

Napa Road 2569 Summary of Findings

November 10, 2017

Background

The subject property was purchased in May 2014 by the current owner. At the time of purchase, the existing improvements included four detached small structures with utilities.

Richardson Architects (RA) were initially hired to provide design development services for a new single-family structure encompassing and incorporating the original kitchen and library. All other structures were to be demolished.

RA's contract is an agreement for design development services to come up with a number of design concepts. Once approved, RA would provide a proposal for the next steps.

PB+A understands that no other written agreements were drafted between the architect and Owner. Subsequently RA's services were extended to include the completion of the construction documents for building permit. The provided "Building Permit" set indicates RA as the "Architect" on the cover sheet. RA's billing for the provided plans exceed the anticipated fees stated in the original agreement by nearly a factor of 10.

Based on the information provided by the Owner, PB+A understands that the RA drawings did not satisfy the Owners design concepts and was not constructible given plate height discrepancies and overlooked code requirements.

PB+A further understands that the Owner ultimately retained the services of Rick Rocklewitz to draft a new permit set that also includes the structural requirements.

Design Concept

Based on information provided by the Owner, the focal point of the overall design was to be a centrally oriented, open rafter, vaulted dining room with clerestory windows above patio doors, and at the gable end walls, reminiscent of a William Turnbull designed dining room.

Review of Provided Drawings and Documents

PB+A has reviewed the following sets of drawings:

1. Agreement between the Owner and the Architect, dated June 17, 2014
2. Various correspondence emails between the Owner and the Architect
3. Architect's Invoices
4. Progress set by RA with all sheets dated November 14, 2014
5. Progress set by RA with sheets dated November 14 and December 5, 2014
6. Progress set by RA with sheets dated November 14, December 8 and December 23, 2014
7. "Building Permit" set by RA dated June 30, 2015
8. Approved and permitted set of drawings by Rick Rocklewitz (RR) approved on January 29, 2016

Summary of findings:

1. DINING ROOM ISSUES

Following is a summary of findings on the three provided sets of drawings:

- November 14, 2014 progress set by RA:

The set includes title sheet, existing and new site plans, floor and roof plans, elevations and partial section at the Dining Room. The site plans indicate a 2' elevation change at the building pad. The existing and new building are also marked.

The earliest version of the Dining Room indicated a plate height of 10' - 3-3/8". The drawings indicate a dining room with a vaulted ceiling, two french doors to the patio area and a high window on the west gable end wall. The specified direction of the slope and elevations of the building do not match.

- December 5, 2014 progress set by RA:

The set only includes revisions to the elevations and roof plan.

The plate height is indicated at 12' - 0". The drawings show a dining room with a vaulted roof and exposed beams, with clerestory windows above the french doors. A high window is indicated on the west gable end wall.

The slope of all low-slope roofs are indicated at 1%, which is below the code required minimum. The specified direction of the slope and elevations of the building do not match.

- December 23, 2014 progress set by RA:

The set includes the title sheet, site plans, floor plan, elevations, sections and interior elevations. The floor plans have been revised (December 14, 2014) to show a 24" thick wall at the west elevation walls of the dining room, with no indications for a high window on the gable end wall.

The plate height of the dining room has been revised to 10' - 0". The clerestory windows are removed above the french doors. The high window at the west gable end wall of the dining room has also been removed.

The specified direction of the slope and elevations of the building do not match.

- June 30, 2015 "Building Permit" set by RA:

This set appears to be final revision intended for submittal to the Building Department with RA indicated as the Architect of Record. It includes Title 24 calculations, California Green Building checklist, site plan, elevations, section, details and electrical layout.

As with the previous set, the plate height is reduced to 10' - 0", and clerestory windows above the french doors are removed. The high window at the west gable end wall of the dining room has also been removed. The fixtures indicated for the Dining Room were inconsistent with an open rafter ceiling.

- January 29, 2016 approved set of drawings by RR

This set includes floor plans including electrical layout, foundation, shear wall and roof framing plans, elevations, and structural details.

The French doors are revised from 2 to 3 with narrower rough openings. The plate height and the pitch of the roof over the Dining room have been increased allowing for installation of high window at the gable end walls, and transom windows over the French doors.

2. GARAGE EGRESS ISSUES

- All four revisions of the RA drawings depict a garage with no exit door (other than the roll up door), and no doors to the residence. Sonoma County (as with many other permitting jurisdictions) requires a separate egress door for all garages.

The approved set of drawings by RR includes a man door, the installation of which reduced the effective square footage of adjacent entry and powder room.

3. EXISTING STONE WALL

- Reportedly, RA abutted the new garage next to an existing stone wall without any considerations. The RA drawings do not make mention of the subject stone wall. We understand that the garage had to be moved in the final permit set to accommodate the subject stone wall, requiring the shortening of the garage.

Conclusions

Based on the review of the documents provided by the Owner, PB+A is of the opinion that the services provided by the Architect of the Record fell below the standard of care.



TECHNICAL BULLETIN

PERMIT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403
(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-2210

B-21

Required Exit Doors in Garages

INTRODUCTION

The California Building Code requires that every portion of the building have a code complying means of egress. This bulletin is intended to clarify the requirements for minimum exiting from a residential garage.

TECHNICAL DETAILS

The California Building Code requires that exit doors be openable from the inside without the use of a key, or any special knowledge or effort. Operating mechanisms must be installed 34" to 48" above the finished floor. Therefore an overhead garage door does not meet the requirements for an exit door.

An exterior key-operated deadbolt is often installed at the door between the garage and the residential portion of the building for security purposes. In this case, the door between the house and the garage cannot serve as a complying exit from the garage because the deadbolt on the garage side requires a key to open.

For the above reasons, it is often necessary to provide an additional door that opens directly to the exterior, which is openable from the garage side without the use of a key, or any special knowledge or effort.

REFERENCES

2007 California Building Code, Section 1001.1, 1008.1.8

Effective date: 4/2/2006

Revision date: 12/31/2007