

# GG319-14

## 1105.1

**Proponent:** Jonathan Siu, City of Seattle, representing City of Seattle Dept of Planning & Development (jon.siu@seattle.gov)

**Delete and substitute as follows:**

**1105.1 Historic building sites.** ~~The provisions of this code relating to the construction, repair, alteration, addition and restoration of building sites and site improvements, where each individual provision is evaluated separately on its own merit, shall not be mandatory for historic building sites for any of the following conditions:~~

- ~~1. Where implementation of that provision would change the visible configuration of building site improvements in a manner that is not in keeping with the building site's historic nature, as determined by the *code official*, in consultation with the authority having jurisdiction over historic buildings or sites;~~
- ~~2. Where compliance with that provision would produce a conflict with a building site function that is fundamental to the historic nature of the building site, as determined by the *code official*, in consultation with the authority having jurisdiction over historic buildings or sites; or~~
- ~~3. Where such building sites are judged by the *code official* in consultation with the authority having jurisdiction over historic buildings or sites to not constitute a distinct environmental hazard.~~

Provisions of this code relating to the construction, repair, alteration, addition and restoration of building sites and site improvements shall not be mandatory for historic building sites, provided a report has been submitted to the code official and signed by a *registered design professional*, or a representative of the State Historic Preservation Office, or the historic preservation authority having jurisdiction, demonstrating compliance with that provision would threaten, degrade or destroy the historic nature of the building site. This section shall not apply where the authority having jurisdiction for environmental safety determines the building site constitutes a distinct environmental hazard.

**Reason:** The intent of this proposal is to align the IgCC with the IECC's provisions regarding historic buildings. A separate but related proposal has been submitted to similarly align Section 1005.

The intent of this section of the IgCC is to require compliance with the code, to the extent feasible, given the historic nature of the building site. The only consideration that could override the needs of historic preservation is if the site is a "distinct environmental hazard."

In the Group B cycle in 2013, the ICC voting membership approved Item CE7-13, as modified by a Public Comment (AMPC), which addressed this same issue. The public comment was put forward by a coalition of representatives of several groups, including the Washington Association of Building Officials Technical Code Development Committee and the American Institute of Architects. This proposal replaces the existing IgCC text with text similar to that approved in CE7-13. This will accomplish the same intent, as far as how the code is applied to historic building sites, and creates consistency between the codes.

One difference between the current IgCC and this proposal is there are three entities that are allowed to substantiate the determination of the impacts of the code requirements on the historic nature of the site. This provides both flexibility and reliability for the reporting requirement. As in CE7-13, the code official receives the report, but the report is created by one of the three entities listed--a registered design professional, someone from the State Historic Preservation Office, or the entity who has authority over historic preservation in the jurisdiction.

In addition, it is likely that another entity, such as the Federal Environmental Protection Agency, will be the agency with the expertise to determine whether the site is a "distinct environment hazard"--it is much less likely that expertise will reside in the code official's office or in that of the historical preservation authority. However, if the code official does have the authority and expertise, the proposed text is broad enough to allow them to make the determination.

**Cost Impact:** Will increase the cost of construction. Possible extra cost to procure the required report.

GG319-14 : 1105.1-SIU1015