

APPEAL UNDER S. 7 OF THE BUILDING CONTROL ACTS 1990 (AS AMENDED)

REPORT ON SITE INSPECTION

Appeal against:-	Refusal to grant Disability Access Certificate
Proposed works:-	Material change of use at first floor level of an existing primary school building, from existing store room to proposed library; with ancillary works
Location, and appellant:-	Saint Joseph's National School, Hilltown, Ballymitty, Co. Wexford
Board DAC appeal ref no.:-	DV 26.DV0005
Building Control Authority:-	Wexford County Council
BCA reference:-	DAC 048/15
Date of site inspection	14 March 2016
Inspection undertaken by	E. O Cofaigh

I travelled to the premises, introduced myself to the Acting Principal, and inspected as above.

Over and above a general "look around" and confirmation of the correspondence of the drawings with the premises, I wished to examine in particular the stairwell, the stairs giving access to the first floor from the main entrance, and the possibility of incorporating a lifting platform into the stairwell. I assessed for myself the accuracy of survey and proposal drawings provided.

Using a laser measuring device I measured dimensions in plan and in section at this area, to the extent I considered relevant.

I also noted the location of the proposed "Accessible WC" and looked at the present toilets at the school, although in my view these are not directly relevant to the appeal.

This was to inform my consideration of the proposals for access to the first floor and to help formulate a recommendation to An Bord. I have incorporated the relevant findings and dimensions taken into my Report on the appeal.

E. O Cofaigh

15 March 2016

APPEAL UNDER S. 7 OF THE BUILDING CONTROL ACTS 1990 (AS AMENDED)

REPORT

15 MARCH 2016

Appeal against:-	Refusal to grant Disability Access Certificate
Proposed works:-	Material change of use at first floor level of an existing primary school building, from existing store room to proposed library; with ancillary works
Location, and appellant:-	Saint Joseph's National School, Hilltown, Ballymitty, Co. Wexford
Board DAC appeal ref no.:-	DV 26.DV0005
Building Control Authority:-	Wexford County Council
BCA reference:-	DAC 048/15
Agent:-	J. Staples and Associates Ltd., Fire Safety Engineering Consultants, M6, Wexford Enterprise Centre, Kerlogue, Co. Wexford

Report prepared by:- Board Consultant:- E. O Cofaigh

CONTENTS

- 1 Introduction
- 2 The proposals the subject of the appeal
- 3 Treatment of this appeal
- 4 Application of building regulations to the proposals
- 5 Timeline
- 6 History
- 7 Application to BCA
- 8 Refusal of the BCA, dated 5 November 2015
- 9 The appeal to An Bord received on 4 December 2015
- 10 BCA response, received by An Bord on 23 December 2015
- 11 Assessment of the application
- 12 Assessment and recommendations

1 INTRODUCTION

This is an appeal against a refusal by the building control authority to grant a Disability Access Certificate (“DAC”). The appellant seeks the overturning of the BCA’s decision and the grant of a DAC by An Bord.

The application to the Building Control Authority (“BCA”) was for a Revised Disability Access Certificate. It seems the BCA rejected an earlier application for a DAC as invalid and advised the applicant to apply for a Revised DAC.

The subject of the refusal and of this appeal are a proposed change of use of a existing Store room, area about 85 sq metres, at first floor level in a Primary School, into a Library. This room is the only room at first floor level. The only access to this space is by way of a stairs.

The dispute between the BCA and the applicant/appellant is about the design of the stairs.

The 2010 edition of the Technical Guidance Document to Part M of the building regulations applies to the proposals.

Much of the dialogue (by way of letters, and revised reports and drawings) between the BCA and the applicant involved retrofitting a toilet, protection to opening doors and an access route, to comply with the DAC originally granted for the school extension within which this proposed library is located.

These matters arose because the detail of an earlier DAC hadn’t been complied with. In my view this is essentially an enforcement matter. In my view, An Bord need not review the retrofit work in detail when considering this appeal. This does not remove the obligation from the building owner to provide the sanitary facilities, protect the opening doors and correct the deviations from the previously approved design.

2 THE PROPOSALS THE SUBJECT OF THE APPEAL

The building where the works are located is a national school. This was extended in 2011 (DAC reference below) with a 400 sq m ground level extension, and, at first floor level, a store of about 85 square metres, reached by a staircase.

The Board of Management of the National School now wish to convert the store into a library. This will intensify the use of the room, now to be open to pupils. The maximum number of people in the room will be 31, according to the terms on which the fire safety certificate (referred to in the correspondence) was granted.

There is no dispute between the BCA and the appellant about the change of use of the room per se. The refusal of the DAC arises because the BCA *“is of the opinion that the internal stairs, the only access route to the proposed area of the Material Change of Use for which this application refers, does not comply with the necessary requirements of the Building Regulations Part K and subsequently Part M.”*

The nature of the application in the first instance is a complicating factor. Originally (in August 2015) the School applied for a DAC for a Material Change of Use to an existing building. The BCA rejected this application as invalid, saying there was

already a DAC for the school. The BCA wanted an application made for a Revised DAC. The School then applied for a Revised DAC.

The nature of the application has implications for the technical guidance to be followed in the design of the stairs serving the proposed library. The appellant says that as the proposals relate to a pre-existing building, the guidance on stairs in existing buildings should be followed. I share this view.

3 TREATMENT OF THIS APPEAL

Article 40 (1) of the building control regulations 1997 (as amended) provides that where an appeal is brought to An Bord it shall determine the appeal as if the application to the BCA to which the appeal relates had been made to An Bord in the first instance; and the decision of An Bord shall operate to annul the decision of the BCA from the date of such decision.

This appeal does not relate to conditions only. Article 40 (2) is not applicable to this appeal.

In accordance with art. 40(1) I have reviewed the application as if it had been made to An Bord in the first instance. In preparing my report and recommendations on the application I have also had regard to the BCA’s decision and their reasons for refusal; to the applicant’s revised and additional material submitted along with the appeal; and to my observations during my inspection of the premises.

4 APPLICATION OF BUILDING REGULATIONS TO THE PROPOSALS

4.1 S.I. 513 of 2010

Part M of the building regulations, as modified by S.I. 513 of 2010, provides that, *“Part M shall apply to the building, where a material change of use as described in subparagraph (2)(b)(i), (ii), (iv), (vi), (vii) or (viii) of [article 13 of S.I. 497 of 1997] takes place.”*

(“Building” is defined at s.1 of the building control act to include *part of a building*.)

Under S.I. 513, the definition of a “material alteration” of an existing building, is *“an alteration, where the work or part of the work carried out by itself would be the subject of a requirement of Part A, B or M of the Second Schedule to these Regulations”*.

The appellant accepts that the proposed works come within these provisions. Changing the store to a library involves a material change of use as referred to in the regulations. The proposed works are subject to and must comply with Part M.

4.2 Building regulations apply to this particular project as follows:-

	Building regulation requirement	Applicability to proposals the subject of this appeal
M1	Adequate provision shall be made for people to access and use a building, its facilities and its environs.	1. All new works must comply in full with this requirement.

		2. The proposals must not result in any new or greater contravention of the requirement within the existing building.
M2	Adequate provision shall be made for people to approach and access an extension to a building.	Not applicable
M3	If sanitary facilities are provided in a building to be extended, adequate sanitary facilities shall be provided for people within the extension.	Not applicable
M4		Not relevant

The application and appeal flow from requirement M1.

The applicant has neither sought a dispensation from, nor relaxation of, the applicable building regulation.

5 TIMELINE

	Date	Action
1	17.08.2015	Application received by BCA. One drawing with floor plans and other details at scales 1-100 and 1-200; report.
2	14.09.2015	BCA ask for additional information relating to: the approach route to the proposed works; access to the building; internal circulation and sanitary facilities.
3	25.09.2015	Additional information submitted to BCA A revised report and drawings; and an additional drawing:- 05-05, Alterations to stairs, showing at scale 1-50 how the existing stairs would be modified.
4	02.11.2015	Further additional information received by BCA. This was a revised report, and drawings 01-04, Ground floor plan, elevation, section, Rev. C, Oct15; 02-04, First floor plan, elevations, site plan, Rev. B, Sept 15. Drawing 05-05, shows the ground and first floor plans of the stairs as proposed, and a three-dimensional representation, not to scale, of the same stairs. This is an important drawing as it shows exactly what the appellant proposes to do with the existing stairs to improve its useability by people with disabilities.
5	05.11.2015	BCA issue Decision to refuse a Revised DAC
6	04.12.2015	Appeal received by An Bord
7	23.12.2015	BCA forward the files and make observations on the appeal
8	25.01.2016	Further revised drawings received by An Bord

It will be seen that there are four distinct sets of drawings and reports relating to this application. I have examined all documents. In my view, it is reasonable to consider the material which An Bord received on 4 December as modified by that of 25 January as the proposals which An Bord should consider.

Notwithstanding the thickness of the file and the multiple submissions, the proposals under appeal are small in area. The room to be used as a library is suitable for that purpose. The doubt surrounds the stairs which gives access to the library. The design of the stairs and its compliance with Part M in giving access to the library is almost the entire concern.

6 HISTORY

Wexford Co. Council DAC 007/11 – Proposed extension to the existing St. Joseph’s National School, Wexford. This Certificate was granted free from any conditions. The drawings forming part of the application show the first floor store and stairs thereto.

7 APPLICATION TO BCA

The drawings and report submitted to the BCA in August 2015 were repeatedly overtaken by revised material. The material which An Bord received on 4 December along with the supplementary material of 25 January is the most relevant.

8 REFUSAL OF THE BCA DATED 5 NOVEMBER 2015

The BCA communicated their decision on the application by letter to the applicant dated 5 November 2015. The reason for refusal is given as follows.

“... the Building Control Authority is of the opinion that the internal stairs, the only access route to the proposed area of the Material Change of Use for which this application refers, does not comply with the necessary requirements of the Building Regulations Part K and subsequently Part M.

“Specific reference to Part K, section 1.1.11-1.1.13 requirement for stairs with a change of direction in places of assembly and the necessary landings goings (the minimum distance between the nosing of the last step of a flight and the first step of the next flight measured on the inner side of the stairs) and the landing widths.

“Part M, Section 1.3.4.3 and 2.3.4.3 reference to functional requirements and guidance for compliance for stairs, reference Part K for general basic level of compliance for the construction of stairs.

“Additional rationale

“The width of the stairs as presented is inadequate to support the provision of handrails on both sides....

“The flights, as proposed, overlap creating a 300 mm rise/step on the inner side between flights and in contravention with the basic design principles for stairs.

“Insufficient information provided technical specification / method of construction with regard proposals for widening of the stairs (noted @ 80 mm.)”

9 THE APPEAL TO AN BORD RECEIVED ON 4.12.2015

The appellant's case extends over four pages, their Item 2 received by An Bord on 4 December 2015, as follows.

- 0 The stairs in dispute was built on foot of the BCA's previous DAC except that the widths were not maintained, a second handrail wasn't provided on two of the flights, and the as-built width is 1020 mm instead of the approved 1000-1150 mm. [Inspector comment:- if everything had been built per the previous DAC, there would be no difficulty. The question now, is whether something slightly different to that can now comply also.]
- 1 The stairs in now in an existing building; the applicable guidance in TGD-M is that this be at least 1000 mm wide; the going is now 256 mm, there are less than 12 steps in each flight, the landing widths are at least the width of the stairs, and it's proposed to install a second handrail. [Inspector comment:- the dimensions are correct.]
- 2 The stairs design complies with TGD-K s.1.1.12 inasmuch as it has the requisite changes of direction between flights. [Inspector comment:- correct.]
- 3 The stairs serves a place of assembly, but as the library has an occupant capacity of 31, this is not a "large number". [Inspector comment:- I agree.]
- 4 The stairs design complies with TGD-K s.1.1.13 inasmuch as it has level landings top and bottom and the landing lengths are as long as the stairs is wide. [Inspector comment:- correct.]
- 5 Under TGD-K the width of a stairs is taken as the length of a step. The actual steps exceed 1000 mm wide. TGD-B 1997 says handrails protruding less than 100 mm into a stairs may be ignored when measuring clear width. [Inspector comment:- the TGD-B provision re how handrails affect the width of a stairs is in relation to fire safety and is not applicable in the present situation.]
- 6 To modify the stairs, built of concrete, isn't practicable. [Inspector comment:- the appellant contradicts this later by offering to modify the stairs.]
- 7 The same facilities are being provided on the ground floor as on the first floor. This meets the functional requirements of Part M. [Inspector comment:- this is a matter of opinion and is debatable. There will not be two identical libraries. The proposed ground floor facilities are far simpler. In my view, the appellant is wrong in this remark.]
- 8 The stairs complies with TGD-K, 1997, and was approved under DAC 007/2011. [Inspector comment:- the appellant has said the stairs was not built per the approved plans.]
- 9 TGD-M s.1.3.4.3 says an ambulant stairs "should" be provided; and "should" is advisory but not mandatory. [Inspector comment:- the entire TGD-M is not mandatory, but there is no good reason not to follow the guidance.]
- 10 The existing stairs can be made compliant with the previous DAC by adding the second handrail on each of the upper two flights. [Inspector comment:- the stairs also needs widening.]

- 11 The applicant/appellant provided a drawing showing how the stairs widened by 80 mm. This causes an overlap at the second landing between the first and last steps in the flights adjoining. To deal with this, the appellant proposes to modify the handrail design on both sides.
- 12 The BCA say quarter landings aren't allowed under TGD-K. The appellant disagrees.

10 BCA RESPONSE, RECEIVED BY AN BORD ON 23.12.2015

The Building Control Authority's response to the appeal is three pages long.

In the original DAC 007/11, the stairs served a store, not a place of assembly or public access, and wasn't assessed for Part M compliance; but the applicant's report said the stairs "shall comply" with the minimum standards in Parts B, K and M.

The stairs was to be 1.0 m clear between handrails with two handrails each side.

The BCA is applying TGD-M s.2.3.4 [this being the guidance applicable to existing buildings] and wasn't "unfair" in its assessment.

The BCA assessed the application, involving changing the first floor store to a library, taking account of the minimum requirements in TGD-K and TGD-M, for a stairs to afford safe passage for the building users. This means, minimum width 1.0 m between handrails, continuous handrails, landing widths and lengths to ensure safe passage.

The irregular and in the BCA's opinion unworkable design proposes chasing out solid load bearing walls to insert handrails and to add an extra 80 mm onto each step, and there's insufficient information regarding how this would be done.

The BCA then addresses the appellants' case point-by-point:-

	Appellant	BCA commentary
0	Stairs built per previous DAC except for widths and handrails	
1	Applicable guidance is TGD-M 2.3.4	Contradictory and inconsistent information
2	Design complies with TGD-K s.1.1.12	Not relevant: "the landings were cited as the issue, not the flights"
3	31 isn't a "large number" of people using stairs	Accepted
4	Landing design and lengths comply with TGD-K 1.1.13	Design of top and bottom landings isn't in question. [Inspector comment:- it's the design of the <i>intermediate</i> landings, where the steps will overlap after they widen the stairs, which is in question]
5	Width of stairs is the length of a step	Not relevant and confusing
6	Modifying the stairs isn't practicable	The stairs as-built contravenes the minimum standards in TGD-K, and contradicts the

		appellants' submission saying modifications would be possible.
7	Same facilities being provided on ground floor	Accessibility priorities mean that adequate provision "shall be made for people to access and use that part of a building".
8	Stairs complies with TGD-K and was approved by the BCA	Stairs isn't compliant with TGD-K and was not built as approved under DAC007/11
9	"Should" is advisory, but not mandatory	"A blatant disregard and contempt of legislative requirements under the Building Control Acts".
10	Stairs can comply with previous DAC by adding second handrail	This contradicts the appellants' point 5.
11	Drawing shows how stairs will be made 80 mm wider	The proposed design does not, in the opinion of the BCA, comply with Part K and could be considered an access/egress and health and safety hazard.
12	TGD-K permits quarter landings on stairs in places of assembly	The landing width and going should be at least as great as the smallest width of a flight, and, this means the distance between the nosing of the last step of a flight and the first step of the next flight.

11 ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

11.1 In accordance with article 39 of the regulations I have assessed this application as if it had been made to An Bord in the first instance, taking into account the material received by An Bord during the appeal.

11.2 This application is in respect of a proposed material change of use of a space on the first floor of an existing primary school. The present use is as a store. The use for which a DAC is sought is as a library. The number of people who will use the space is 31. The only access to this space is by way of an existing staircase. The staircase is not built in accordance with the detail on the DAC under which the stairs were originally permitted. This staircase is to be modified to improve its accessibility.

The extent of what is "certified" by the issue of a Disability Access Certificate is limited to compliance with Part M of the building regulations:- Under article 20(D)7(b) of the building control regulations, "*A disability access certificate granted under this Part shall only be construed as certifying that the building or works, if constructed in accordance with the plans, documents and information submitted, would comply with the requirements of Part M of the Second Schedule to the Building Regulations.*"

11.3 A material change of use in an existing building

In my view, the BCA erred in invalidating the August application and in requesting the applicant to apply for a Revised DAC. What should have been sought is a DAC for a Material Change of Use to an existing building. In any event, the technical guidance relevant to the present application is TGD-M (2010) Section 2:- Access and Use of Existing Buildings other than Dwellings, and specifically within that as regards

accessing this first floor room from ground floor level, section 2.3.4, “Vertical features”.

Changing the use of the space from a store to a library does in my view trigger the application of Part M to the proposals.

11.4 The applicable technical guidance

The size of this room falls short of the point at which the relevant guidance indicates the provision of a passenger lift to this space. That guidance provides that “*where no lift or lifting device is provided, the same range of services should be made available on the entry or accessible level.*”

The guidance encourages provision of “*other lifting devices, such as lifting platforms that facilitate vertical travel to facilities, especially in buildings (where no lift is required)*”.

The guidance on stairs in existing buildings (s.2.3.4.3) says that where a lifting device is provided, an internal stairs suitable for ambulant disabled people is not necessary.

Where an ambulant internal stairs is provided, the guidance provides that “*where it is not practicable to provide the minimum clear width indicated in 1.3.4.3, it should be as wide as possible, but the minimum unobstructed width between handrails should be not less than 1000 mm.*” TGD-M s.1.3.4.3 gives detail provisions as regards the rise of flights between landings (maximum 1.8 metres), design of step nosings, 150-180 mm rise on the steps, handrails on both sides, surface resistance, and more.

As regards landings, that “*where it is not practicable to provide the length of landings in 1.3.4.3, it should be as long as possible, but not less than 1000 mm long.*” Section 1.3.4.3 requires landings to be at least 1200 mm long.

And finally as regards steps, that “*where it is not practicable to provide steps with the going in 1.3.4.3, they should be as large as possible, but with a going not less than 250 mm.*” Section 1.3.4.3 requires goings to be at least 300 mm long.

11.5 The library facilities

The report provided with the application sets out that the detail design of switches, ironmongery etc. will comply with the applicable guidance in TGD-M. The BCA considered that use of the space as a library complied with Part M. I am of the same view. For the BCA, the contentious aspect of the application was (and is) not the library, but, rather, of the access to the library from the storey below.

In my opinion, this is not the only consideration: the question of library facilities for a person who cannot use the stairs must also be addressed. The TGD says at 1.3.4.1.1, Lifts:- “*Where no lift or lifting device is provided, the same range of services/facilities should be made available on the entry or accessible level.*”

The appellant says in his 29 October letter to the BCA and at point 7 of his appeal that “*Library facilities, provided on the First Floor, will also be available on the Ground Floor for building occupants that are not able to make use of the stairs.*” However, there is no evidence of this on the floor plan drawings submitted with the appeal. From my site inspection, I see that the proposed ground floor library facilities are book

shelves in and around the stairs. In my view, this proposal does not comply with the guidance at 1.3.4.1.1, because (a) the range of books etc. is far smaller; and (b) the proposal will be constrained by fire safety requirements.

11.6 The design of the stairs

To comply with TGD-M the stairs must be suitable for ambulant disabled people. To this end, the appellant proposes to modify the existing stairs by making the treads 80 mm wider and thereby providing 1000 mm clear between handrails. The going is 256 mm and the rise varies (but is uniform within each flight) between 154 and 147 mm.

The detail design is set out at s.3.8 “Internal stairs – Particular information” in the appellant’s report which An Bord received on 4 December 2015.

Having considered this part of the report and examined the detail of the appellant’s A3 size drawing 05/05, I am of the view that the design of the stairs as modified complies with requirement M1 of the building regulations:- *“Adequate provision shall be made for people to access and use a building, its facilities and its environs.”*

11.7 Compliance with TGD-K and compliance with DAC 007/11

The BCA were of the view that the stairs (as proposed to be modified) did not comply with the Part M guidance applicable to stairs in existing buildings. However, equally important in their reasons for refusal was the modified stairs’ failure to comply with the guidance on stairs in TGD-K. In their commentary on the appeal, the BCA say:-

“Point 6. The stairs as constructed is in contravention of minimum standards required for the design and specification of stairs as per TGD Part K and non compliant with specifications as submitted in previously granted DAC 007/11. Point 8. The stairs is not compliant with Part K TGD and as constructed does not comply with the DAC 007/11 as previously granted.”

I am of the view that whether the stairs was built in accordance with the previously-approved design is a matter for enforcement by the BCA, and is not a matter which properly should be brought to bear on consideration of the present appeal. If this appeal is granted, then the stairs must be built in accordance with the plans and particulars now in front of An Bord. The requirement for compliance with DAC 007/11 falls away.

I am of the view that whether the stairs as now proposed complies with the requirements of Part K of the building regulations is not a matter which should be brought to bear on consideration of the appeal. It is in my view a matter for the building owner to comply with all parts of the building regulations, while a DAC is limited to certifying compliance with Part M.

It would therefore not be appropriate to form a view as to whether the proposed design of the stairs complies with Part K – or Part A, also referred to in internal BCA reports.

“My non-technical summary of the issue”:-

The steps and flights on the stairs in its existing form comply with TGD-M guidance on steps and flights. The argument between the BCA and the appellant turns on the need for a second handrail on the top two flights. There’s only one handrail there, at present. To install this second handrail, means the existing stairs is then not wide

enough to comply with the TGD-M guidance on the minimum 1000 mm width between handrails. Then, to get this width, the appellant must widen the stairs, and this, in turn, means the whole stairs “squashes up”, and the landings become dangerous. This summarises the BCA’s reason for disallowing the application.

In my view, in all this argument about the design of the stairs, the TGD-M guidance on providing “the same range of services/facilities” at an accessible level has been overlooked.

11.8 The “same range of services/facilities”

If An Bord grant the DAC as the appellant seeks, and if the building owner modifies the stairs and uses the store as a library:- a pupil or a teacher with an ambulant disability will be able to use the stairs. This will be a stairs which in the opinion of the BCA does not comply with building regulations Part K.

Furthermore, despite any effort on the part of the staff, library facilities provided on the ground floor for somebody who is unable to climb the stairs will not match what’s in the room upstairs.

In my view, this is a key issue. The principal of Universal Access, as expressed in TGD-M s.1.3.4.1.1, “*the same range of facilities that are available on the other levels should be made accessible on the entry or accessible level*”. In my view, a range of book shelves doesn’t constitute a library; and in my view, to bring all the pupils upstairs to a library while leaving one pupil downstairs at some shelves, does not comply with requirement M1.

In my view therefore, modifying the stairs, whether or not this modification actually complies with the TGD-M guidance on the design of an ambulant accessible stairs, will not deliver overall Part M compliance. The argument between the BCA and the appellant about whether or not the stairs complies with the regulations is irrelevant, because even if the stairs does comply with that guidance, the school will not have the same range of library services/facilities on the ground floor, and a child who cannot avail of the stairs will be deprived of the library.

11.9 Alternative proposal

Judging by the papers, neither the appellant nor the BCA has considered the text at TGD-M s.1.3.4.1.1:- “*Consideration should be given to other lifting devices, such as lifting platforms that facilitate vertical travel to facilities, especially in buildings to which the exceptions [from the requirement for a full passenger lift] apply. Lifting platforms should comply with 2.3.4.1.1.*”

There is enough space in the stairwell of the existing stairs to install a vertical lifting platform to comply with TGD-M 2.3.4.1.1, without interfering with the surrounding structure.

If such a lift were installed, not only people with ambulant disabilities but also anybody using a wheelchair would be able to access the library; and the guidance at TGD-M 2.3.4.3 “*where a lifting device is provided ... an internal stairs suitable for ambulant disabled people is not necessary*” could be followed. This means all the problems around the appellants’ widening of the stairs and squashing up of the landings don’t arise.

In my view, the space upstairs is entirely suitable as a library; and the appropriate access to this, to comply with Building regulations Part M, is to install a vertical lifting platform to comply with the guidance at TGD-M s.2.3.4.1.1. This will provide access to the library for all building users.

12 ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In accordance with art. 39(a) of the Building Control Regulations (as amended), I have restricted my assessment to considering the extent to which the design complies with the requirements of Part M of the Second Schedule to the Building Regulations.

I consider that the works to which the application relates, if constructed in accordance with the plans, calculations, specifications and particulars submitted, would, subject to imposition of the condition below, comply with the requirements of Part M of the Second Schedule to the Building Regulations 1997 to 2010. In considering this application no assessment has been made as to whether the works or building would comply with the other requirements of the Second Schedule to the Building Regulations 1997 to 2010.

Recommendations, reasons and considerations:-

I recommend that in accordance with s.7(2) of the Building Control Acts 1990 and 2007, An Bord allow this appeal and grant a Disability Access Certificate for the proposed works subject to the attachment of a condition as below. I recommend that An Bord certify that:-

The works or building to which the application relates, if constructed in accordance with the plans, calculations, specifications and particulars submitted, would comply with the requirements of Part M of the Second Schedule to the Building Regulations 1997 to 2010. In considering this application no assessment has been made as to whether the works or building would comply with the other requirements of the Second Schedule to the Building Regulations 1997 to 2010. This certificate is granted subject to the following condition:-

Condition

The works shall include installation of a vertical lifting platform complying with the guidance at section 2.3.4.1.1 of the 2010 edition of the Technical Guidance Document “Access and Use” published by the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and Local Government. The modifications to the stairs proposed in the original application need not be executed.

Reasons

To make adequate provision for people to access and use this building, its facilities and environs; and to take account of the guidance in paragraphs 2.3.4.1 and 2.3.4.3 of the Technical Guidance Document.

E. O Cofaigh B.Arch. HFAIA, 15 March 2016