



MAURA HEALEY
GOVERNOR

KIM DRISCOLL
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

YVONNE HAO
SECRETARY, EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Division of Occupational Licensure
Office of Public Safety and Inspections

1000 Washington Street, Suite 710
Boston, Massachusetts 02118

LAYLA R. D'EMILIA
UNDERSECRETARY, CONSUMER
AFFAIRS AND BUSINESS
REGULATION

SARAH R. WILKINSON
COMMISSIONER, DIVISION OF
OCCUPATIONAL LICENSURE

Minutes

BBRS Building Code Appeals Board (BCAB)
Meeting Location: Virtual Microsoft Teams-Meeting
February 1, 2024

Meeting Called to order by the Chairman Michael McDowell, at 9:30 a.m. followed by Roll call:

Board Members Present:

David Riquinha
Michael McDowell, Chairman
Jacob Nunnemacher

Guests Present:

See sign-in sheet for each case:

- Case Number:** 23-0072
Appellant: Paul Wainright (Owner-Norma & Salvador Kelis)
Property Address: 109-111 Lincoln Street, Pittsfield, MA. 01201
Summary of Case: Appellants sought relief from 780 CMR Section 102.6.4 (#2), 780 CMR 2.00 Section 1001.3.1, 1016.2 (#2) & (#3) & 780 CMR 1011.10, with respect to an existing building.

Jacob Nunnemacher made a **MOTION** that was **SECONDED** by David Riquinha, to provide an **INTERPRETATION** as requested of **780 CMR 9th Edition Section 102.6.4 #1, #2**. It is the interpretation of the Board that the Building Inspector may cite in writing a violation of existing conditions that he feels make the building unsafe, unhealthy or otherwise non-compliant with **780 CMR** to include the inadequate means of egress and egress components, and he has the ability to make the applicant come up to current codes of **780 CMR Section 9th Edition** for full compliance, however he can accept compliance alternatives. (Motion #1). The Motion was approved by unanimous vote.

Jacob Nunnemacher made a **Motion** that was **SECONDED** by David Riquinha, to **DENY** the request for a variance to **780 CMR 2.0, 780 CMR 1001.3.1, 780 CMR 1016.2 #2, 780 CMR 1016.2 #3, 780 CMR 1011.1.0** because the appellant has not provided enough detailed information on all of the issues to grant the variance and part of those issues are outlined by the City to include, but not limited to the locked bathroom door, the low ceiling height, and window access to the emergency escape. This is also **DENIED** because the City is opposed and not all of the issues have been addressed. (Motion #2). This Motion was approved by unanimous vote.



The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.