Agenda
Village of Arlington Heights
Building Code Review Board
Commissions Room
33 S. Arlington Heights Rd., AH IL 60005
March 21, 2017
6:30 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. February 27, 2017 Minutes

IV. REPORTS

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Continuance of February 27, 2017 Meeting

VI. NEW BUSINESS

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Persons with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services, such as an American Sign Language interpreter or written materials in accessible formats, should contact David Robb, Disability Services Coordinator, at 33 S. Arlington Heights Road, Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005, (847)368-5793 (Voice), (847)368-5980 (Fax) or drobb@vah.com.

Item: February 27, 2017 Minutes

Department: Building Services

Approval of February 27, 2017 Minutes

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	**Type**
February 27, 2017 Minutes	Minutes

BUILDING CODE REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES OF A MEETING BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS BUILDING CODE REVIEW BOARD

February 27, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT:

ADMINISTRATION PRESENT:
John Carrato, Chairman
Carl Baldassarra
Richard Bondarowicz
John Scaletta (Trustee)
Steve Touloumis, Director of Building Services
Charley Craig, Assistant Building Official
Don Lay, Fire Safety Supervisor
Bernie Lyons, Deputy Fire Chief
Patty LeVee, Recording Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:
Darin Flaska DVM- Owner – Arlington Animal Hospital
Anita Kuhnle DVM- Owner – Arlington Animal Hospital
Manuel Govea, Associate for Linden Group Architects
Kyle Fread, Project Executive, RWE Management
Jason Sanderson, Construction Manager

SUBJECT:

Petitioner, Jason Sanderson of RWE Management**,** seeking a variance from Section 23-402, [F]903.2 of Chapter 23 of the Village of Arlington Heights Municipal Code requiring all new buildings and structure to be equipped with automatic sprinkler systems pertaining to Arlington Animal Hospital at 412 W. Algonquin Road.

There being a quorum present, Chairman Carrato called the meeting to order at 7:02pm. All stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CARL BALDASSARRA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 25, 2016 MEETING, SECONDED BY RICHARD BONDAROWICZ, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Govea introduced the request for an exception/waiver of the Village amendment requiring all new buildings and structures to be equipped with a fire protection system.

Arlington Heights Animal Hospital is currently looking to improve their facility. They are looking to move their kennel area into an addition where they can better handle the animals and improve their facilities inside, which is the care side of the hospital. Currently, the addition is 664 square feet. (Under 1000 square feet). The existing building is constructed of metal stud, masonry and siding. The current water service is insufficient. They have adequate separation between their building and adjacent properties and are considering that with the size of the addition, being less than 1000 square feet, the cost to bring an upgraded service is approximately $50,000.

Mr. Fread continued, cost is about $50,000 to bring in new water service and then having to sprinkle the additional remodeled area and addition, which this code amendment triggers, because once they do that addition the code is saying they need to sprinkle that portion with any additional remodeling as well. If the addition was not there, none of this would have been triggered. The whole 664 square foot addition is triggering this, and means they need to bring in a whole new water main, which is on the other side of their existing parking lot. They would have to bore underneath the existing parking lot, in lieu of ripping that all open. They are an existing business; they do not want to shut down for this project. They would be working around that as well as trying to put all of the sprinkler system in there. Any additional remodel down the line, if they didn't want to touch the other half of the building, that would trigger a whole sprinkler system on that side as well.

Mr. Govea added that if they were not doing the addition, just remodeling, they would not be doing the sprinkler system as understood, correct? The addition is kennel space.

Mr. Lay stated that we have not made anyone retrofit a fire sprinkler for a remodel. **Chairman Carrato** added, without an addition. **Mr. Lay** responded, correct.

Trustee Scaletta asked if it matters what the scope of the remodel is. **Mr. Lay** said as far as he knows we have not and referred to Mr. Craig.

Mr. Craig responded, not that he is aware of as far as the scope of this addition and the scope of the remodeling which is what we have been basing all the decisions on. **Mr. Lay** commented to his knowledge, we have not unless he is mistaken, unless there is something that happened previously.

Trustee Scaletta asked, if somebody was to gut the place and redesign the interior that may require being sprinklered; today, as of now, based on what has come forward, that we have not.

Trustee Scaletta commented that the Board does not factor the cost as a hardship.

Chairman Carrato opened to discussion to non-combustible. **Mr. Govea** explained the current building is steel frame, metal stud with masonry wainscope and siding above the addition. They plan to construct a concrete block and then skin it in the same fashion

as the existing building. The roof structure itself is also bar joist in the existing and they are looking to do steel joist rafters.

Mr. Baldassarra inquired on the total cost of the project. **Mr. Fread** responded the total cost is approximately $500,000 without this work and acknowledged it would add another 10%. It is $500,000 with the addition and renovation work.

Mr. Bondarowicz asked if the current building has a fire detection system throughout. **Mr. Lay** responded, there is a fire alarm, as far as he understands there is a fire sprinkler in the boiler room.

Mr. Bondarowicz added, but there is a fire alarm detection system within the existing. **Mr. Lay** said there is a fire alarm, he is not aware of the extent of the detection aspect, but there is a fire alarm in the building that will send a signal if it is activated.

Mr. Bondarowicz asked what would be required in the renovated area; will that have to meet the current code for all fire detection? **Mr. Lay** responded, fire detection, fire alarms, yes, they would have to bring that up to code. Regarding pull stations, he does not think that use requires it. It would be typical, like the horns and strobes, and those types would have to be current.

Mr. Bondarowicz asked if there was currently a fire panel in the existing building. Is there going to be a new panel as part of the scope that is going to need to be upgraded or put in as a result of the renovation work, regardless of the addition?

Mr. Flaska responded that they do have smoke alarms in the facility that trigger the alarm company, that then triggers the fire department. **Mr. Bondarowicz** asked if it is a commercial panel or is it a secondary system, noting that he is not as familiar with the fire detection systems.

Mr. Baldassarra asked if this is a commercial detection system with detectors in all bases of the building or is it a couple here/there. Is there a detection system? **Mr. Flaska** replied there are multiple alarms like that in the general area.

Mr. Bondarowicz asked if there is a fire detection plan that has been submitted for the renovation work. **Mr. Fread** replied, not yet, but they are planning on it. **Mr. Bondarowicz** asked you would not do this renovation if you could not do the addition, correct? What's happening is you are moving the kennel outside of the original envelope of the building. At this point in time you do not have a fire detection plan for the renovation. **Mr. Fread** answered correct, they are planning to add and extend the existing fire alarm system.

Mr. Baldassarra said, are you saying if you put the sprinklers in, you do not need to do that. **Mr. Fread** replied, no, he is saying the whole sprinkler thing triggered this. They have not pursued the rest of the paperwork for the fire detection system. With the drawings as planned, they would extend the existing system into the addition regardless

of the sprinklers. It came up that the sprinkler system was an issue and therefore they wanted to get this in front of the Building Code Review Board as quickly as possible.

Mr. Bondarowicz stated, although we are not considering dollars, going back to fire detection systems, which are not inexpensive, you have $50,000 cost of sprinkling your renovation plus the addition. What kind of system is there currently and can it handle what you are doing with the renovation plus the addition? There may be a dollar figure in that also.

Mr. Fread said they are figuring on extending the detection system with this project.

Mr. Baldassarra added that they do not need to do that if they do sprinkler heads. **Mr. Bondarowicz** added that if potentially they are going to do a new fire detection system, then you are gutting all the walls, you are reconfiguring. **Mr. Govea** stated, no, it is not a complete gut. They are trying to help with costs, trying to salvage as many walls as they can, there is a mezzanine with an air handler above. They are trying to keep a lot of that structure in tack so they do not disrupt it.

Mr. Touloumis, to clarify, stated he did not know that it was true they would not need their alarm system in conjunction with their sprinkler. **Mr. Baldassarra** added you would not need detectors everywhere, but you need to have an alarm system. **Mr. Lay** added, currently you do not have to have an alarm system in this at all. He needs to have the ability to send a signal if the current sprinkler would activate. That is all he is required to have. If he upgrades, he still does not have to add any additional devices, because the sprinkler would be sufficient to send an alarm.

Trustee Scaletta asked if they had a panel. **Mr. Flaska** was not 100% sure. **Trustee Scaletta** asked, if they had investigated the ability to add additional detectors to the existing panel. **Mr. Flaska** replied that with the panel that they have they can put multiple extra slopes, heat sensors on that panel. There has been no reason for it now, but when they do the addition they will need a few more, but that panel, according to the company can handle additional smoke to heat sensors. It was checked when first put in, which was early 2015**. Ms. Kuhnle** mentioned the panel was upgraded then as part of the security system. **Mr. Flaska** stated that it does go to a security company; it has carbon monoxide, smoke, heat.

Chairman Carrato called on the recommendation of Building Services.

Mr. Touloumis explained that Building Services is denying the petition based on the fact the code requires sprinklers. We have a zero square foot requirement that has been part of our amended code. If this was being built as a standalone, new 600 square foot building, would we still want to not put sprinklers in when we have a zero threshold? Just because this is an addition to a building, should not make a difference, it is a significant square foot area. The rationale is that the addition triggering the requirement for the sprinklers and the remodeling is not correct in his interpretation. The code would require sprinklers to be done with alterations to existing construction.

This could lead to a discussion of what we are talking about, are we gutting it to the studs, or are we just replacing some trim work. Presuming it is a massive gut; the code would require the building to be brought to the current code. To say it is only a certain percentage opens the door to what percentage is good enough (10%, 25%, 50%), where do you draw the line? None of these are valid reasons to support not adding sprinklers as the code requires.

Mr. Baldassarra asked for the Fire Department recommendation. **Deputy Chief Lyons** stated they do not have a recommendation. They are supportive of the Building Department's efforts to keep the occupant safe, the fire fighters safe, but at the same time, if the Building Code Review Board decided to grant the variance, they would not oppose it. The reason being is there were discussions about the amendments to the code, he was here representing the Fire Department, and they said they would be flexible and reasonable to any variances that came up. This variance, because it is small, because there are not exposures close by, because it is made of non-combustible material, they would not be opposed.

Trustee Scaletta inquired on staffing at the hospital, are they on duty 24 hours a day. **Mr. Flaska** replied, no, staff arrive at 6:00am and typically leave between 7:30-8:00pm. There are times some people are there a little later in the evening. Doors open at 8:00am and close at 7:00pm. Last person leaves around 8:00pm weekdays, 4:00-5:00pm Saturdays, and Sundays around 2:00pm. He noted a lot of similar facilities in the area to not have people in their buildings overnight monitoring the animals.

Trustee Scaletta asked about smoke and heat detectors and where the call goes if those alarms were to go off. **Mr. Flaska** said there are smoke, heat and carbon monoxide detectors and the call goes to 911, Northwest Central Dispatch.

Mr. Baldassarra, referring to the site plan and application, noted the application says the building has ample separation from adjacent property structures, 60 feet to the east and 100 feet to the north. This should not be measured to the structures of your neighbors but to your property line. You neighbor can put a building right on the property line. On the site plan it looks like your building 5.2 feet to the property line, and on another drawing it says 6 inches. It is not 60 feet but more like 5 feet. That is operative measurement point for considering exposure to adjacent properties. The building next door could be anywhere on that property, it just happens to be 60 feet today; they can put an addition on too. **Mr. Flaska** noted that it is a townhouse; they do not believe that is allowed.

Mr. Baldassarra stated they measure to the property line when they look at building exposures.

Mr. Baldassarra stated he wanted to make sure it was understood that when people come to the Board and ask for changes to our Ordinance because of hardships, that normally does not include money. This appears to be simply solved by money. When people come to the Board to be relieved of a code, they normally state that instead of

this I am going to do x, y, z. To come and not offer anything is something the Board does not normally deal with. There is no alternative proposed.

Mr. Sanderson expressed that during meetings what was discussed, and maybe not documented well, was doing non-combustible construction. Changing some of the construction type to be solid masonry, using steel trusses and steel framing to help increase the chance of this being a Tech 5B construction or something of that affect, would be more flammable. Time was spent talking with Don Lay about what the exposure of some of the structures nearest to them. They would try and increase the fire resistance rating of the materials and work with staff. Fully addressable systems, which they think they have, was discussed and may be required, so the response time is greater with the fire department. They are trying to avoid ripping up and trying to connect to the water main. It would disrupt their business because that water main would have to cut across the driveway which leads to the back part of their parking lot. There is an impact and they are an operating business. It is understood everything can be solved with money. It did come up in discussion that when this code was written there might be some flexibility. They thought this was a reasonable request, no disrespect by asking without giving.

Mr. Bondarowicz asked where the water main was located, is service out the rear of the property? Are you going out on Algonquin? **Mr. Sanderson** indicated on his larger plan the location of the water main and stated they do not think it would go onto Algonquin. They have not yet check anything on closing off the hydrant to be sure pressure is adequate for the system. They have not gone that far to start to develop to make sure they would need a pump in addition to the system. It was noted, Mr. Sanderson's role is Construction Manager.

Chairman Carrato (viewing plans) noted there is clearly a lot more room to the property lines than the dimensions given. **Mr. Baldassarra** stated the plat of survey appears to show 5.2 feet off the back of the building or the east side of the building. **Chairman Carrato** stated that is the existing room, the extension is nowhere near. **Mr. Bondarowicz** said he believes there is an error in dimensions. **Mr. Sanderson** agreed that on the 6 inches there is absolutely an error. The plat of survey is correct; the site plan has the error.

Mr. Bondarowicz inquired about the boarding area and if the wall separating the new boarding area and the remaining structure is a glass wall assembly. It appears to be steel doors with closures that are fire rated and looks like it is not solid wall assembly (referring to 81.1). It appears to be drawn as glass. **Mr. Govea** stated, no, they are salvaging the existing wall. The demising wall is metal stud; the exterior walls are CMU (concrete masonry unit). **Mr. Bondarowicz** stated that essentially this will be a fire rated assembly. **Mr. Govea** answered, virtually.
Chairman Carrato and Mr. Baldassarra questioned that. **Mr. Baldassarra** asked if that was a fire rated wall being built. **Mr. Sanderson** said they will put door closures on there. They can have the doors R rated. **Mr. Baldassarra** replied, metal panel

construction that is not rated. **Mr. Sanderson** replied whatever the existing exterior wall is will remain.

Mr. Baldassarra suggested that could be proposed as part of the package. **Mr. Sanderson** stated they can easily add more drywall to the inside of that to beef up the exterior wall.

Mr. Baldassarra said that he would expect to see a proposal in lieu of what is required and they would consider that.

Chairman Carrato stated that with this building type material and what is being added, it does not make a lot of sense to deny this. If the Board needs them to do some extra items, he can understand it, but he is struggling with saying they have to put a sprinkler in the whole unit because of this addition.

Mr. Baldassarra noted that once they spend money on the water main; that is the big cost, to do the rest is incremental, not to minimize it, but this is the big ticket item. On the other hand, as Mr. Touloumis mentioned, where do we draw the line next time? We are not anti-business and want businesses to prosper but we have an Ordinance. To give a waiver sets a bad precedence too. **Chairman Carrato** replied; this is our job, people come to the Board for a waiver.

Trustee Scaletta asked if there were animals overnight in this building and what the maximum amount of animals that would be in the building at any one time once remodeled. **Mr. Sanderson** answered they are currently boarding and with the boarding addition there would be 30 dogs at one time. They also have a cat boarding area with five to seven cats.

Trustee Scaletta asked how long it would take to add a water main across the driveway. **Mr. Sanderson** guessed 4-5 days, a week.

Trustee Scaletta asked the difference in cost with the non-combustible materials (steel trusses) versus adding the sprinkler system. **Mr. Sanderson** stated that because the CMU walls make sense for the use, being that they would not put drywall in the animal holding area, they are going to use CMU regardless. The upgrade to them is using the steel trusses. The steel trusses over the wood trusses are maybe a 10% increase on material cost. The trusses for a 900 square foot addition are maybe $10,000 to $12,000; it is roughly another $1,200 to $1,300 to go up to steel trusses or steel framing. They have reached out for pricing on the water main and sprinkler piping. Just on the remodeled area and addition, without the general contractor's fee, is at $46,000. It would be $31,000 for the contractor to do the water main and $15,000 for the contractor to do the sprinkler. That would not include any Village tap fees.

Mr. Baldassarra asked $15,000 to sprinkler 664 square feet? Is it the entire building? **Mr. Sanderson** responded, no, as he understood, it was the remodeled area, which is

maybe from Column Line F (looking at drawing), plus the addition. **Ms. Kuhnle** added, it is approximately 3,000 square feet.

Mr. Bondarowicz asked if it is 3,000 square feet including the addition. It is the understanding that part of our code is a 3,000 square foot threshold, not for sprinkling but for potentially a commercial fire panel. **Mr. Lay** stated it is a change of occupancy in a 3,000 square foot area. **Mr. Bondarowicz** stated that fact does not apply in this situation; it is not a change of occupancy.

Trustee Scaletta said he agrees that the Petitioner has come forward with no alternative to make this better and presented examples of past hearings where alternatives were presented. He does not feel the Petitioner(s) are coming forward with making this any better other than asking for a variation. Dollars is not a hardship and you are not presenting what you propose to do, or what you think accomplishes the goal of what you are trying to achieve.

Mr. Flaska stated the code states that if there are any significant changes, you need to put in sprinklers. If there was no addition, and in the past there has been no forced sprinklers on architectural changes, more than likely they would not have to put sprinklers in this 3,000 square foot section. According to Mr. Lay and Mr. Craig, nothing has come across the Board where they forced someone to put through sprinklers in that 3,000 square foot section.

Trustee Scaletta stated that was correct, they did not go back and amortize and make everyone with an existing space put in sprinklers. They said if someone comes forward and is asking to add an addition, that they would want them to be compliant.

Mr. Sanderson said when meeting with Mr. Lay and Mr. Touloumis, they mentioned trying to make this non-combustible. They did put in steel framing where they do not have if they are sprinkling the building.

Mr. Baldassarra asked what type of construction is the existing building. It states it is 2B, which already is steel construction. **Ms. Kuhnle** stated it is all steel, even the roof is steel. **Mr. Baldassarra** asked, you would put this addition on with a wood roof otherwise. **Mr. Sanderson** replied if they are sprinkling it, he believes they can. **Mr. Baldassarra** agreed, yes, they can.

Mr. Sanderson explained that instead of submitting the drawing with wood trusses and then proposing non-combustible, they met with staff and Mr. Lay and came up with doing the addition as non-combustible. That would help their case for not needing to sprinkle. He believes they jumped a step in coming to the Board now instead of coming here and presenting their proposed solution.

Mr. Baldassarra added that if they put on a wood frame structure and do not have any fire separations, the classification of the entire building would be 5B. You need to meet the height and area for 5B. It was not clear in the application.

Trustee Scaletta stated there is some confusion with Petitioner stating he had conversation with staff and then Building Services still coming up with a recommendation of denial. Where is the disconnect? **Mr. Lay** stated the disconnect is between Mr. Touloumis and himself.

Mr. Touloumis stated he does not know if it is a disconnect as much as there is a philosophy. The Petitioner knew their position coming in, but alternatives such as are presenting, he does not know if this could make a 5B based on the area, but maybe a 5A or whatever the case may be, as opposed to coming with a 2B. **Mr. Lay** said they did discuss fire loading on the new versus a change of construction with or without a sprinkler. What would be more beneficial if you did not have a sprinkler; obviously a fire proof building. They discussed upgrading the construction type to accommodate the lack of a sprinkler. They were willing to do that and that is something they did talk about. There were several meetings and many, many discussions with them about what we can help them achieve.

Chairman Carrato went back to earlier comments, as Mr. Touloumis is saying, this is a precedent that maybe we do not want to set. He is not sure he agrees that they have not demonstrated that they are trying to do something to improve the situation in lieu of sprinkling. That is what it comes down to. He believes they have attempted to do that with the type of construction.

Trustee Scaletta asked, you are going to have different doors than what exists now which would prevent fire from spilling over to the main building? **Mr. Govea** said they can. **Mr. Sanderson** added that the doors they proposed are steel doors with closures on them. Part of doing this is because of sound, they do not want those doors left open so the noise of the barking does not travel. It so happens that a steel door with a closure on it falls under a rated door. He is not going to say that was intentional to create this fire separation because that was not necessarily the intent.

Mr. Sanderson continued that he understood from meetings that when they wrote the code, they knew there would be circumstances that could permit people to come in and ask for this. Common sense was a term that was used in their meeting. Some people might use common sense differently and view it differently. Had they understood that they could propose some different things to eliminate $45,000, they could have put fire shutter doors on there, rated doors on there, they could come up with a lot of things to separate this. If it means waiting another month to come back with that, or working with staff to establish that and working with the Fire Department and Mr. Lay, that is what we are here to do, we are here to work with you. In a typical process, they are given conditions. They were not expecting a home run, they came before the Board to have a discussion and understand. When they met with staff he asked what the options were and what can they do. There was a difference of opinion, which is part of why they are here. Fire Protection is the main concern of the Fire Department, and they felt Mr. Lay had a difference of opinion whether this was permittable.

Trustee Scaletta stated, one, he does not think this one project sets precedence for the Board. Each structure that would come before the Board is going to be unique in nature. Two, he would feel more comfortable if they provided some of the additional items that were previously mentioned. He is not comfortable making the motion trying to spell out what those conditions would be. If someone else was more comfortable with that, that is fine or they can table this for another meeting.

Mr. Bondarowicz said from the construction perspective, the items mentioned should be looked into. Going back to the fire panel confirmation, it is something to explore. Ultimately it is going to come down to staff, that the fire panel is a commercial fire panel that you would put in potentially in the lieu of sprinkler requirement, that this is a commercial panel that is monitored, that can handle not only the complete renovation work, but the addition. One simple thought is HVAC. Is the HVAC separated on the structure? Is this space heated/cooled independently of the addition. **Mr. Govea** stated it was. (Small discussion on the fire wall and two hour separation.)

Mr. Baldassarra suggested the putting a rated wall for the 660 square feet might be a waste. You have 6,700 feet; it does not make sense to worry about that. He thinks a couple of ideas as has been mentioned about upgrading the fire panel, and complete detection in every space, complete detection to cover the entire building in accordance with NFPA 72 Standard, in lieu of, a complete detection system everywhere. He suggested they could propose some separations, Column line F might be a good place to do that, it is about half the building.

Mr. Govea mentioned that currently that is a masonry wall. **Mr. Baldassarra** questioned the doors and the openings and stated the non-combustible construction is a plus.

Mr. Sanderson mentioned the NFPA panel being a fully addressable system, will verify if it is there or not. **Mr. Baldassarra** said it does not even have to be fully addressable, that is what is in the market today. Complete coverage is what they are talking about.

Mr. Baldassarra continued that if they come back, also consider, what kind of combustibles are there in this space. Do you have combustibles that he wouldn't expect? **Ms. Kuhnle** asked if you are referring to the new space, because the new space has zero, because it is fiberglass and metal, etc. **Mr. Baldassarra** asked if there are any storage areas of anything. Flammable liquids? Flammable liquid cabinets for alcohol and things? (*Background discussion on roof, inaudible)*

Mr. **Flaska** stated they are doing metal joists with fire treated plywood. **Mr. Touloumis** asked what they are putting on the roof. **Mr. Baldassarra** asked, using wood deck? **Mr. Govea** answered, fire treated. **Mr. Baldassarra** did not think it would be 2B. **Mr. Govea** said it will allow it for the roof deck. **Mr. Touloumis** said they would have to check on the combustibles for that and then look going on the roof itself. Not putting on a rated roof, correct.

Mr. Baldassarra asked what the existing roof was. **Ms. Kuhnle** replied metal. **Mr. Govea** said the deck is metal but it is asphalt shingles, but when he was roofing it he was going through metal. **Mr. Govea** noted the existing drawings show plywood over metal deck.

Trustee Scaletta said if they had enough information to table this for another meeting. **Mr. Sanderson** was satisfied.

Chairman Carrato called for a Motion to table.

TRUSTEE SCALETTA MOTIONED TO CONTINUE, SECONDED BY MR. BALDASSARA. THE MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:56pm.

Item: Continuance of February 27, 2017 Meeting

Department: Building Services

Request

Continuance of February 27, 2017 meeting pertaining to 412 W. Algonquin Road, Arlington Animal Hospital, seeking a variance from Section 23-402, [F] 903.2 of Chapter 23 of the Village of Arlington Heights Municipal Code requiring all new buildings and structures to be equipped with automatic sprinkler systems.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type
Proposal for Variance	Correspondence

Attachment
(412 W. Algonquin Rd)
Revised 3/3/2017

Reason:
The proposed addition at Arlington Heights Animal Hospital is part of an interior remodel project to improve the treatment area of the hospital with updated equipment, surgical suites, and procedure areas. This remodeling project requires the relocation of existing Animal Boarding areas to the proposed 600 square foot addition. We are requesting variation from fire sprinkler based on several factors listed below:

1. The addition is 10% of the existing square footage and is less than 1,000 s.f.
2. The existing building is constructed of non-combustible materials with masonry and steel walls and roof structure. Type 2B Construction.
3. Proposed 600 s.f. addition will also be constructed of non-combustible masonry walls and steel roof structure. Type 2B Construction.
4. Current water service is not sufficient and will need to be improved to accommodate Fire Sprinklers.
5. Allowable area per un-amended IBC 2009 code is 23,000s.f. without area increases and 31,740 with frontage increase. The total proposed building area will be a single story 6,768 s.f. building which is on 22 percent of the unamended IBC 2009.
6. Requirement to sprinkle the 600s.f. addition triggers requirement to sprinkle the remodeled 3,000 s.f. area that would not otherwise require sprinklers per the amended Arlington Heights building code.
7. The building has ample separation from adjacent property structures. 60' to the east and 100' to the north.

Hardship:
If the variance is not approved the applicant will experience the following hardships:

1. They will be required to extend a new water main to the building to service the sprinkler system, which would require the existing parking lot be closed for approximately (1) week to extend the water main to the existing building.
2. They will be required to sprinkle the remodeled 3,000 s.f. area that would not otherwise require sprinklers per the amended Arlington Heights building code.
3. They will be required to extend sprinkler into other areas as they are remodeled.
4. They will be required (depending on system installed) to perform continued maintenance and testing of sprinkler system.

Proposed Alternates to Full Sprinkler System:

1. We are proposing to build the addition with Type 2B Construction which would include non-combustible masonry walls and steel roof structure. Please note, that this has already been incorporated into the submitted permit drawings, after initial meetings and review with Staff.
2. We propose creating a fire separation wall at Column Line F which separates the existing half of the building from the half that is being renovated. The existing wall construction is a full height masonry wall, which we will add fire rated doors, and fire caulk all penetrations.
3. We propose adding a fully addressable and monitored fire alarm system compliant with NFPA in lieu of adding a full sprinkler system.