 Code Enforcement Bulletin

To: Municipal Building Officials
Staff of the Office of the State Building Inspector

From: Lisa R. Humble. AIA, NCARB, State Building Inspector
Office of the State Building Inspector

Date: September 3, 2009

Bulletin: Issue #1

Subject: 1. Questions regarding the following portions of the 2005 State Building Code
1a. Section AG105 of the International Residential Code
1b. Section 1026.1 of the International Building Code
1c. Section 1107.6.1.2 of the International Building Code
1d. Section 3403.1 of the International Building Code
1e. Section 3403.5 of the International Building Code
2. Formal Interpretation I-03-07 validity

1a. Section AG105 of the International Residential Code

This issue would pertain to Section AG105 Barrier Requirements of the 2003 International Residential Code portion of the 2005 State Building Code.

Scenario:

A homeowner is installing an above grade inflatable swimming pool which contains water over twenty-four inches deep. This is one of the heavy duty blow-up pools having soft sides (inflatable) sides which are advertised by department stores and other merchants.

Question:

Is a pool barrier required for an above grade inflatable swimming pool that contains water over twenty-four inches deep?

Answer:

Yes. A pool barrier is required. Such barrier is intended to provide protection against potential drownings and near-drownings by restricting access to the swimming pool.

1b. Section 1026.1 of the International Building Code

The following is be offered to address a clarification request regarding the 2009 Amendment; Section 1026.1 of the 2003 International Building Code.

Question:

Is floor proximity egress marking system required on one side of an exit access corridor or both sides?

Answer:

Floor proximity egress marking system is required at one side of an exit access corridor to be in compliance with Section 1026.1 minimum requirements.

Telephone (860) 685-8310
1111 Country Club Road
Middletown, CT 06457
<http://www.ct.gov/dps>
An Equal Opportunity Employer

1c. Section 1107.6.1.2 of the International Building Code

This request applies to Section 1107.6.1.2 of the 2003 International Building Code portion of the 2005 Building Code. Request for Building Code Interpretation/Clarification Accessible and Adaptable Units for R-1 Hotel Use Group

Question:

Are Type B dwelling units required in an R-1 Hotel/Motel use?

Answer:

Typically most R-1 hotel/motel facilities are not intended to be occupied as a residence. When this occurs usually the Type B dwelling units are not required.

In some cases, a hotel/motel may offer long-term or extended stay lodging accommodations or may be intended to be occupied as a residence. Type B dwelling unit criteria would apply to these situations. Basically, if the amenities and operation of the units resemble more to that of an apartment than a hotel, then they are subject to a Type B dwelling unit requirements.

The following information is needed to make a reasonable determination if Type B dwelling units are required. Such factors should be considered are:

- a. What amenities will be included inside the units such as kitchen facilities.
- b. How will the property and units lodging units be marketed to the public with regard to the length of stay, (short-term or long-term).

1d. Section 3403.1 of the International Building Code

Scenario:

An existing high rise building is being renovated and is to be fully sprinklered. New wall construction is being done in various areas. The existing apartments are being renovated with new finishes, new doors as well as the existing kitchens and bathrooms are totally replaced with new plumbing fixtures, countertops and cabinets.

It is understood that during the renovation and removal of the bathroom's tub and shower enclosure, a portion of the existing gypsum wallboard was damaged and removed. In some areas, this wall finish is part of an existing ventilation shaft which serves the bathrooms. This project's original scope of work was not intended as renovating and/or touching the shaft. The existing vent openings into the shaft are not being renovated.

In the areas which the bathroom renovation has removed the gypsum wallboard the existing shaft construction has been exposed. It has been revealed that the wall assembly does not appear to be a two hour fire rated shaft enclosure.

Question:

Now that the areas of the existing shaft have been affected by construction, (due to limited damage in removal of the existing tub and shower enclosure), does the entire shaft construction have to be brought up to the 2005 State Building Code requirements?

Answer:

Chapter 34 of the 2003 International Building Code portion of the 2005 State Building Code has provisions which apply to existing buildings and structures. Section 3403.1 of this chapter addresses this project scenario.

In part the code states that Additions or alterations to any building or structure shall conform with the requirements of the code for new construction. Additions or alterations shall not be made to an existing building or structure which will cause the existing building or structure to be in violation of any provision of this code. ... Portions of the structure not altered and not affected by the alteration are not required to comply with the code requirements for a new structure.

Any damage made to the existing shaft, due to the removal of the tub and shower enclosure, needs to be repaired to comply with code requirements. The remainder of the existing shaft is not being altered. Since this project's scope of work does not entail work on the existing shaft then, as per Section 3403.1, it can remain existing.

1e. Section 3403.5 of the International Building Code

This request applies to Section 3403.5 of the 2003 International Building Code portion of the 2005 State Building Code.

Question:

Is it the intent of the SBC to require a review of the entire building's means of egress for compliance with the CT State Fire Safety Code, prior to the issuance of a building permit, and not be limited only to the area(s) affected by the proposed alteration?

Answer:

Section 3403.5 "Means of Egress" is a subsection being part of Section 3403.1 "Existing buildings or structures". This section of the code specifically addresses what the code requires when and building addition or alteration occurs. The code is clear that the work being done is to conform to the requirements for new construction. Therefore, this code requirement applies to only the scope of work which is included in the building permit. The means of egress requirement would address only the building area affected by the building addition or alteration.

Question:

Is a written, and accepted plan of correction for any means of egress violation to the CSFSC sufficient to issue a building permit for the proposed alteration?

Answer:

The proposed plan along with what the corrective measures and the scope of work of the alteration would need to be evaluated to determine compliance with the Connecticut Fire Safety Code. This question would be best addressed by the Office of the State Fire Marshal.

2. Formal Interpretation I-03-07 validity

Question:

Formal Interpretation I-03-07 addresses floor proximity exit signs.

Specifically Question #4 states the following:

"Question 4: Section 404.2.9 of the 2003 ICC/ANSI A117.1 standard requires smooth door surfaces within 10 inches vertically from the floor. Section 1011.1.1.1 of the IBC allows the floor proximity exit sign to be mounted on the door, potentially resulting in a door surface that is not smooth. Which requirement prevails in case of a conflict?"

Answer 4: Section 102.4 of the IBC states "Where differences occur between provisions of this code and referenced codes and standards, the provisions of this code shall apply." The IBC would thus prevail, permitting mounting of the sign on the door. "

Is this formal interpretation still valid?

Answer:

When there is a conflict between a reference standard and the International Building Code language the code language prevails.

Yes formal interpretation I-03-07 is valid.

In this scenario, code compliance with both the IBC and the reference standard can be provided.

Review the following minimum requirements.

Section 404.2.9 of the 2003 ICC/ANSI A117.1 (reference standard) requires a smooth door surface within 10 inches vertically from the floor.

Section 1011.1.1.1 of the 2003 International Building Code portion of the 2005 State Building Code provides a range of not less than 6 inches and nor more than 18 inches above the finish floor for the required floor proximity exit signs mounting height.

The required floor proximity exit signs can be mounted on the door above the 10 inches above the finish floor and be in compliance with the IBC code requirements as well as the reference standard requirements and therefore there is no conflict.