



Corrections Notice

Permit Application #SPRAD210636

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: Ted Allen)

3. While a 2-HR rated Fire Wall appears inadequate, IBC Section 503.1.2 Buildings on same lot presents an additional option where two or more buildings on the same lot shall be regulated as separate buildings. For example, the fire wall becomes two exterior walls and per 503.1.2 walls and openings in exterior walls shall comply with Tables 601 and 602. The distance to an adjacent lot line shall be determined in accordance with Table 602 and Section 705. In this instance the existing wood shear wall and new exterior wall constructed under Phase 1b would be constructed not less than the fire-resistance rating based on fire separation distance (as required by Table 602 for exterior walls based on the fire separation distance) and continue to parapets provided on exterior walls of buildings (see IBC Section 705) and insulation added per code. RCRBD is prepared to allow the imaginary lot line to extend vertically only where two exterior walls exist thereby allowing for openings in the upper stories in the 1b structure if allowed by the Architect. Todd Carr Notes: We would accept the 3-Hour Rated Wall to be made up of two independent fire walls, where the existing building exterior wall would become a 1-hour rated wall assembly that would require drywall to be installed on both sides of the existing building walls, so find an assembly where you cover the 3/4" plywood shear wall on the north side of the existing wall you want to keep. Then find a 2-hour rated wall assembly you can construct for the new building which will need to meet the requirements for parapets as well. Also review those existing window openings on the raised roof area of the existing building, to see these will be allowed in close proximity to the the area separation fire wall.

Applicant Response. Thank you, and noted for future "Area 1B" permit submission. The permit submission in question does not require a fire wall at Column Line 10, as the entire building is Type V-B, as exists.

RCRBD finds this direction as proposed to be flawed as in the example when a townhouse is constructed only as a duplex and friction is developed when it counts and after the fact. There is a need to understand what we are being asked to approve, for example it appears you are adding a layer of drywall but no rated assembly is specified inside or out? Why is the head of wall non-rated at this time while it is under construction and inspected by Routt County?

6. Required second exit door is not shown with exit signs or emergency lighting. Provide details of all required panic hardware providing free egress at all times on the plans.

Plans submitted do not appear revised to show exit sign and emergency lighting for the required second exit door, See sheet E2.11 for required exit on Grid A between Grids 3 and 5. This condition has been reported by Routt County inspectors when it comes up during Final Inspections and Fails because there are no exit lights and everything is drywalled. A similar issue comes up with the exit door hardware, please furnish door hardware schedule to RCRBD for review.

9. Provide kitchen equipment shown 'by others' on mechanical plans. While sheets M2.31 and M4.11 have been revised, see Detail 4/M4.12 for kitchen equipment shown 'by others'.

10. The 1st submittal appears to be missing Civil Plans. Note that approved Civil plans are required prior to issuance of



permits including Foundation Only. Please submit Civil plans that are complete for review and approval by RCRBD.

Engineering Review (Reviewed By: Stuart King, P.E.)

1. Upload approved civil site plans CV-21-06.

Planning Review (Reviewed By: Kelly Douglas)

1. Building Permit not approved yet. CV-21-06 must be approved first.

Utilities Review - City (Reviewed By: Amber Gregory)

3. Tap fee assessment sent to applicant. Needs tap fees paid.
4. approved plans need uploaded

Construction Site Management Review (Reviewed By: Scott Slamal)

1. CSMP required for this project along with completed CSMP checklist. Civil plans need to be uploaded also for further review.

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.

Sincerely,

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

Malea Michael-Ferrier

Administrative Assistant/Plan Reviewer Assistant