



# Corrections Notice

January 19, 2024

Permit Application: SPRMU231779

Property address: 2300 MT WERNER CIR;

Following are the comments regarding the plan review for the above referenced application. We have noted several concerns and/or non-conforming items regarding the work to be performed. These items must be addressed through revised drawings submitted online through your My Items page in order to proceed.

## **Building Code Review** (Reviewed By: Todd Carr )

1. S-2 Parking Garage Type IB Construction Type and Table 601 and 602 in 2018 IBC: On the Sheet G.10 you do provide the ratings for Type IB Construction, which are 2-hours for primary structural frame, exterior and interior bearing walls, and floor construction. Roof construction is listed at 1-hour for IB construction in Table 601 however we have no roof construction. On Sheet G0.13 you do show all exterior walls, and all columns shaded in orange as being provided a 2-hour rating, and you covered our Stair Cores and Elevator Shafts. However on Sheet G0.12 you are not showing the Floor/Ceiling assembly between S-2 and R-2 above as 2-Hour rated. Sheet A5.10 Detail 2 shows FS-SS-1 on sheet G0.20 to be used as the assembly for the ceiling of the parking garage, which is UL # D-503 detail 6 on sheet G0.20 and is listed as a 1-hour rating, with the structural exposed I-beams having a spray applied fire proofing. This UL#D-503 can be used as a 2-hour rating, and per your structural plans your slab thickness will be 3 ½" thick concrete at 4000psi over 3" x 18 GA Vulcraft VLI Metal Deck, so I believe you meet items 2 and 4 in UL D-503 design. The Issue is per FS-SS-1 on sheet G0.20 the I-beam appears to be left exposed below what you're calling a white vinyl scrim garage ceiling product, so the beam is not enclosed in an assembly. The beam will have a spray applied fire proofing per UL Assembly, but I cannot find the assembly in the plans or specs, and detail FS-SS only states this entire assembly is good for an hour. We view the beam as part of the primary structural frame that supports the floor slab per table 601. In Section 510.4 in the commentary and code section it states you have to either meet Table 508.4 for occupancy separation which in this case is 1-hour, or meet table 601 if it's more stringent than 508.4, and in this case table 601 requests a 2-hour rating. I'm glad to meet to discuss how you may have interpreted section 510.4 or table 601, as specifically 510.4 does not read very clearly in the regular code section, the commentary does help provide clarity in the example figure, or possibly I'm missing another exception you may be applying. Also once we review this comment, we should add one more line item to sheet G0.10 under Building construction review in the top middle column, that provides required separation between S-2 to R-2.
2. The columns that support the beams in the parking garage which then support the slab between the S-2 and R-2 occupancies, are shown as 2-hour rated on G0.13, however I cannot find the assembly to be used, if you can provide me a detail in the plans and sheet number that would be appreciated.
3. G0.13 Sheet: We have a trash room and boiler room located in Level 00 where both rooms are called S-1 Occupancy adjacent to the S-2 parking garage area that are not shown to have 1-hour rated walls or not shaded pink like other 1-hour walls separating S-1 from S-2 areas. Please label these as 1-hour walls and then check the doors into these rooms as well to ensure they carry the required rating to be placed in a 1-hour wall like the other doors.
4. Structural Calculations Page 8 of 1959 and Structural Sheet SO.20: The Structural Engineer has the

construction type listed as II-B only, and then shows building fire ratings per IBC table 601 as II-B ratings only which is all 0 ratings. The Architectural Code Study labels the Building as two different types of construction, the parking garage level 00 is I-B construction for the entire lower level, in order to match the Architectural Plans we are simply requesting this information along with required ratings be added to page 8 of 1959 of the structural calculations.

5. GO.13 Sheet: The Generator Room is shown adjacent to the Stair Core 01, we believe the Concrete wall that separates these two rooms will be 2-hours however the orange shading does not appear visible behind the elevator shaft nor the stair core adjacent to the generator room, please confirm this will be 2-hours, then simply label it as 2-hours on Sheet GO.13.

6. Sheet GO.10 Code Study Request: When we are reviewing buildings of Type I or II Construction, we request that you add Section 602.2 Types I and II that states all materials must be non-combustible, then add Section 603 under Section 602.2, which provides the exceptions. Another suggestion that can be helpful on project this size, is to have a list of any known exceptions that will be utilized under Section 603 both for our Inspectors but also the Contractor, this is not required simply suggested and helps avoid issues or conflict during the project.

7. Stairway width in stair core 1 and 2: We have a local amendment that requires all stairs to be 48" wide, however in our newest code adoption of the 2021 ICC Codes are fire districts no longer require this 48" width through a local amendment. We will need to simply request you provide a response back per the below. State you desire a code modification request per section 104.10 to construct the stairs per the 2018 IBC as written for width based on occupant load, versus following the local amendment. I will then get the Fire Marshall to sign off.

8. GO.10 Code Study Request: Please add Section 1019 Exit Access Stairways and Ramps, then state constructed in accordance with Section 713 Shafts Enclosures, as we assume this is how the stair cores are designed, this way we know how the stair cores are designed per code. Additionally the elevator shafts would be designed in accordance with Section 713. In Stair Core 1 at Level 04 we have a roof/ceiling hatch door showing to access the mechanical platform level, will this hatch door carry a 1.5 hour rating per requirements for openings in a shaft in Section 716?

9. Elevators and Stair Cores Top Enclosures: Per Section 713.12 we want to ensure the top of these shaft enclosures are protected and will carry a 2-hour rating, currently the plans to do not state how the top will be enclosed, on some of the drawings it appears you may have only anticipated a 1-hour rating, so not sure if there is an exception I'm missing or not, just let me know. See section below I'm referencing.

713.12 Enclosure at top. A shaft enclosure that does not extend to the underside of the roof sheathing, deck or slab of the building shall be enclosed at the top with construction of the same fire-resistance rating as the topmost floor penetrated by the shaft, but not less than the fire-resistance rating required for the shaft enclosure.

10. Sheet GO.14 Exiting Question for Stair Core 02: On level 01 inside Stair Core 02 I notice the door 90 is set up to swing 180 degrees outward into the corridor which is fine, is the concept or existing strategy for those who will be coming down from Levels 02, 03, 04, and 05-dormers to be able to exit out at level 01 through this door then exit to door 86 to the exterior, versus continuing to the Level 00, if so which I believe is the case we would desire an exit sign on the inside of the Stair Core 2 above exit door 90 directing you to the corridor.

11. Sheet GO.17 Exiting Travel Distance Confirmation Needed: Please confirm that the total travel distance when inside each individual R-2 Dwelling unit on level 5 from the most remote areas which may be the decks or another room on this level, is 75' or less to the dwelling unit main door that leads to the corridor on level 04. I have used some scaling and measurement tools and appears we meet the 75' maximum distance for one exit out of each dwelling unit, but simply wanted confirmation back in a response, thank you.

12. ADA Sheet GO.10: Under Accessibility and Egress Review, Parking states you have provided 4 ADA



parking stalls even though only 2 are required per table 1106.1 for 42 total spaces. However Sheet A1.00 only shows 2 ADA parking symbols in stalls 9 and 42, please correct the G0.10 to match sheet A1.00 and state you provide 2 spaces, and 42 is van accessible.

13. ADA Sheet G0.10: Could you please add the Unit Numbers to the Code Study portion of this sheet that will be Type A units, this helps both now during the initial review but also down the road to find this information quickly if we see future permits on the building, I show Unit 206 and Unit 109 as the Type A units, thank you in advance.

14. Energy Code: Sheet G0.10 provides us all the necessary compliance information per our Locally Adopted 2018 IECC, however you state a ResCheck was done but I cannot seem to find this document. You do meet the prescriptive table, so I'm not concerned with the envelope, but if you can upload the ResCheck so we can confirm it matches the plans that would be appreciated.

15. Sheet A1.00: On this sheet most of the interior walls that are required to be 1-hour rated, are labeled as F2-S, but when I go back to the Sheet G0.23 I only see detail F shown, not a detail F2-S. This pattern continues throughout the Architectural Plans where walls and floor assemblies are referenced but do not match the exact name on the G-Sheets, Please update either the G-Sheets to match the Architectural Sheets, or update G-Sheets to match the Architectural Sheets so they align and are named identical, as these are important assemblies and details.

16. Section 718.5 Combustible material in concealed spaces in Type I and II construction: Similar to Section 603, we simply like to know in advance if any exceptions will be taken from this section of the Code.

#### **Engineering Review** (Reviewed By: Emrick Soltis, P.E., CFM )

1. See Grade and Fill permit application SPRGR231782 for Civil Construction Plan comments.

#### **Planning Review** (Reviewed By: Toby Stauffer, AICP )

1. Compliance with PL20220623 conditions of approval #1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 required.
2. Compliance with PL20220479 conditions of approval #3, 4, 6, 8, 9 required.

#### **Construction Site Management Review** (Reviewed By: Scott Slamal )

1. CSMP does not include proposed sidewalk along Mt Werner Circle.

#### **Utilities Review - Mt. Werner** (Reviewed By: Beau Cahill )

1. Easements, Plats and other agreements need to be executed prior to building permit approval
2. Request for Water and Sewer Form needs to be signed and returned to MWW (can be found on mwwater.com)
3. Plant Investment Fees are to be paid in full to MWW prior to permit approval. Form was emailed to applicants on 1/2/24; Plant Investment Form can also be found on mwwater.com

#### **Construction Stormwater Review** (Reviewed By: Scott Slamal )

1. See SWMP review correction notice sent on 1/11/2024 for Construction Stormwater Permit application SPRSW231783. [Scott Slamal @ 01/18/2024 8:36 AM]



If I can provide any further information to you, please feel free to contact me at (970) 870-5334 or by email at [mmichael-ferrier@co.routt.co.us](mailto:mmichael-ferrier@co.routt.co.us).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Malea Michael-Ferrier'.

Malea Michael-Ferrier

Sr Permit Tech/Plan Reviewer Assistant