

**Housing Advisory and Appeals Board
Staff Reports
March 12, 2014**

Exhibit A:

Consent of Residential Housing Code Violations at: 1152 East 400 South

(Case No. HAZ2013-03429;(Norman E. Alvord) City Council District Five

A. Appealed Deficiency: Both egress windows located in both basement bedrooms have the same deficiency. The emergency egress windows fail to meet the minimum 20"x 24" required openable area as discribed in *Code section 18.50.200.B2*.

Findings: Because the three code deficiencies restrict a safe and unobstructed means of egress from the basement bedrooms staff recommends denial of this appeal.

B. Appealed Deficiency: Both egress windows fail to meet the minimum 3.5 square feet requirement required as described in *Code section 18.50.200.B*.

Findings: Because the three code deficiencies restrict a safe and unobstructed means of egress from the basement bedrooms staff recommends denial of this appeal.

C. Appealed Deficiency: Both egress windows have a finished sill height greater than 48" and fail to meet the requirement found in *Code section 18.50.200.B2*.

Findings: Because the three code deficiencies restrict a safe and unobstructed means of egress from the basement bedrooms staff recommends denial of this appeal.

Exhibit B:

Consent of Residential Housing Code Violations at: 457 South University St.

(Case No. HAZ2013-00260;(Jamison Blair) City Council District Four

A. Appealed Deficiency: The common area stairway is deficient in height due to an encroachment at the bottom of the stairway opening. The low point of the encroachment into the required ceiling height in the stairway measures less than 6'0".

Findings: Because the overall stairway headroom height fails to provide a safe means of egress from the basement as required in *Code Section 18.50.200.C.7* staff recommends denial of the appeal.

B. Appealed Deficiency: The emergency egress window located in this basement bedroom #1 has two code deficiencies. (1) Window rough opening is less than 20"x24" (2) Window opening is less than 3.5 Sq. Ft.

Findings: Because the two code deficiencies restrict a safe and unobstructed means of egress from this basement bedroom as discribed in *Code section 18.50.200.B2* staff recommends denial of this appeal.

C. Appealed Deficiency: The emergency egress window located in this basement bedroom #2 has three code deficiencies. (1) Window rough opening is less than 20"x24" (2) Total window opening is less than 3.5 Sq. Ft. (3) The window sill height is greater than 48"

Findings: Because these three code deficiencies restrict a safe and unobstructed means of egress from this basement bedroom as discribed in *Code section 18.50.200.B2* staff recommends denial of this appeal.

PLEASE NOTE: Adding approved egress windows for the basement bedrooms may reduce the parking area for this building and additional safety concerns will need to be addressed.

R310.2 Window wells. *The minimum horizontal area of the window well shall be 9 square feet (0.84 m2), with a minimum horizontal projection and width of 36 inches (914 mm). The area of the window well shall allow the emergency escape and rescue opening to be fully opened.*

Exhibit C:

Consent of Residential Housing Code Violations at: 1558 East Michigan Ave

(Case No. HAZ2013-03865;(Jon Olson) City Council District Six

A. Appealed Deficiency: Egress windows located in basement bedroom #1 is too small. The emergency egress window fails to meet the minimum 20"x 24" required openable area as described in *Code section 18.50.200.B2*.

Both egress windows exceed the minimum 3.5 square feet requirement as described in *Code section 18.50.200.B2*.

Both egress windows have a finished sill height less than 48" and are within the requirement found in *Code section 18.50.200.B2*.

B. Appealed Deficiency: Egress window located in basement bedroom #2 is too small. The emergency egress window fails to meet the minimum 20"x 24" required openable area as described in *Code section 18.50.200.B2*.

Findings: Because the code deficiency restricts a safe and unobstructed means of egress from the basement bedrooms. Therefore staff recommends denial of this appeal.

Exhibit D

Consent of Residential Housing Code Violations at: 1145 East Princeton Ave.

(Case No. HAZ2013-03110;(Nathan Levinson & Dianna Rae) City Council District Five

A. Appealed Deficiency: Egress window located in the upper floor bedroom has one code deficiency. The type of hardware used for the opener is installed near the center of the window. This creates an obstruction when the window is fully opened and reduces the opening to 16" x 40". However it should be noted that this measurement exceeds the minimum square feet requirement required, found in Code section 18.50.200 Findings: The emergency egress window located in this bedroom is deficient. The window fails to meet the minimum 20"x 24" required openable area as described in Code section 18.50.200.B2. Therefore staff recommends denial of this appeal.

Exhibit E

Consent of Residential Housing Code Violations at: 540 East Wilmington Ave.

(Case No. HAZ2013-03599;(James Withy) City Council District Seven

A. Appealed Deficiency: Ceiling height in the basement varies in height from 5'9" to 5'11". Code requires a safe headroom height for all habitable rooms shall not be less than 6'4" as described in *Code Section 18.50.180.A.1*. The deficient ceiling height is found throughout the finished area in the basement with no ceiling height greater than 5'11". The ceiling projection shown here has a floor to ceiling measurement of 5'4".

B. Appealed Deficiency: Ceiling projection in this walk way opening requires a safe means of egress height at 6'0" as described in *Code Section 18.50.180.A.1*. This projection has reduced the opening to 5'4" measured from the floor to the bottom of the obstruction.

Findings: Although it would require considerable structural changes to achieve a safe ceiling height for all rooms located in the basement. The overall ceiling height is severely deficient. Therefore staff recommends denial of the appeal.