



LEE'S SUMMIT
MISSOURI

CODE MODIFICATION REQUEST
(COMMERCIAL)

BUILDING/STRUCTURE NAME: Dunder Mifflin Properties 211_____

PREMISE ADDRESS: 211 SE Douglas_____

PERMIT NUMBER (if applicable): PRCOM20246348_____

OWNER'S NAME: Adam O'Kane / Amanda Bush_____

TO: Director of Development Services

In accordance with the Lee's Summit Building Code, I wish to apply for a modification to one or more provisions of the code as I feel that the spirit and intent of the Lee's Summit Building Code are observed the public health, welfare and safety are assured. The following articulates my request for your review and action. (NOTE: ATTACH ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NECESSARY)

Use provisions of the 2018 IEBC

Please reference letter from FP&C Consultants.

SUBMITTED BY:

NAME: __Jeff Bresette – FP&C Consultants_____

() OWNER () OWNER'S AGENT

ADDRESS: 1330 Burlington Street, Ste 200_____

Tel.# _816-931-3377_____

CITY, STATE, ZIP: _North Kansas City, MO 64116__

SIGNATURE: _____

TRACY DEISTER – MANAGER OF CODES ADMINISTRATION: (x) APPROVAL () DENIAL

SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: 9/3/2025

AIMEE NASSIF – DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES: (x) APPROVED () DENIED

SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: 9/5/2025

COMMENTS: The request is to use the provisions of the 18 IEBC on this project. The IEBC allows the use of alternative approaches to achieve code compliance. Specifically is this case an accessible route. Based on the project scope staff is in support of the request.

A COPY MUST BE ATTACHED TO THE APPROVED PLANS ON THE JOB SITE

9/18/2023 N:\CODES ADMIN\Forms 2019

September 3, 2025

Tracy Deister
City of Lee's Summit
220 SE Green Street
Lee's Summit, Missouri 64063

211 SE DOUGLAS CODE MODIFICATION REQUEST

Dear Tracy:

This is a Code Modification Request (CMR) for the use of the 2018 International Existing Building Code (IEBC) for the building located at 211 SE Douglas in downtown Lee's Summit. It is our understanding that the City of Lee's Summit has not adopted the IEBC, but it is permitted to be used with the application of a Code Modification Request.

It is my understanding that the 209/211 structures are on one property and are classified as type V-B construction, non-sprinklered. The uses are Group B in the 209 building and will be Group M in the 211 building. The issue is an accessible route to the 211 building and an accessible exit from the building. Currently, the main door to the building is on the north side of the 211 structure between buildings. The threshold is about 7 ½" above the walkway to a door that swings out from the interior of the space. The door, however, is 32" in width with a net clear width of 30" and has a knob instead of a lever handle.

There are three overhead doors on the west face of the building with a concrete apron with a 3%-4% slope for drainage. Between the concrete apron and the asphalt is a drop of between 1.5" and 2.5".

Since 209 and 211 SE Douglas are one building on a property, then per the IEBC Section 305.4.1, this is classified as a partial change of occupancy.

Although there are three methods to follow within the IEBC for general construction, Prescriptive Compliance Method, Classification of Work Method and Performance Approach Method, accessibility compliance for existing buildings is a separate approach that is required for all of the above construction methods. It is our understanding that the permit issued was a non-construction permit, which would most closely align with an IEBC Classification of Alteration Level 1 following the Work Method.

IEBC Section 305.4.1 says that when a building goes through a partial change of occupancy, Sections 305.6 Alterations, 305.7 Alterations affecting an area containing a primary function, and 305.8 Scoping for Alterations are required to be followed.

Section 305.6 requires a facility with alterations to comply with the International Building Code (IBC) unless the alterations are technically infeasible. Based on the definition of technically infeasible in IEBC Section 202, the existing structural frame of the building requires the removal or alteration of a load bearing member,

in this case a concrete masonry unit (CMU) wall. In order for the door opening to be modified to install a wider door, the CMU wall would need to be widened by approximately 6"

Section 305.7 exception 1 says that the cost for providing the accessible route are not required to exceed 20% of the costs of the alterations affecting the primary function area.

In an email with the building owner, it is my understanding that the costs for renovations are as follows (totaling \$4075 – the tenant performed most of the labor):

- Flooring - \$800
- Drywall- \$200
- Paint- \$275
- Electrical for install door opening - Lynn Electrical -\$1200
- Door opener- \$1600

Per 305.7 exception 1, 20% of the cost of alterations to remove barriers is \$815. The owner is willing to put in a ramp; however, the concrete estimate is approximately \$5000. A wood ramp could be installed for much less, but it is not a permanent solution and is more than \$815. Since the door is only 7 ½" above the walkway, continuing the landing to the east creates issues as well since the slope of the walkway is very slight and would take about a 10' landing until 4" risers can be installed. A single step is not possible since it is more than 7". If a concrete ramp is installed, there is most likely ponding going occur on the west side of the ramp and then the ramp on the east side would extend to the parking lot due to the slope of grade. This ramp extension is not in the \$5000 estimate.

We propose to patch the asphalt between the exterior space and the concrete apron to make an accessible route to the building. Most of the electrical costs were to install a door opening system that would permit the tenant to assist with allowing access to the building to those that need access. We can make accommodations to include signage for assistance.

Section 305.8 provides scoping provisions for the alterations of the building. None of the provisions apply, however the existing bathroom has been provided with additional grab bars at the water closet per the city inspector.

We believe that the application of the IEBC has been met. The installation of asphalt to remove the inaccessible path between the building will cost more than \$815 which is 20% of the cost of the alterations. The operator also has a willingness to assist their customers in entering and leaving the building by opening the overhead doors. Changing the door in the existing CMU wall is technically infeasible.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me.

Submitted by:
FP&C Consultants KC, LLC

Jeff Bresette

JLB/ms

Cc: Adam O’Kane