

Plumbing Board of Appeals
Meeting Minutes
August 25, 2015

Board Members Present:

Tom Day, Chairman
Michael Hessenius, Vice Chairman
Jim Meier-Gast

Board Members Absent:

Brian Rogers

Also Present:

Kevin Ciabatti, Building Services Director	Wade Squiers, Fusion Architects, Inc.
Duncan McCallum, Plans Examination Coordinator	Craig Byers, Developer
Dale Seaman, Chief Plumbing Inspector	Scott Byers, Developer
Lyn Wedemeier, Plans Examiner	
Dawn Kolosik, Recording Secretary	

Chairman Tom Day brought the meeting to order at 9:00 AM. Minutes from the previous meeting held on April 30, 2015, were reviewed. Mike Hessenius made a motion to approve the minutes as recorded, seconded by Jim Meier-Gast. All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Day introduced the next item agenda, NewBo Lofts appeal. Kevin Ciabatti stated project was reviewed, the current amendment refers to separate bathrooms in restaurants and stated the question is whether a combined location accessible by two tenant spaces, one being a restaurant and one being a retail space, would be an acceptable alternative to this requirement of separate bathrooms (Sec 35.14). Wade Squiers then introduced himself. He stated they wanted to allow for maximum flexibility by providing restrooms for incoming tenants and in order to do that, they had to find a portion of the building where they could put the bathrooms up front and allow an equivalent access from either space to the bathrooms without having to go through either tenant space. In the end, it allows them to be more efficient with use of space whereas if they had restrooms for each space, the area would need to be a little larger than it is now, without sacrificing the number of fixtures. For a space or building this small, it becomes critical to utilize the space more efficiently than they might otherwise which is why they are attempting to do this. Chairman Day asked if the doors from the restaurant and retail space would be locked when the retail space is not open; Wade stated they would provide some sort of access from the restaurant so people wouldn't be able to go into the retail space. He clarified the doors to the restroom will always be open. Jim asked what the primary entrance side from the retail space. Wade stated this would be a function of how many actual tenants there will be and where they would like to have it, to try to build in flexibility. He stated it would be a set of double doors off the lower side. The back door shown is for service.

Kevin read the amendment, "All food and/or drink establishments that provide seating for on premises consumption shall provide separate restroom facilities for men and women on the same level as the occupancy during the hours the establishment is open." The question has always been "separate meaning within the space?" or "separate meaning men's and women's?" The Building Services Dept has always interpreted it as "separate meaning the space".

Lyn Wedemeier stated with this space configuration, it would meet the fixture requirement. Chairman Day asked if the Board of Health would govern a hand wash sink in the kitchen area. Lyn stated yes.

Jim stated that having familiarity with the site layout, he did not see an issue with it other than how it was set up and eventually there could be four different tenants. The two far right tenants wouldn't have easy access to the restrooms; he would be interested to see the theory behind how they would access the restroom space. Craig Byers stated the space is currently designed for two tenants and that's the only two tenants going into the building today. In the future, if additional tenants are added, they realize they will have to install another bathroom.

Chairman Day asked if the space was re-tenanted, they would have to come to the Building Dept and run those plans by the Examiner. Kevin stated if the restaurant was re-tenanted there would not be an issue as bathrooms would not be required within the space as the restaurant is driving the reason why the appeal is being heard. So if they are office and retail, you could have one hallway sharing as long as you get the locking arrangements correct, but yes, they would have to come back to the Building Dept for review. Kevin stated as the appeal is proposed, if the appeal is granted it works, and any re-purposing of the building it works as long as an individual can get to the common bathrooms it works.

Chairman Day entertained a motion regarding the appeal. Jim Meier-Gast moved to approve; Mike Hessenius seconded. All in favor. Appeal is granted.

Chairman Day introduced item #2 on the agenda: Discussion on long-standing existing plumbing amendments. Kevin stated the Building Dept sometimes struggles on amendments such as the one just heard. He wanted to put it in for future discussion to look at the amendment and determine: 1) is that what we intended as a Board/City, and 2) if that's the intent, should it read differently?

Kevin stated the other amendment he would like to review is also in Section 35.14 regarding urinals: "A minimum of one urinal shall be provided for general use in offices or public buildings". He would like to make sure that is indeed, given the fact the way the codes are adopted, we've always had that amendment in place, is this something we would like to explore? He asked the Board to start thinking about how to move forward as these amendments cause a large amount of struggle within the department.

Chairman Day introduced item #4 on the agenda: Discussion of Rules of Procedure for the Plumbing Board of Appeals. Kevin stated this issue came up because the department has been asked to produce Rules of Procedure for another appeal board. In doing so, he decided to make sure all other appeal boards have these Rules; unfortunately, he could only find Rules for two of the four Boards. The department is now in the process of creating Rules of Procedure for the Plumbing Board of Appeals. He wanted to make the Board aware of this issue and would like to present the document for discussion at the next Appeal meeting. Kevin did ask the Board to submit any requested changes to Dawn for discussion at the next meeting.

The Board scheduled their next meeting for October 26, 2015, at 9:30 am depending upon Brian Rogers' availability.

Kevin then discussed Board membership. He stated the positions that have been and are currently open are the At-Large, Journeyman Plumber, and a Mechanical Engineer/PE positions. In addition, there is a question about if the Boards as a whole need to be as large as they currently are; this is controlled by the Mayor and Council. Kevin informed the Board that there has been discussion to reduce the size of

NewBo Lofts Appeal

August 25, 2015

Page 3 of 3

the Boards; this is something Kevin is trying to avoid. He did make a request to the Board to think about possible new members and submit those names to Dawn so she can send the proper information to them for application.

Chairman Day asked if there was any old or new business to discuss. There being no response, Chairman Day entertained a motion to adjourn. Jim Meier-Gast moved; Mike Hessenius seconded. All in favor. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 9:51 am.

Respectfully submitted,
Dawn Kolosik, Recording Secretary