

Building Commission Meeting
Wednesday, June 5, 2019 - FINAL
6:00 PM
Glenview Village Hall

1. Call to Order, Chairman Heaney called for a motion to open the meeting - 1st - Commissioner Means. 2nd - Commissioner Lindsay.
2. Roll call and declaration of a quorum – 6:15 pm
 - a. Commissioners in attendance:
 - i. Jeff Heaney – Chairman
 - ii. Eric Means
 - iii. Thomas Lindsay
 - b. Commissioners absent/ vacant:
 - i. Greg Wozniak – absent
 - ii. Vacant seat – Previously - Brown
 - c. Also present:
 - i. Joe Footlik – Inspectional Services Manager
 - ii. Helen Wiseman – Plan Review Manager, Acting Secretary
3. Minutes – May 21, 2019 –Motion called to approve the Minutes with a correction in spelling – 1st Commissioner Lindsay, 2nd Chairman Heaney. Vote – All in favor: 3-0.
4. General communications – None.
5. Pending Business:
 - a. Meeting schedule confirmation – Ms. Wiseman asked the Commissioners if the next few meeting dates may be confirmed. All Commissioners in attendance confirmed their availability for the 6/19 meeting. The 6/26 scheduled meeting previously confirmed all Commissioners to be available with Chairman Heaney attending remotely. The next scheduled meeting date for 7/17 was confirmed to be a date that all the Commissioners in attendance would be available for. The 7/31 scheduled meeting date was confirmed to be available for all Commissioners in attendance except Commissioner Means who will be out of town on that date. Ms. Wiseman reminded the Commissioners that in order to meet on that date with a quorum, the remaining Commissioners would need to be in attendance on 7/31. Commissioner Wozniak’s availability must be confirmed at the next meeting. The Commissioners decided to leave the confirmation of August meeting dates for at a future meeting.
 - b. Commissioners continue the review of remaining sections of Part 3 beginning with Section R403.1.1 2015 page 97 and 2018 page 96 in the Significant Code Changes books where they left off at the last Commission meeting.
 - ✓**IRC Part 3** – 2015 - R403.1.1 – Minimum Footing Size – Modification – Chairman Heaney stated that this section is an item of interest, but, he does not feel the Commission would want to change it. Chairman Heaney further stated that he feels the minimum footing sizes which were amendments in the past adoption should be kept. Discussion ensued about the minimum footing sizes. Ms. Wiseman clarified that the minimum footing sizes currently are 10 inch x 20 inch for masonry veneer and 8 inches x 18 inches for frame construction. Commissioner Lindsay suggested that the Commission may want to consider a minimum 10 inch x 20 inch footing across the board. All Commissioners agreed that this was a good idea. Discussion regarding the currently existing trench footing requirements was to retain amendments.
 - ✓2015 - R403.1.2 / R602.10.9.1 - Continuous Footings Seismic – Clarification – Commissioner Means stated that our area is not a seismic concern, but,

- the section should be maintained. The map figures would confirm seismic areas.
- ✓2015 – R403.1.3 – Footing and Stem Wall Reinforcing in Seismic – Clarification – Chairman Heaney stated that this section would be the same case.
 - ✓2015 – R403.1.6 – Foundation Anchorage – Modification – Location required to be in the middle third now. Chairman Heaney stated that this was a good practice. All agreed to retain.
 - ✓2018 – R403.3 (1) – Insulation Requirements for Frost-Protected Footings – Modification - * Discussion regarding sill anchorage continued. Commissioner Means mentioned that the sill plate would bridge over the thickened slab. Commissioner Lindsay stated that the old detail would require a 2 x 6 over the ridged foam. Commissioner Means added that the eccentricity of the plate bending in each direction may be a concern. All Commissioners agreed that this and the previous sections were to be retained.
 - ✓2018 – Table R403.4 – Crushed Stone Footings – Modification – All Commissioners agreed that this section should be removed from the code adoption as is currently the case.
 - ✓R2015 – R404.1.4.1 – Masonry Foundation Walls Seismic – Modification - Commissioners confirmed same case as other seismic sections. To be retained.
 - ✓2015 - R404.4 Retaining Walls – All Commissioners chose to retain.
 - ✓2018 – R408.3 – Unvented Crawl Spaces – Modification – Dehumidification in lieu of crawl space vents. Commissioner Means stated that it is not wise to open your crawl space to the outside air. Chairman Heaney stated that crawl vents are not wanted. Mr. Footlik stated that crawl vents are a bad practice. Commissioner Lindsay stated that they tend to rust. Mr. Footlik added that the screens deteriorate allowing insects. All Commissioners agreed that dehumidification is the preferred option and are glad that it is offered.
 - ✓2015 - Table R502.3.1 (1) and Table R502.3.1 (2) – Floor Joists Spans for Common Lumber Species – Modification – Chairman Heaney deferred to Commissioner Means who is the subject matter expert. Commissioner Means stated that the tables were adjusted for current species data. All Commissioners chose to retain.
 - ✓2015 – R502.10 – Framing of Floor Openings – Modification – Chairman Heaney stated that this will be an inspection item. All Commissioners chose to retain.
 - ✓2018 – Table R505.3.2 – Cold-Formed Steel Joist Spans – Modification - All Commissioners chose to retain.
 - ✓ * Invited guest arrived. Chairman Heaney and Commissioners welcomed Mary Bacci, Physical Therapist (25 years) and North Shore School District Special Education Staff. Mr. Footlik thanked Ms. Bacci for coming to present on behalf of the Building Commissioners and Staff. The guest was invited to provide research and feedback on an item discuss at the last meeting – 2015 – R311.8 Ramps – Continued Discussion – Ms. Bacci begun by stating that the many of her clients choose to install chair lifts to improve the accessibility of the built environment. She stated that she provides wheel chair assessments for every inch you raise a surface. Pitch is important. Children do not have good head or trunk control. Many times other equipment beyond the wheelchair is provided to keep the person in an

upright posture. Ramps used for those that are injured as well as elderly. One must be aware of what it does to a person's stance when in a wheelchair. With most homes there is only one place to put a ramp. If downhill ramp, the person is leaning forward with a steeper pitch ramp. Going up, the person is less likely to fall, however, propelling up is more difficult. She stated that she has a sister who was hit by a car and is in a wheelchair. She had no way to do a ramp on her property. She was a triathlete and has great strength in her upper body and core and she struggled as strong as she is. With couples, one could be in a wheelchair and one could be getting older caring for the other. Most elderly want to stay in their home. Maybe, this consideration is not cut and dry. What is important is the individual differences in people's abilities. Individual needs need to be met. Ms. Bacci stated that she made a ramp template to give a visual for the difference between a 1:8 pitch ramp and a 1:12 pitch ramp. She showed it to the Commissioners and stated that one would feel the difference in a ramp 1:8 pitch and one that is 1:12 pitch. The traveling chairs have small wheels. They are not the same momentum. Mr. Footlik asked for one walking would the effect be the same. Ms. Bacci responded yes, it would be the same. Mr. Footlik asked, How about with a cane? Ms. Bacci responded, the same. Mr. Footlik stated that he sees ramps going in on new homes to not be an issue. He sees garage man door entries to be more of a convenience. Commissioner Lindsay shared that he was involved in a home in Wilmette where the occupants wanted to have access to their backyard and had a ramp to the rear. Further, a garage would be common for unloading. Ms. Bacci stated that she has seen examples where the home has both a sidewalk and a ramp. One would have to have enough land to do this. Commissioner Means stated that he has been involved in homes in Chicago where the entry is 3 ft. above the ground. Mr. Footlik stated that some in Glenview need 3 or 4 turns to fit on sites. Ms. Wiseman reminded the Commissioners that, based on the code requirement, a single family home is not required to have a ramp. One proposal considered is if a ramp were proposed at a required exit, the ramp would be required to be pitched at 1:12 pitch maximum. If the ramp were proposed at a location that is not an exit, the pitch of the ramp could be 1:8 pitch. Chairman Heaney suggested that maybe an amendment could be written that only allows higher pitch of up to 1:8 in the case of a height of only one riser. Mr. Footlik stated that what he is hearing from Ms. Wiseman is that a 2nd ramp would be allowed to be steeper. Chairman Heaney stated that an amendment could be made to allow a 1:8 pitch only in the case of a single riser of 7 ¾ inches or one riser. Most typical homes are about a 20 inch rise or 3 risers. Mr. Footlik stated that altering to code requirement to make the ramp less steep is making the code tougher and may prevent one from continuing to use their home. He continued that he feels that in a residential setting, the Village should do everything that can be done to allow the resident to enjoy their home. Commissioner Lindsay stated that he would like the exception to allow a 1:8 pitch ramp for a non-exit ramp to only apply at the discretion of the Building Department. He stated that he is concerned that the applicant can do a 1:8 pitch ramp without really considering the ramifications. Commissioner Means stated that his sister has been in a wheelchair for a year after a stroke. Chairman Heaney asked about what would be applicable for a Group Home situation. Mr. Footlik stated that he thought the Illinois Accessibility Code would apply. Ms. Wiseman added that for single family

homes, the Illinois Accessibility Code would not apply, although, the Village would require fire alarms and notification. Commissioner Lindsay stated that what Ms. Bacci is stating is that a 1:12 pitch would be the way to go. Ms. Wiseman asked, if the Commission wanted to add that a consultation with staff was required prior to approval. Mr. Footlik stated that sending a staff member out to the site and creating meetings would not be efficient use of taxpayer monies. He would support a letter being required from a State licensed Architect or Structural Engineer. Chairman Heaney suggested maybe requiring an approval letter from the physician treating the person. The suggestion was that due to HIPA laws that would probably be inappropriate. Commissioner Lindsay asked if handouts could be created and provided to the customer and placed on the website. Commissioner Lindsay asked, does the world know the difference between a 1:8 pitch and a 1:12 pitch? Ms. Bacci added that the difference between a 1:8 pitch and a 1:12 pitch is 4 %. It is a minimal percentage, but. Looking at the rise over the same run it is a rise of 20 inches for a 1:12 pitch versus 30 inches for a 1:8 pitch. Commissioner Means stated that in the case of a new home he would have a problem allowing a steeper ramp than 1:12. He feels this should be a retrofit issue. Commissioner Means stated that his sister had a stroke and uses a cane and a wheelchair. A ramp was constructed to the back door. Put to the left of the stair. The back entrance has become the egress for her. Ms. Wiseman mentioned that when a customer comes in to request a ramp permit, staff provides all of the information to them. The minimum code requirements from the single family code as well as the requirements of the Illinois Accessibility code which would not apply but would be more maneuverable. The customer makes the decision. In this proposal, if the ramp is not allowed at a 1:8 pitch because it is an exit, it would need to be 1:12 per the single family code. Chairman Heaney stated that is if a 1:8 pitch ramp is proposed which is not an exit, it had better conform to the needs of the person using it. The suggestion was made that the amendment be written that the ramp must conform to the needs of the person using it. Ms. Wiseman asked, who would decide whether the ramp conforms to the needs of the person using it? Ms. Bacci stated that it is not easy to drive a power chair up and down a steep ramp. Chairman Heaney suggested maybe the 1:8 pitch should only be allowed if the wheelchair is pushed by an assistant and not with independent use. Commissioner Lindsay reiterated that he feels there should at least be a handout for ramps. If there is not, there should be. A 1:8 pitch should only be used under certain circumstances. There are a number of concerns that exist with this steep pitch. Mr. Footlik suggested that the discussion be tabled on this topic at this time. He stated that staff would discuss with the Village Attorney and get his input. It can be followed up on at a future meeting. Chairman Heaney made a motion to hold a decision on this section for future discussion. Motion 2nd Commissioner Means. 3-0 All in Favor. Motion carried. Ms. Bacci added that Glenview may run into situations like at the one exit manufactured home park where ramps did not work and platform lifts were added. Chairman Heaney stated that a platform lift can cost about \$10,000. Ms. Bacci stated that in her experience the resident wants to stay in their home. She knows of a neighbor who had a stroke and put in a 2nd floor lift. Now putting in a second lift to the basement to do laundry. Commissioner Means added that elevators in home could range from \$30,000.00 to \$100,000.00. Commissioner Lindsay reiterated that a handout should be created to make

- people aware of the options. Ms. Wiseman stated that this would give the applicant the knowledge, but, the choice would be left up to them as the code allows. Chairman Heaney stated that, like Mr. Footlik says, we are here to help. Ms. Bacci stated that if someone builds something and it gets sold, it is in existence. Chairman Heaney added that you could have things built 10 years ago and some without a permit. It should be proven that it met the code at the time. If they purchase violation, they might need to be fixed later. Ms. Bacci stated that she knows of a home that was sold as accessible and it was not. Mr. Footlik stated that there would be no difference with a set of stairs that are steeper than 7 ¾ inches. Commissioner Lindsay stated that he does not want to over require, but, there is a dramatic difference between a 1:12 pitch and a 1:8 pitch. Mr. Footlik again suggested that staff consult the Village Attorney. Ms. Bacci stated that she likes the idea of reaching out to senior centers and other groups to make spaces more accessible. The Chairman, Commissioner and staff thanked Ms. Bacci for her time and she was assisted by Commissioner Lindsay to her car with her ramp template. Discussion to follow in the future with Village Attorney input.
- ✓2018 – R507 – Decks, R507.2 - Deck Materials, and 2015 – R507.1, R507.4 – Decking – Modifications – Commissioner Lindsay stated that he was personally fine with the code addressing composite decking. All Commissioners chose to retain each section.
 - ✓2015 – R507.2 – Deck Ledger Connection and Band Joists – Clarification R507.2.4 – Alternative Deck Lateral Load Connection - Modification – Discussion ensued regarding the anchorage of decks to homes and the requirement for tie backs for lateral support. Commissioner Means mentioned that for masonry veneer construction, due to the distance to the support beyond the exterior face of the wall the bolts usually bend. Mr. Footlik mentioned that the code is encouraging decks to be independent from the home. Ms. Wiseman added that this would require separate structural beam and post support on both ends of the floor joists. Commissioner Means stated that if attached to the home, tie backs would be required to prevent pull out. Commissioner Lindsay mentioned the pier footings adjacent to the home can be a problem with the over-dig area of backfill. The footing would not be bearing on the right stuff. Commissioner Lindsay stated that in the case of new construction, wing walls could be used for support. Commissioner Means stated that the basement walls are not meant to take outward loads. Commissioner Lindsay asked Commissioner Means in his expertise, is this section a problem. Commissioner Means stated that the section only gets better. All Commissioners chose to retain each section.
 - ✓2018 – R507.3 – Deck Footings – Addition – Commissioners noted that the details shown in the Significant Changes Codebook show subgrade wood. All agreed this should not be allowed as is currently in force and will be amended to not allow.
 - ✓2018 – R507.4 – Posts – Modification – Chairman Heaney stated that some Village require only 6 inch x 6 inch posts. All Commissioners chose to retain each section.
 - ✓2018 – R507.5 – Deck Beams, R507.6 – Deck Joists, R507.7, R507.8, R507.9 – Decking, Vertical and Lateral Support – Modifications – Since each of these sections were modified both in the 2015 and the 2018 codes, the 2018 significant changes book was used for evaluation – Commissioner Means noted that the code is providing a cookbook way of building a deck

with rule of thumb requirements. An applicant could always hire a Structural Engineer to design something which varies and is structurally sound. Chairman Heaney added that he and Commissioner Lindsay do not want to hire a Structural Engineer. Commissioner Means stated that if the load is on a post eccentrically, the post could fail. Ms. Wiseman added that she does not believe the intent of the Village is to design decks for people. All of the Commissioners responded, no. Commissioner Lindsay stated that the only concern he has with these code requirements is that not being reviewed by Village staff with the turnover of inconsistent third party personnel. Average existing grade is an example. Are we going to have to hire someone to have the Village say the submittal is acceptable? Mr. Footlik stated that if any Architect seals it and addresses the code, it will be acceptable. All Commissioners chose to retain each section.

- ✓2015 – Table R602.3 (1) – Fastening Schedule – Roof Requirements, Wall Requirements, and Floor Requirements – Modification - All Commissioners chose to retain each section.
- ✓2015 – R602.3.1 – Stud Size, Height and Spacing – Modification – Commissioner Means stated that the section now allows taller gables. All Commissioners chose to retain each section.
- ✓2018 – Table R602.3 (6) – Alternate Stud Height – Addition – Commissioner Lindsay stated that this section is confirming to the norms of construction. Commissioner Means stated that basically the table has been modified to account for ultimate design and wind speed. It is based on exposure category and open plans. Different M.O., but, same meaning. All Commissioners chose to retain each section.
- ✓2015 – R602.7 – Headers – Modification – Commissioner Means stated that the change requires an engineered rim board for compression and not beams. He stated that his house was built with LVL Rim boards with face mounted hangers. Chairman Heaney stated that that is a nice detail. All Commissioners chose to retain each section.
- ✓2018 – Tables R602.7 (1) and R 602.7 (2) Girder and Header Spans – Modification – Commissioner Means stated that the section shows the king studs extending to the upper plate to brace the wall. The studs take the inward and outward loads. If not provided, drywall ends up cracking from the wall sucking in and out. All Commissioners chose to retain each section.
- ✓2018 – Table R602.7.5 – Lateral Support for Headers – Modification – Commissioner Means stated that it is a rule of thumb requirement. He stated he is not going to say to change it, however, from a structural standpoint, a Structural Engineer could design differently. All Commissioners chose to retain each section.
- ✓2015 – Table R602.10.3 (1) – Bracing Requirements based on Wind Speed – Modification – Commissioner Means stated that this is a cookbook method for designing shear walls. It is a pain in the behind. Even if you use plywood, you still have to follow the cookbook method. If you do not have enough walls to resist the shear, you must add steel. If we were to modify this, it would be tough to know where to start. All Commissioners chose to retain each section.
- ✓ Table R602.10.3 (4) – Seismic Adjustment Factors – Modification - Commissioners confirmed same case as other seismic sections. To be retained.
- ✓2018 – Table 602.10.4.1 – Mixing Bracing Methods – Modification – Commissioner Lindsay stated that he would like to strike the whole section.

Commissioner Means stated that the theory is that the home must be designed as a stand-alone home. Commissioner Lindsay asked what the statistics were for number of homes failing? Commissioner Means stated that it depends on if you are considering modern homes or walls themselves. CSWSP 95% there. There would be service building issues and not houses falling down. Examples are cracks in drywall, cracks in windows, open joints, etc. Mr. Footlik stated that these would be issues for the Village. Commissioner Lindsay asked about portal framing on detached garages. How does the detached garage manufacture do that? Commissioner Means stated that the requirement has been in the code since 2006. The design has gotten easier since then. Commissioner Means stated that he feels the section should be kept. He stated that C.S. means continuous sheathing. Commissioner Lindsay stated that if no one wants to challenge this... Commissioner Means stated that he will not. Chairman Heaney asked if all the Commissioners were on board with the code changes through the Masonry section. Commissioner Lindsay stated that he thought the Commissioners could get through Section 700 quickly. All Commissioners chose to retain this section and sections below through to Masonry.

- ✓ 2015 Table R602.10.5 – Contributing Length of Method CS-PF Braced Walls, 2015 R602.10.6.2 – Method PFH: Portal Frame with Hold Downs, 2018 R602.10.6.4 – Method CS-PF Continuously Sheathed Portal Frame, 2018 R602.10.6.5 – Method BV-WSP, 2015 R602.12 – Simplified Wall Bracing, 2015 R602.10.11 – Cripple Wall Bracing, 2018 Tables R603.3.1 and R603.3.1.1 (2) Cold-Formed Steel wall Construction, 2015 R603.9.5 – Structural Sheathing over Steel Framing for Stone and Masonry Veneer – Modification - All Commissioners chose to retain each section.
- ✓ 2015 – R606 – Masonry Walls (Reorganization) and R606.3.5 Grouting Requirements for Masonry Construction (Modification) - All Commissioners chose to retain each section.
- ✓ 2018 – R610 – Structural Insulated Panels and 2015 – R610.7 – Drilling and Notching in Structural Insulated Panels – Modification - All Commissioners chose to retain each section.
- ✓ 2018 – R703.2 – Water-Resistive Barrier – Modification – All Commissioners chose to retain this section.
- ✓ 2015 – R703.3 – Siding Material Thickness and Attachment - Modification – All Commissioners chose to retain this section.
- ✓ Mr. Footlik suggested the Commissioners try and review through to the section for roofing being the 800 section tonight. He stated that there were no items of concern that he had in these sections.
- ✓ 2018 – R703.3.1 – Soffit Installation, 2015 – 703.3.5 – Wood, Hardboard and Wood Structural Panel Siding, 2015 – R703.6 – Wood Shakes and Shingles on Exterior Walls, 2018 – R703.8.4 – Veneer Anchorage through Insulation, 2015 – R703.9 – EIFS, 2018 – R703.8.4 (1) Airspace Requirements, 2015 – R703.11.1 – Vinyl Siding Attachment (Addition), 2018 – R703.11.2 – Vinyl Siding Installation Over Foam Plastic Sheathing, 2015 – R703.13 and 703.14 – Insulated Vinyl Siding and Polypropylene Siding (Addition), 2015 – R703.15, R703.16, R703.17 – Cladding Attachment over Foam Sheathing (Addition) – Modifications except as noted - All Commissioners chose to retain each section.

6. New Business – None.

7. Discussion – None.
8. Adjournment -

Close Meeting. Chairman Heaney asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. 1st – Commissioner Means. 2nd – Commissioner Lindsay. All in favor – 3-0. 8:40 pm

Sections taken in varying order - *