Proponent: Jim Edelson, New Buildings Institute, representing New Buildings Institute; Ric Cochrane (ric_cochrane@nthp.org)

Delete and substitute as follows:

SECTION 202
DEFINITIONS

HISTORIC BUILDINGS. Buildings that are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, or designated as historic under an appropriate state or local law.

Any building or structure that is one or more of the following:

1. Listed, or certified as eligible for listing by the State Historic Preservation Officer or the Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places, in the National Register of Historic Places
2. Designated as historic under an applicable state or local law; or
3. Certified as a contributing resource within a National Register listed, state designated, or locally designated historic district.

Revise as follows:

1005.1 Historic buildings. The provisions of this code relating to the construction, repair, alteration, addition, restoration and movement of structures, and change of occupancy, where each individual provision is evaluated separately on its own merit, shall not be mandatory for historic buildings for any of the following conditions 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 that compliance with that provision would threaten, degrade or destroy the historic form, fabric or function of the building.

1. Where implementation of such provisions would require a change in the visible configuration of building components in a manner that is not in keeping with the building’s historic nature, as determined by the code official; or
2. Where compliance with such provisions would produce a conflict with a building function that is fundamental to the historic nature of the building.

Reason: In the 2015 cycle of the I-Codes, the definition of “historic building” has been revised in the IEBC, the IPMC, and the commercial and residential sections of the IECC. Those four codes had four inconsistent and confusing definitions for “historic building.” All of the 2015 editions will have a consistent and clear definition of “historic building” that reflects how historic buildings are actually designated or determined to be eligible for listing in the US, at either the national, state or local level - and either individually or as part of a district.

This proposal brings that same definition that was adopted in the IECC, IEBC and IPMC for historic buildings to the IgCC, making it consistent with the other I-Codes.

The proposal also changes the charging language for historic buildings in the IgCC. The existing charging language seeks to limit the extent to which historic buildings would be exempted from the provisions of the IgCC. It makes historic buildings subject to the current IgCC with two exemptions. However, those two exemptions require the code official to make a determination of impact on historic nature or function. Similar approaches were considered during the 2013 hearings for the 2015 edition of the IECC, but were rejected by the ICC voting body because such determinations generally do not fall under the authority of the building department, but rather national, state and local designation authorities.

This proposal parallels the approach adopted in Section C101.4.2 of the commercial section of the 2015 IECC. Historic buildings are exempt from provisions of the code when a report is provided explaining why compliance would be detrimental to the historic form, fabric or function of the building. To provide flexibility while ensuring the report’s credibility, the proposal provides that the report be signed by any of:

1. A registered design professional
2. A representative of the State Historic Preservation Office or
3. A representative of any other preservation authority having jurisdiction over the building.

This removes building officials from having to make historic determinations that are the province of other authorities. With this proposal, the IgCC also avoids giving a blanket exemption to energy savings in historic buildings, while exempting historic buildings only from those provisions that could be detrimental to the historic nature of the building.

Cost Impact: Will not increase the cost of construction