



6. Openings shall not be limited to an aggregate width of 25 percent of the length of the wall where opening serves a *shaft enclosure* in accordance with Section 713.
7. Openings shall not be limited to an aggregate width of 25 percent of the length of the wall where opening serves a *chute access room* in accordance with Section 713.13.3 or a *chute discharge room* in accordance with Section 713.13.4.

**Supporting Information (Required):**

All proposals must include a written explanation and justification as to how they address physical, environmental, and/or customary characteristics that are specific to the City and County of Denver. The following questions must be answered for a proposal to be considered.

- Purpose: What does your proposal achieve?
- Reason: Why is your proposal necessary?
- Substantiation: Why is your proposal valid? (i.e. technical justification)

The purpose of this proposal is to pull forward a 2024 code change that has already been approved through the ICC Group A hearings under proposal FS42-21. The topic of this proposal has been extensively debated among plan reviewers as the code doesn't address situations where it is not possible to meet the 25% length limitation, leading to inconsistent reviews. This amendment will lead to consistent plan reviews and enforcement. Note that the ICC committee voted 13-0 to approve this proposal as submitted, and there were no public comments.

**FS42-21**

**Committee Action:**

**As Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee concluded this code change reflects the common practice in review and construction with little or no reports of safety issues. (Vote: 13-0)

The reason statement from proposal FS42-21 follows:

This proposal adds two new exceptions to the 25% length limitation for fire barrier openings. This section already includes Exceptions 2 and 5 for openings into stair, ramp and exit passageway enclosures where it is not practical to meet this length limitation since the door opening typically takes up well over 25% of the length of the wall. The two new exceptions are proposed for the same reason - it is simply not practical to meet this length limitation. Exception 6 is for shaft enclosures where door openings typically exceed 25% of the length of a wall - consider elevator doors or shaft access doors that take up nearly the entire length of the wall. Exception 7 is for chute access rooms and discharge rooms. Chute access rooms are typically very small rooms and it is not practical to meet the 25% limitation for the door into these rooms without oversizing the room. Chute discharge rooms often have a large door opening to allow passage of trash or recycling dumpsters and it is not practical to meet the 25% limitation without oversizing the room.

**Bibliography and Access to Materials** (as needed when substantiating material is associated with the amendment proposal):

None.

**Other Regulations Proposed to be Affected**

**\*For proposals to delete content from the 2019 Denver Green Code in conjunction with adding it to other mandatory Denver codes and/or regulations, only.**

Please identify which other mandatory codes or regulations are suggested to be updated (if any) to accept relocated content.

**Referenced Standards:**

List any new referenced standards that are proposed to be referenced in the code.

None.

**Impact:**

How will this proposal impact cost and restrictiveness of code? ("X" answer for each item below)

Cost of construction:    \_\_\_ Increase    \_\_\_ Decrease      X   No Impact

Cost of design:            \_\_\_ Increase    \_\_\_ Decrease      X   No Impact

Restrictiveness:        \_\_\_ Increase      X   Decrease    \_\_\_ No Impact

**Departmental Impact (City use only):**

This amendment proposal increases/decreases/is neutral to the cost of plans review.

This amendment increases/decreases/is neutral to the cost of inspections.