

From: [DGS Website@DGS](mailto:DGS_Website@DGS)
To: CBSC@DGS
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT on PROPOSED BUILDING STANDARDS - Bryce Nesbitt
Date: Monday, October 18, 2021 12:51:10 AM

Commenter Contact Information

Name: Bryce Nesbitt
Date: 10/18/2021 12:00:00 AM
Representing: Obviously Enterprises
Mailing Address
Number and Street: 1470 Acton Street
City: Berkeley
State: CA
Zip Code: 94702
Telephone #: 5105588770
Email: bryce2@obviously.com

Proposed Building Standard

Title 24 Part #: Part 10
Section #: 5, 506.1
Proposing State Agency: HCD
This comment is intended for review during: 45-Day Comment Period

Your recommendation based on the criteria of Health and Safety Code Section 18930(a):
Further Study Required

In support of your recommendation above, provide the rationale based on the criteria of Health and Safety Code Section 18930(a). If you recommend anything other than approve, cite the criteria in your comment. If you oppose a proposed building standard, offer a solution or alternative for the state agency to consider.

Title 24, Part 10 (Existing Building Code), Chapter 5, Section 506 Change of Occupancy, Section 506.1

Proposal: Amend the CEBC Section 506.1 to allow the usage of the exterior wall fire-rating provisions at the time of construction, during a change of use (Section 1004 and Section 1010 would apply also, if adopted).

Rationale: We're converting a lot of existing space in buildings into Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's). These conversions can be highly cost and carbon efficient, where existing attics, basement, utility rooms and accessory buildings are converted.

The CEBC refers to the CRC and CBC for fire separation distance (FSD). CRC Table R302.1 requires an ASTM E119 wall for distances under 5 feet. For example in a 3-foot setback City, imagine a basement conversion where the basement extends 2 feet above ground. A strict interpretation of this code would require the bottom two feet of the exterior wall be removed and rebuilt, with no changes above that point.

Converting part of an existing building's wall to a 1 hour fire rating hardly seems like the low hanging fruit in terms of fire hardening of the structure. The local jurisdiction's hands are tied here, requiring low benefit high cost wall rebuilding, on existing structures. These intrusive wall rebuildings on existing structures can be highly disruptive to the water barrier outside the changed area, leading to long term wall damage. The gypsum layer often used for 1 hour fire protection must be kept dry, in a way that partial retrofits of existing walls cannot readily ensure.

Thus the proposal to let the exterior wall fire-rating provisions at the time of construction continue to apply, for all existing buildings, even with a change of use.

Criteria Cited: 18930(a)(5) The cost to the public is reasonable, based on the overall benefit to be derived from the building standards.

9 Point Criteria Info:

18930(a) 5