

**Building Commission Meeting**  
Wednesday, October 1, 2014 at 6:30 PM  
Village Hall

1. **Call to Order**, Chairman Heaney opened the meeting
2. **Roll call and declaration of a quorum – 7:00 pm**
  - a. In attendance: Jeff Heaney, Chair; Kent Brown; Eric Means; Greg Wozniak; Tom Lindsay
  - b. Absent: None
  - c. Also present: Joe Footlik, Helen Wiseman and Brent Troxell
3. **Minutes:** Various minor amendments to the minutes were requested by the Commissioners. Staff will incorporate changes.

Commissioner Lindsay moved to approve as amended, seconded by Commissioner Brown.

The motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

4. **Pending business: None**
5. **Old Business: None**
6. **New Business**

**a. Tabled Items**

**Item 26: Trenches**

Commissioner Means reported findings from the code as they relate to trenches. The table in the code stipulates various trench size and design requirements for single-family additions. The minimum width of footing shall be 12.0 inches for one story. Commissioner Means used calculations from his own experience to determine the size of home that could be built with the calculations from the table. There was discussion amongst the Commissioners about how Commissioner Means arrived at these conclusions.

Commissioner Means believes that these calculations are adequate for most new construction as long as the soil is of an acceptable quality. Other commissioners expressed concerns about adequate loads of a second floor when a second floor addition is not part of the original plan.

Mr. Footlik clarified the process that would have to happen in order to verify the loads were adequate.

Mrs. Wiseman stated that the current code has already been amended in such a way that the concerns of the Commissioners should be addressed by previous amendments. Mrs. Wiseman clarified that the trench requirements would be the same for new construction and additions.

Commissioner Means spoke regarding the loads carried by various trench bell designs. The Commission then discussed the implementation of 20.0 inch trench bells versus 16.0 inch trench bells.

Commissioner Wozniak was in favor of maintaining consistency for both situations. He also thought it was appropriate and easiest for contractors and architects to understand.

Commissioner Means wanted to clarify that, given the correct soil quality, the plan could still be approved by professionals if the design was outside the requirements, but was engineered beyond the requirements.

Mrs. Wiseman asked for clarification that the Commissioners were debating a 16.0 inch straight trench versus a 12.0 inch trench with a bell of 20.0 inches. The Commissioners clarified through an extended debate that the consensus was to amend the code to allow either a 20.0 inch trench for masonry construction, or an 16.0 inch straight trench or a 12.0 inch trench with a 20.0 inch bell for frame construction.

Commissioner Means made a motion to adopt the amendment to the code as discussed to allow a 16.0 inch straight trench or a 12.0 inch with a 20.0 inch bell for frame construction.

The motion to approve the amendment for trench foundation regulations was seconded by Commissioner Lindsay and passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Commissioner Means also made a motion to amend the code so that all residential foundations have 2 – No. 5 Steel Reinforcing rods within the top and bottom of the wall.

The motion to approve the amendment for reinforcing bar regulations was seconded by Commissioner Lindsay and passed by a unanimous voice vote.

### **Item 53: Sill Height**

Commissioner Lindsay commented that he had researched sill heights with various window manufacturers. The most common sill height after this research was 5'1". Commissioner Lindsay went on to explain the difficulties this requirement can have for older homes. Commissioner Lindsay proposes adding an amendment to allow flexibility from 24.0" to 22.0" for double hung windows only. There was consensus among the Commission about this issue.

Commissioner Lindsay made a motion to add an exception #4 to R312.2.1, window sills – for double hung windows, an exception be made to allow sill height to be at 22.0 inches above the finish floor.

The motion to approve the amendment for sill height regulations was seconded by Commissioner Wozniak and passed by a unanimous voice vote.

### **Item 54: Deck to Veneer**

Mr. Footlik summarized some of the instances in which he has seen this deck to veneer configuration and dangers it poses for elevated decks.

The Commissioners summarized the concerns about structure and loads in these instances.

Mr. Footlik went on to explain the results of a seminar he has recently attended and how it relates to this topic.

The Commission went on to discuss the various configurations of decks which would fall under these regulations.

Mr. Footlik continued to explain the number of instances where porches are constructed in a less than ideal manner because of some of the weaknesses in the code and labor force involved with these smaller projects.

Commissioner Lindsay expressed his interest in eliminating some of the more extensive structural requirements for decks when they are not elevated.

The Commission discussed the various aspects of these requirements as they relate to structures with brick veneers.

The Commissioners arrived at a conclusion that the code should not be amended to allow any kind of veneer mounting. Commissioner Means summarized several ways homes with brick veneers could accomplish building a deck without using the veneer as a mounting point. Chairman Heaney stated he did not feel it was the job of this commission to redesign every deck project.

Commissioner Lindsay asked if the new code would address other ledger materials. Commissioner Means and Chairman Heaney clarified the permitted materials and design regulations. Mrs. Wiseman read several sections of the code as it related to attachment of structures and lateral loads to clarify points that various commission members were making.

Chairman Heaney asked for clarification from the commission to confirm that they wished to leave this regulation alone. The Commissioners all agreed.

**Various Items:**

Mrs. Wiseman presented various options to adopt the code in various formats in regards to the application of the new fire sprinkler code.

The Commission asked that Mrs. Wiseman present several of the summarized options for their review.

Option 1: Accepting the code as is.

Option 2: Accepting the code with thresholds regarding the size of a home.

Option 3: Accepting the code with a threshold regarding the value of the home.

Option 4: Delete fire sprinkler requirements for 1 and 2 family dwelling units, maintain requirement for additions with existing fire sprinkler and strengthening other fire prevention or containment measures.

The Commission asked several clarifying questions regarding how building size would be calculated and what an appropriate number would be. Mrs. Wiseman requested that the standard Maximum Building Size calculation be used to maintain consistency and limit confusion for architects and plan reviewers alike.

Commissioner Wozniak summarized his findings regarding costs of sprinkler systems and other preventative measures in other municipalities that already have similar requirements such as Park Ridge and Hinsdale. Commissioner Wozniak stated that the average cost of installing a sprinkler system on a "Glenview Sized" lot on Henley or Linneman would be \$12,500 - \$15,000.

The Commission discussed the various details of the regulation and costs that may accompany these requirements.

After receiving clarifying information about the regulations in other municipalities and some of the ancillary costs that accompany these regulations, Commissioner Wozniak asked for clarification on the intention of the new fire sprinkler code.

Mr. Footlik explained that the Glenview Fire Department supports these requirements and the Fire Chief could be invited to the next meeting to discuss the details of how these regulations will help them effectively do their jobs and the overall safety of the community. Mr. Footlik explained that it is his belief and understanding that the intention of fire sprinklers is to save lives, not property.

The Commissioners further debated and explored the merits of fire sprinkler requirements, how it should be applied to various construction types, and how these regulations could be applied to the Village of Glenview. The Commissioners stated that they would like to have the Fire Chief and maybe the Village Attorney available to attend the next meeting.

Mr. Footlik explained that the Fire Chief will explain the details about how fires are fought within the Village and how this information may affect their decisions regarding these regulations.

Prior to the close of the meeting, the Commissioners requested various clarifying items from Mrs. Wiseman for presentation at the next meeting.

**8. Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn was made by Chairman Heaney and seconded by Commissioner Lindsay at 9:17 PM.