



Town of South Kingstown, Rhode Island

BUILDING AND ZONING DEPARTMENT

180 High Street
Wakefield, RI 02879
Tel (401) 789-9331 x1224
Fax (401) 789-9792

A meeting of the Building Code Board of Appeals for the Town of South Kingstown, County of Washington, in the State of Rhode Island was held at the Town Hall, 180 High Street, Wakefield on Tuesday, December 13, 2022.

Members Present:

Edward Melchiori
Thomas Gilchrist
Laura Krekorian

Members Absent:

Michael Joyce
Paul Schurman

Also present: James Gorman, Building Official and Clerk, and Jessica Spence, Administrative Support Associate.

The following petition was heard:

Petition of James and LaRea McKelvey, 109 Columbia Street, Wakefield, RI 02879. The applicant is seeking relief of State Building Code 2021 (SBC-2), Section R311.3.2 - Floor elevations at other exterior doors. Doors other than the required egress door shall be provided with landings or floors no more than eight and one quarter inches (8 ¼") (209.55 mm) below the top of the threshold. Exception: A top landing is not required where a stairway of not more than two (2) risers is located on the exterior side of the door, provided that the door does not swing over the stairway. The applicant is requesting a variance from the landing requirement and to allow three (3) stair risers servicing the exterior door of the detached garage.

Owner is James M. and LaRea Jo McKelvey for premises located at 109 Columbia Street, South Kingstown, RI 02879. Assessor's Map 57-1, Lot 201, Zoned R10.

The following documents were entered into record:

- Application signed by James McKelvey and received December 1, 2022
- Cover Page Architectural Drawings (G-001), Architectural Site Plan (AS-001), First Floor Plan (A-109) all prepared by Providence Architecture and stamped by Kevin Diamond, AIA and dated March 2, 2022.
- Photographs (2 pages)

Mr. Gorman called the meeting to order at 4:28 pm, the necessary quorum was present.

Mr. Gorman read the variance request into record.

James McKelvey was present.

Mr. McKelvey stated that they recently added a detached one car garage. The area in question with the shed doors leads into the storage area at the back of the garage. The lot is very small. They are seeking an exception because there is only about 11' from the rear property line and a 3' landing with stairs along the front they would only be 6' from the property line which would make bringing things in and out of the garage difficult. Additionally, if they add a landing there is going to be 17-1/4 space which would create a fall wherever they put the steps; this would also present an issue in regard to moving items in and out of the garage.

Mr. McKelvey stated that currently the risers are 5-5/8" to 5-3/4", it is easier to do two (2) shorter risers instead of (two) 2 taller risers. They could possibly pull some paver up to raise the patio up, which would create two (2) 8-1/4" risers or the other way would be to put the landing in which would eliminate a lot of the patio area.

Discussion ensued in regard to the garage layout, door locations and property grade.

Mr. McKelvey stated the doors swing into the garage. The storage area has access to the garage. These doors offer no egress to the house. Last year there was a shed on this location that was destroyed by a storm. They have rebuilt in the same location. The garage is level, but the grade is sloping to the backyard.

Discussion ensued regarding other possible options to meet the Code requirements regarding riser height and distance to the threshold.

The Board questioned why the applicant can't build the 3' x 3' landing and add the steps to either or both sides of the landing.

Code requirements were discussed.

The Board then discussed a possible solution of moving the top tread closer to the threshold which would create two (2) stairs with an 8-1/4" rise and eliminate the need for a landing. Each tread could be sloped 1/4" front to back to shed the water.

Discussion ensued regarding where the measurements would be taken from the threshold.

The Board then reviewed their solution to confirm that it would meet the Building Code requirements.

Discussion ensued that since this was an inswing door the Board would be comfortable with no landing.

Discussion ensued regarding the making of a motion and if in fact a motion would be needed.

The applicant was directed that he should withdraw his appeal since no relief would be necessary based on the solutions discussed which will conform to the Code.

Whereas the following motion was made:

The Motion is as follows:

Mr. Gilchrist made the following motion which was duly seconded by Mr. Melchiori.

Whereas a vote was taken: 3-0 in favor.

(T. Gilchrist-aye, E. Melchiori-aye, L. Krekorian – aye)

The Board directed the applicant to submit a cross-section showing step and slope details up to the threshold with dimensions. This will show a two (2) riser solution with maximum rise to not to exceed 8-1/4". This will also eliminate the need for a 3'x3' landing. The plans will be reviewed by the Building Official to verify the proposal meets the Code requirements.

Mr. McKelvey's application was withdrawn administratively.

There was no other business.

Mr. Melchiori made the motion to adjourn which was duly seconded by Ms. Krekorian.

All members were in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 4:54 pm