## **Development Services**

## From Concept to Construction







Status: Decision Rende	ered	
Appeal ID: 24405		Project Address: 4908 NE Tillamook St
Hearing Date: 11/25/20		Appellant Name: Jeff Hayes
<b>Case No.:</b> B-007		Appellant Phone: 205-601-9107
Appeal Type: Building		Plans Examiner/Inspector: Sloan Shelton
Project Type: residential		<b>Stories:</b> 2 <b>Occupancy:</b> Family <b>Construction Type:</b> Residence
Building/Business Nar	ne:	Fire Sprinklers: No
Appeal Involves: Altera	ation of an existing structure	LUR or Permit Application No.: 20-106616-RS
Plan Submitted Option	ı: pdf [File 1] [File 2]	Proposed use: Residence
		comply with the following:
Appeal item 1 Code Section Requires	R311.7 CG  Existing stairs. Existing stairs may comply with the following:  30" minimum width, 6'-2" headroom height measured vertically from the plane of the nosings of the treads.	
	between treads.  Existing triangular-shaped winder some or replaced stairs must comp	
Code Modification or Alternate Requested	I request that you approve the original basement stairs (build in 1914) rather than asking us to demolish and rebuild the stairs to match current code requirements.	
Proposed Design	After evaluating the complications with demolishing the original stairs from the first floor to the basement, which would require us also to demolish and rebuild the stairs from the first floor to the second floor as these sit right above the basement stairs, we did the following:  We removed the original lathe and plaster walls and ceilings, giving us a width of 32" and a nominal ceiling height of 6'1"  We put in a new subfloor and finished floor in the basement, all on one level for access to people with limited mobility (my daughter-in-law's parents), which raised the finished floor approximately 3	
	1/4" above the original concrete flo	

Second, given that the landing at the top of the basement stairs has an exit and that there is a double door exit within 16' of the base of the basement stairs, in my opinion the original stairs are equivalent in terms of life safety and fire protection to rebuilt stairs that would comply with current code requirements.

Third, the bottom tread is 5" above the new basement floor, which gives it a greater than 3/8" difference from the typical rise of the rest of the risers (8"), and it is 11 1/4" run, which gives it a greater than 3/8" difference from the typical run of the treads (9"). It is also 1 1/2" thick rather than 3/4" thick like the other treads. However, as this is the bottom step, in my opinion it provides a greater landing area for people going up or coming down the stairs. Yet if required, we could replace it with a tread that matches the others in thickness and run. In my opinion, this tread is preferable to the fix suggested by the inspectors: that we remove the bottom tread entirely and build a 3'x3' platform with a rise matching that of the other risers. Should we do this, we would have less than 36" of clear passage between the platform and a support post, limiting access for people with limited mobility.

## APPEAL DECISION

- 1a. Decrease in minimum required headroom at existing stairs to basement conversion from 6' 8" to 6' 1": Denied. Proposal does not provide equivalent Life Safety protection.
- 1b. Reduction in minimum required riser height from 8" to 3": Denied. Proposal does not provide equivalent Life Safety protection.

Appellant may contact John Butler (503 865-6427) or e-mail at John.Butler@portlandoregon.gov with questions.

Pursuant to City Code Chapter 24.10, you may appeal this decision to the Building Code Board of Appeal within 90 calendar days of the date this decision is published. For information on the appeals process, go to www.portlandoregon.gov/bds/appealsinfo, call (503) 823-7300 or come in to the Development Services Center.



