ANSI 804.3 Exc. – Outdoor Grill Counters

Q: Is there a requirement for a work surface where an outdoor grill is built into a stone counter/structure that is a common use or amenity area? It is my understanding that the intent of the outdoor grill area is not to do major food prep and clean up, so a work surface may not be required. [The ANSI Commentary for the Exception to ANSI 804.3 states The intent of the exception is to allow kitchenettes and wet bars to not include accessible work surfaces because major food preparation or clean-up is not expected in these areas.]

A: The Exception to ANSI 804.3 states Spaces that do not provide a cooktop or conventional range shall not be required to provide an accessible work surface. Since an outdoor grill built into a stone counter functions much the same as a cooktop does in a kitchen or kitchenette, it is reasonable to assume that the counter area will be used to assemble food intended to be cooked on the grill, to receive food after it has been cooked, or to dish the food out. “Major food preparation and cleanup” is not limited to cutting up food or wiping down counters; it also includes typical preparation activities prior to and after cooking. As a result, there is a requirement for a work surface adjacent to an outdoor grill.

NCBC 1106.1 – Added Car Chargers

Q: I have seen a couple of electric car charging stations that were not made accessible when they were added next to regular parking spaces. Since I think we will see them added more frequently, included being incorporated into the multi-family arena, what are the requirements associated with them?

A: The NCBC 1106.1 provisions regarding parking in general state: Where parking is provided, accessible parking shall be provided in compliance with NCBC Table 1106.1, except as required by Sections 1106.2 through 1106.4. Where more than one parking facility is provided on a site, the number of parking spaces required to be accessible shall be calculated separately for each parking facility.

Since EV charging stations are a separate type of parking facility on the site, they are addressed under the code just the same as required by NCBC 1106.1. The following is required:
1. Accessible parking is provided per NCBC Table 1106.1.
2. The first charging space is a van accessible space per NCBC 1106.5.
3. The charging cable shall not obstruct the access aisle.
4. Chargers shall be accessible [operable parts per ANSI 309; reach ranges per ANSI 308].
5. An accessible route shall be provided from the charging area parking to the building. [NCBC 1104.2]

This is a separate type of parking than that required by NCBC 1106.2 for multifamily, it is not related to the occupancy classification or unit type.
NCBC 1108.3 Self -Storage Units: Q & A (cont’d)

The December 2017 newsletter, which addresses several self-storage related items, was of particular interest to both architectural firms who design, and contractors who build, self-storage facilities. Several questions with a common theme were raised by the newsletter. The Q & A are below for your benefit as well.

Q1: Would you please identify the senior deputy section chief at USDOJ whom you spoke with, so that we can contact that person. It sounds like that person has specific knowledge that would be of assistance to us on future projects.

A1: NCDOI has been asked by USDOJ/Office of Civil Rights not to name specific individuals within USDOJ/OCR when reference is made to them. This request was made for three reasons: 1) when a name was given out previously, that individual was bombarded with calls disrupting their work cycle; 2) the interpretations given by USDOJ personnel are intended to represent the opinions of the entire USDOJ/OCR department; and 3) the USDOJ Technical Assistance Helpline has always been available at 1-800-514-0301 Extension 7 for questions.

Q2: You refer to several requirements as being addressed by NCBC 1108.3. I could not locate an explicit requirement in 1108.3 for the accessible units to be located as close to the main entrance as possible. Is this requirement derived from some other provision of the NC Building Code?

A2: The wording in the AU article states ‘All new accessible units shall be grouped and located as close to the building’s main entrance as possible.’ While there is no specific travel distance requirement in the code (other than for travel between parking and a building entrance), the intent behind that provision is included in the code intent to group accessible storage units in a single building. Not all persons with disabilities have wheelchairs; often, the mobility related issues involve lack of stamina or an inability to walk any distance without trouble. This may be the result of a cardiac or respiratory-related issue, or a situation with a walking cast. The thought was that designer would use common sense to locate the accessible units close to a building entrance rather than require someone with a disability to have to maneuver both themselves and the items being stored any further than necessary. In retrospect, the word should would have been more appropriate than shall in the sentence quoted above.

Q3: I could not locate an explicit requirement in NCBC 1108.3 for the accessible units to have automatic opening doors. Is this requirement derived from some other portion of the NCBC code?

A3: The code requirement for accessible doors is located in ANSI 404, which would require a side-swinging door with accessible hardware. Since there is no accessible door per ANSI 404 with the width required for a storage door opening (typically 7'-0") an alternate method approval was requested for the use of an automatic overhead door using a garage-door type opener per 2012 NC Admin Code 105.1. The AU article described the rationale for acceptance of that alternate use, i.e., that there are no accessible overhead door opening provisions under the 2010 ADA Standards, and that this mechanism provides a design that is equivalent or better than the side-swing door provisions, and is addressed by both state and federal regulations.

Q4: We have not run across these requirements on previous self-storage projects in North Carolina, but we have projects currently under design that would be affected by them.

A4: You may not have run across these requirements before because ‘if no one asks the question, no one gets an answer’; and in this case, whenever anyone has asked the question, the answer that has been given out since I have been with NCDOI (1997) has been the one noted in the newsletter.

Q5: Are these new requirements, or are they requirements that were just not previously enforced?

A5: The requirements are not new; most likely, the enforcement has been lax.

Q6: Will they now be enforced uniformly across the state?

A6: The intent is for uniform, consistent enforcement across the state.

NCBC 1109.2 Exc. 3 - Toilet Clusters

NCBC 1109.2 Exception 3 is frequently referenced by designers trying to reduce the number of required accessible toilet rooms. A key to the issue is determining when multiple restrooms are part of the same cluster.

Q: When would adjacent toilet rooms be considered part of the same cluster of toilet rooms so that only one of them (or 50%) is required to be accessible per NCBC 1109.2 Exc. 3?

A: To be considered part of the same cluster of toilet rooms, the doors to all ‘clustered’ restrooms are required to be visible from the doorways into all other restrooms within the cluster.

1. In the example shown to the left, the hallway door prevents visibility between the two restroom doors.
2. If the hallway was extended to include the entrances to both restrooms (or the hall doorway was omitted), then both restrooms would be within a single cluster.