



Permit Service Center
Building & Safety Division
Planning and Development Department

Plan Check Correction List

Application #: B2022-06100
Project Address: 2732 Claremont Blvd.

April 5, 2024

Dear Project Applicant,

The City of Berkeley has completed review of the construction documents submitted under the building permit application number specified above. This letter includes comments and corrections from all City of Berkeley reviewing agencies, which must be addressed in order to obtain the permits for the proposed work indicated in the construction documents.

Plans revised in response to corrections must be accompanied with a **written response letter**, which explicitly addresses each correction and the corresponding plan sheet number, revision number and date. **A full plan set of ALL construction drawings is required when responding to corrections. Incomplete or unclear responses to corrections may result in delays.**

Document formatting requirements:

- All permit documents must be submitted in electronic format, as unsecured PDF files.
- Documents with multiple pages must be combined and named according to content.
- Documents that are incomplete or improperly formatted will not be processed.
- Code Enforcement cases must be indicated by case number. Dates specified in Notice(s) of Violation take precedence over any timelines specified in this document.

Document submittal options (choose one):

- 1) **Permits Online:** Upload documents directly to the permit record at the [Permits Online Portal](#), by selecting *Record Info > Attachments > Add*. Permit documents are accessible from the registered Accela Citizen Access (ACA) account associated with the permit.
- 2) **In-Person:** Schedule an appointment for in-person processing through the [Permit Service Center webpage](#). Note that for all in-person submittals, documents must be saved on a USB thumb drive.

Expiration of an application: An application for a permit for any proposed work shall expire one year after the date of filing, unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant that such application has been pursued in good faith or a permit has been issued. The building official or the permit service center coordinator are authorized to grant one or more extensions of time for additional periods not exceeding a 180 days per extension. The extension shall be requested in writing and justifiable cause demonstrated. Requests for time extensions shall be accompanied by the payment of a fee set by resolution of the City Council. [BMC 105.3.2]

To apply for an application extension, complete an [Application Extension Request](#) form, and choose one of the two submittal options listed above.

Date: April 2, 2024

To: Andrew Cockrell
ACockrell@cityofberkeley.info

Cc: Jesse Bright; Kong Chung
jbright@cityofberkeley.info; kchung@cityofberkeley.info

RE: **Plan Review for:** **Single Family Dwelling Exterior and Interior Remodel**
 Project Address: **2732 Claremont Blvd.**
 Agency App. No.: B2022-06100
 TRB+ Project No.: PC23.116.101.3

At the City of Berkeley's request, TRB + Associates has completed its plan review for the project listed above. Please see the section entitled "FOREWORD" on the following page for information on the scope of the review and contact information for your project.

Plan review comments are listed on the following pages.

Sincerely,

TRB + ASSOCIATES, INC.

Bing Young, RA
Supervising Plan Review Architect
Direct: (925) 365-6915
Office: (925) 866-2633
byoung@trbplus.com

PROJECT DATA

Occupancy Group:	R3
Type of Construction:	VB
Risk Category:	II
Number of Stories:	2 with Basement
Conditioned Floor Area:	3898.45
Fire Sprinklered:	No
Valuation:	\$ 290,000

FOREWORD

- This plan review is only for the purpose of evaluating compliance with the provisions contained in the **2019 CBC, 2019 CRC, 2019 CPC, 2019 CMC, 2019 CEC, 2019 Green Building Standards Code, 2019 Energy Code**, and City of Berkeley's Ordinances. Please note that our review does not encompass provisions regulated and enforced by Planning, Engineering, Public Works, Health Departments; or other authorities outside the jurisdiction of the Building Department.
- Please address all of the following items and return a copy of this list, along with a response sheet, indicating the location of all required changes to the plans, specifications and/or calculations. Be as specific as possible in your responses so that we may expedite your recheck.
- If any changes have been made to the plan documents unrelated to those items identified in this comment list, please list the changes on a separate sheet and include in your resubmittal documentation.
- Please refer to re-submittal instructions provided by the Permit Service Center on the cover page of this correction package.

The following re-check comments numbered per the original plan review list have not been fully addressed with the re-submitted plans. Additional comments are provided to clarify the information needed to complete the plan review of this project. The format includes a restatement of the original comment followed by a re-check comment in a separate bold italicized paragraph.

GENERAL COMMENTS

No further comments.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMENTS

Sheet A1.2

- A10. There appears to be alterations on the north facing exterior wall of the building. Alterations would need to comply with Table R302.1(1) CRC and R102.7.1 CRC. Projections, openings and exterior walls of the dwelling facing the north property line shall comply with Table R302.1(1). Please address the following:

- b. Indicate the length of the roof overhang. Projections 2 – 5 feet from property line require a 1-hr fire-resistance rating on the underside, or heavy timber, or fire-retardant-treated wood.

Cycle 2 Comment: Note indicated on sheet A2.4 but reference to detail 16/A5.1 does not clearly show construction meeting the specific construction for fire rating, HT or fire-retardant wood requirements. Please review and amend submittal documents accordingly.

Cycle 3 Comment: The roof projection appears to be less than 2 feet from the property line. Table R302.1(1), CRC does not allow projections less than 2 feet from the property line.

- A11. Indicate the size of the sewer and water lines serving this building as additional plumbing fixtures are proposed. Verify that sewer line will not need to be altered to accommodate the additional waste drainage load. [City of Berkeley Building Permit Checklist](#)

Cycle 2 Comment: Response indicated that sewer lateral to be replaced under separate permit but this does not appear to be noted on the plans. Provide sizing calculations to indicate size of water and sewer line is necessary for this project and note sizes on plan.

Cycle 3 Comment: Response indicates that a 1" water service is provided for this project. It is unclear which table on sheet A1.2 is for water sizing. Please label and use "WSFU" values indicated on Table 610.3 CPC. Please verify that the dishwasher is accounted for in the list of plumbing fixtures for the water sizing calculations. Clearly indicate water sizing per Table 610.4 CPC.

The size of the sewer lateral does not appear to be indicated on proposed site plan. Please list plumbing fixtures and their respective "Drainage Fixture Values" with that indicated in Table 702.1 CPC in the drainage table provided. Show how total drainage unit loading complies with Table 703.2 CPC.

- A12. The sewer line appears to extend through the rear adjacent parcel. Please clarify whether there is an easement for the sewer line.

Cycle 2 Comment: Response indicated that this has been corrected on site plan but the sewer lateral appears to extend toward the adjacent lot 25, 2928 Forest Avenue.

Cycle 3 Comment: Response indicated to see addendum B, Property Access Agreement but agreement appears to be agreement between property owner of 2732 Claremont Blvd and the City allowing City to enter upon respective property. An easement does not appear to be indicated on site plan allowing this property's sewer line to extend through the adjacent parcel.

Sheet 2.4

- A34. Provide roofing specifications (ESR Report or other approved listing), including roof assembly fire classification, for the flat roof area on the plans.

Cycle 2 Comment: Detail 13/A5.1 indicate Sure-Flex PVC FRS Fleeceback membrane per ICC ES-1463. Please review report and indicate on plans if proposed system is an adhered roofing system or mechanically fastened roofing system. Also indicate the respective "System No." and detail on plans installation requirements. (deck type, max. allowable slope, barrier board or slip sheet, insulation, etc)

Cycle 3 Comment: Please provide ESR Report or other approved listing for proposed GAF Ruberoid installation.

- A35. With 2% roof slope, show drainage methodology per R903.4 CRC. The installation and sizing of the drains shall comply with Sections 1106 and 1108 of the California Plumbing Code.

Cycle 2 Comment: A 12" wide scupper is noted on sheet A2.4 but building elevations do not appear to indicate a parapet design. Please clarify by providing a detail on the plan. Note if the scupper is serving as the overflow for what appears to be a drain noted by "N9" it would need to be a minimum of 4" high in addition to the 12" wide currently noted on the plans. Clearly note the location of the low point of the roof and the drain and its respective size for that location. If scupper is serving as overflow, clearly indicate opening into scupper is a minimum of 2" above the roof drain inlet. The roof drain system is typically not a deferred submittal.

Cycle 3 Comment: Please clearly indicate how roof drainage complies with Section 1101.12 CPC. Note provided indicating roof drainage shall be designed by a registered design professional and approved in accordance w/ CRC Section 301.5 is unclear as Section R301.5 relates to Minimum Uniformly Distributed Live Loads. As indicated previously roof drainage systems are not deferred submittals.

- A37. In regards to the roof infill at North property line (Note N4), please see comment A10 above as alterations are required to comply with the current code. [R102.7.1 CRC]

Cycle 2 Comment: Note provided that construction will be 1-hour rated with heavy timber. Detail 16/ A5.1 does not appear to indicate the 1-hour rating and heavy timber construction.

Cycle 3 Comment: Please coordinate response to this item with Comment A10.

Sheet A5.1

- A44. Please coordinate detail 13/A5.1 with comment A34 above.

Cycle 2 Comment: Please see 2nd review comment for A34.

Cycle 3 Comment: Please coordinate with Comment A34

DISABLED ACCESS COMMENTS

Not within scope of review

GREEN BUILDING COMMENTS

No further comments noted.

ENERGY COMMENTS

No further comments noted.

MECHANICAL COMMENTS

No further comments noted.

PLUMBING COMMENTS

No further comments noted.

ELECTRICAL COMMENTS

No further comments noted.

STRUCTURAL COMMENTS

Review performed by: Monte Rinebold, PE

Structural Calculations

S11. No structural calculations appear to be included in the plan set submittal received. Please provide calculations from the engineer-of-record for the scope of work. The response to this comment may generate future comments.

Cycle 2 comment: For the new structural calculations please address the following:

- a. *Cycle 2 comment: Provide updated calculations for 2nd story floor beam L2 B1, which appears to support tributary floor load from bathroom #3, to show that it has capacity to support a minimum floor live load of 40 psf per CBC Table 1607.1, instead of the 30 psf load shown on page B10 of the calculations;*

Cycle 3 comment: This comment is outstanding. Updated structural calculations referenced in the comment response were not received by our office. Please provide for review.

- b. *Cycle 2 comment: Provide calculations for the capacity of the interior continuous footing and the underlying soil to support the 9 kips end reaction from 2nd story floor beam L2 B1, as shown on page B10 of the calculations;*

Cycle 3 comment: This comment is outstanding. Updated structural calculations referenced in the comment response were not received by our office. Please provide for review.

- d. *Cycle 2 comment: Provide an updated calculation for 1st story header beam L1 B3, the shown 4,910 pounds seismic load from the 2nd story shear wall along gridline B does not appear to be the 3,222 pounds design uplift from page F7 amplified by the overstrength factor to comply with ASCE 7-16 Section 12.3.3.3;*

Cycle 3 comment: This comment is outstanding. Updated structural calculations referenced in the comment response were not received by our office. Please provide for review. Additionally, revise the overstrength factor to 2.5 for seismic force-resisting system A15 with a flexible diaphragm per ASCE 7-16 Table 12.2-1.

- f. *Cycle 2 comment: Provide an updated design for the 2nd story shear wall along gridline A, for an FTAO type design each wall pier shall have a minimum 2-foot-length. [AWC SDPWS- 2015 Section 4.3.5.2];*

Cycle 3 comment: This comment is partially outstanding. Updated structural calculations referenced in the comment response were not received by our office. Please provide for review.

- i. *Cycle 2 comment: Provide updated calculations for the 1st story shear wall along gridline D, which appears to include an opening for the new family room fireplace.*

Please clearly show if this shear wall is designed as a segmented, perforated, or FTAO type. Please also indicate the minimum lengths of the wall piers for this shear wall on sheet S2.1;

Cycle 3 comment: This comment is partially outstanding. Updated structural calculations referenced in the comment response were not received by our office. Please provide for review.

- j. *Cycle 2 comment: If the 1st story shear wall along gridline D is an FTAO type, then please provide calculations to show that the CS16 straps specified in detail 16/S5.2 are adequate to transfer the design loads;*

Cycle 3 comment: This comment is outstanding. Updated structural calculations referenced in the comment response were not received by our office. Please provide for review.

- k. *Cycle 2 comment: Please clarify how the basement level shear wall along gridline D resists design uplift loads at the end between gridlines 2 and 3, no holddown appears to be shown. An anchoring device is required at the shear wall ends where the stabilizing dead load moment is not sufficient to prevent uplift due to overturning moments. [AWC SDPWS- 2015 Section 4.3.6.4.2];*

Cycle 3 comment: This comment is partially outstanding. Updated structural calculations referenced in the comment response were not received by our office. Please provide for review.

- l. *Cycle 2 comment: Provide calculations for all new shear walls parallel to gridlines 1-4, the calculation package received by TRB with the Cycle 2 plan set does not appear to include these calculations. The response to this comment may generate future comments.*

Cycle 3 comment: This comment is partially outstanding. Updated structural calculations referenced in the comment response were not received by our office. Please provide for review.

NEW STRUCTURAL COMMENTS

Sheet A5.1

- S15. Detail 8: Specify the connection of the stud to the floor framing. Verify that the detail/attachment is adequate for a 200 lb. concentrated load applied in any direction at any point along the top rail of the new balcony guardrail. [ASCE 7-16 4.5.1]**

The City of Berkeley contact for this review is Jesse Bright, P.E., Supervising Plan Check Engineer (jbright@cityofberkeley.info) via email or by telephone at (510) 981-7523.

[END]

Land Use Planning

Prepared by: Cecelia Mariscal

Application #: B2022-06100

#2732 Claremont Blvd.

cmariscal@berkeleyca.gov

510-981-7439

1. Please provide a measurement string showing the existing and proposed height of the structure at the area of the addition (pony wall). Instructions on how to measure average height can be found on our website linked [here](#).
2. Sheet A3.2-Please add measurement string indicating the average height from the average grade to the top of the proposed railing.
3. Please note that additional information may be requested upon review of resubmitted items.