



A Chapter of The American Institute of Architects
370 James Street, Suite 402, New Haven, CT 06513
203-865-2195 FAX: 203-562-5378
aiainfo@aiact.org, www.aiact.org

March 1, 2016

Members of the Public Safety and Security Committee:

On behalf of the Connecticut Chapter of the American Institute of Architects and our approximately 1,350 members statewide, we would like to express our strong opposition to Raised Senate Bill 238, *An Act Concerning Adoption of Municipal Ordinances Regarding Automatic Fire Extinguishing Systems in New Residential Buildings*.

By State Statute (29-253), all Connecticut towns and municipalities are subject to one state building code. The proposed addition to the statute outlined in this bill, allowing any town or municipality to adopt its own construction standards, will undermine all the benefits of a uniform State code, as well as the authority of the State Building Inspector's office to arbitrate code related decisions, and will create an atmosphere of confusion throughout the entire design and building industry. I have attached a copy of an Opinion from then Attorney General Richard Blumenthal from 1992 on this subject which I hope you might find helpful.

The use of a statewide building has been in effective for almost forty five years and prevents confusion. The only official interpretations or modifications are done through a long standing tested and proven process with the State Building Inspector, thus creating a positive and consistent process across the State.

We respectfully ask that Raised Senate Bill 238 be withdrawn. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Diane Harp Jones
CEO/EVP
AIA Connecticut

Officers

Timothy L. Brewer, AIA
President
George Fellner, AIA
Vice President

Glenn R. Gollenberg, AIA
Secretary
Arthur L. Sanders, AIA
Treasurer

Directors

Linda J. Batchelder, AIA
Daniel Casinelli, AIA
Philip H. Cerrone, III, AIA
Stephanie Degen-Monroe, AIA

Alan S. Lagocki, AIA
Michael Pereira, Associate AIA
Kermit D. Thompson, AIA

Attorney General's Opinion

Attorney General, Richard Blumenthal

August 20, 1992

Honorable Nicholas Cioffi

Commissioner

Department of Public Safety

100 Washington Street

Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Dear Commissioner Cioffi:

You have requested our advice on whether the provisions of the Connecticut Fire Safety Code, the Connecticut State Building Code and Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-315, with regards to automatic fire extinguishing systems, preempt the field so as to preclude local ordinances on the subject. In 1973, a similar question was asked by your agency and our response at that time was in the affirmative. See 1973 Conn. Op. Atty. Gen. (12-14-73). You now seek to have us update our 1973 advice. Our response continues to be in the affirmative.

A local ordinance is preempted by a state statute if it can be shown that the legislature intended to occupy the entire field of regulation on the matter or if the local ordinance irreconcilably conflicts with the statute. Dwyer v. Farrell, 193 Conn. 7, 14, 475 A.2d 257 (1984). The fact that the local ordinance does not expressly conflict with a statute will not save it, however, if the legislative purpose in enacting the statute is frustrated by the ordinance. Manchester Sand & Gravel Co. v. South Windsor, 203 Conn. 267, 273, 524 A.2d 621 (1987). Moreover, a municipality, as a creature of the state, can exercise only such powers as are expressly granted to it or such powers as are reasonably necessary to enable it to discharge its duties and carry into effect the objects and purposes of its creation. Dwyer v. Farrell, 193 Conn. at 11-12.

In R. B. Benson & Co., Inc. v. Town of Trumbull, Docket No. 2354 38, CSCR, Vol. II, p. 579 (April 10, 1987), the court had an opportunity to pass on the very issue of whether municipalities can enact ordinances requiring more extensive use of automatic fire extinguishing systems than required by the Connecticut Fire Safety Code, the Connecticut Building Code and Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-315. The court, in a well reasoned opinion, held that the legislature had manifested an intent to occupy the entire field of building and fire safety regulations. The court stated:

→ The Fire Safety Code sets forth minimum requirements for fire safety, Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-293 (rev. to 1987). This same statute no longer empowers the municipality to enact ordinances or orders pursuant to safety in buildings. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-293 (rev. to 1987) (See Public Act 85-34 which (a) deleted any reference to the municipality's right to make orders with respect to buildings as provided in § 29-383 and (b) repealed § 29-383 in that same act). Conn.

Gen. Stat. § 29-293 (rev. to 1987). Thus, the court finds that the legislature has demonstrated an intent to occupy the entire field of building and fire safety regulations. This conclusion is supported by the scope of the existing legislation involving these two areas. See, Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-251 et seq. and Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-291 et seq.

Id. at 580. The court in that case further held that a local ordinance which attempts to expand the scope of the automatic fire extinguishing system requirements of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-315 is invalid because it conflicts with that statute. Id. at 580.

→ The state building code would also preempt local ordinances on fire extinguishing systems. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-254 authorizes a municipality to propose amendments to the state building code. A municipality which desires to propose such an amendment must do so pursuant to the provisions of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-254, not through a local ordinance.

"The Building and Fire Codes apply to all municipalities through Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-253 (rev. to 1987); See Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-252 (§ 1200.1 of the Building Code incorporates the State Fire Code). The legislature, through § 29-252 and § 29-254 has set forth a statutory scheme for amendments to the building code. This scheme includes the opportunity for a municipality to propose amendments which may be either applicable to all municipalities or, subject to certain conditions, restricted to such municipality. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-254(a). See also Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 29-256, 29-292 and 29-296 (providing for review process of the building and fire codes). Moreover, the statute also provides penalties for violations of the Fire Safety Code. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-295 (rev. to 1987). The broad scope of this legislation demonstrates an intent by the legislature to occupy the field of building and fire safety regulations.

R.B. Benson & Co. Inc. v. Town of Trumbull, supra at 580.

In enacting the Fire Safety Code and the Building Code the legislature manifested an intent to provide for uniformity throughout the State of Connecticut in the field of building and fire safety regulations. Local ordinances affecting the areas regulated by these codes would destroy that uniformity. See Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-253(a); Edwards v. Code Enforcement Committee, 13 Conn. App. 1, 9 534 A.2d 617 (1987).

Although some of the relevant statutes and provisions of the building and fire safety codes have been amended since the decision in R.B. Benson & Co. Inc., the amendments do not affect the outcome of this advisory opinion.

Based on the foregoing reasons, it is our opinion that the provisions of the Connecticut Fire Safety Code, the Connecticut State Building Code and Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-315, with regards to automatic fire extinguishing systems, preempt the field so as to preclude local ordinances on the subject.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD BLUMENTHAL

ATTORNEY GENERAL

Henry Alexandre

RICHARD BLUMENTHAL
ATTORNEY GENERAL



MacKenzie Hall
110 Sherman Street
Hartford, CT 06103
FAX (203) 528-5551

Office of The Attorney General
State of Connecticut

Honorable Nicholas Cioffi
Commissioner
Department of Public Safety
100 Washington Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Dear Commissioner Cioffi:

In a letter dated October 30, 1991, you requested our advice whether the provisions of the Connecticut Fire Safety Code, the Connecticut State Building Code and Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-315, with regards to automatic fire extinguishing systems, preempt the field so as to preclude local ordinances on the subject. In 1978, a similar question was asked by your agency and our response at that time was in the affirmative. See 1978 Conn. Op. Atty. Gen. (12-14-78). You now seek to have us update our 1978 advice. Our response continues to be in the affirmative.

A local ordinance is preempted by a state statute if it can be shown that the legislature intended to occupy the entire field of regulation on the matter or if the local ordinance irreconcilably conflicts with the statute. Dwyer v. Farrell, 193 Conn. 7, 14, 475 A.2d 257 (1984). The fact that the local ordinance does not expressly conflict with a statute will not save it, however, if the legislative purposes in enacting the statute is frustrated by the ordinance. Manchester Sand & Gravel Co. v. South Windsor, 203 Conn. 267, 278, 524 A.2d 621 (1987). Moreover, a municipality, as a creature of the state, can exercise only such powers as are expressly granted to it or such powers as are reasonably necessary to enable it to discharge its duties and carry into effect the objects and purposes of its creation. Dwyer v. Farrell, 193 Conn. at 11-12.

In R. B. Benson & Co., Inc. v. Town of Trumbull, Docket No. 2354 38, CSCR, Vol. II, p.579 (April 10, 1987), the court had an opportunity to pass on the very issue of whether municipalities can enact ordinances requiring more extensive use of automatic fire extinguishing systems than required by the Connecticut Fire Safety Code, the Connecticut Building Code and Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-315. The court, in a well reasoned opinion, held that the legislature had manifested an intent to occupy the entire field of building and fire safety regulations. The court stated:

The Fire Safety Code sets forth minimum requirements for fire safety, Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-293 (rev. to 1987). This same statute no longer empowers the municipality to enact ordinances or orders pursuant to safety in buildings. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-293 (rev. to 1987) (See Public Act 85-34 which (a) deleted any reference to the municipality's right to make orders with respect to buildings as provided in § 29-389 and (b) repealed § 29-383 in that same act). Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-293 (rev. to 1987). Thus, the court finds that the legislature has demonstrated an intent to occupy the entire field of building and fire safety regulations. This conclusion is supported by the scope of the existing legislation involving these two areas. See, Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-251 et seq. and Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-291 et seq.

Id. at 580.

The Court in R. E. Benson & Co., Inc. v. Town of Trumbull, supra, further held that a local ordinance which attempts to expand the scope of the automatic fire extinguishing system requirements of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-315 is invalid because it conflicts with that statute. Id. at 580.

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-254 authorizes a municipality to propose amendments to the state building code. A municipality which desires to propose such an amendment must do so pursuant to the provisions of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-254, not through a local ordinance.

The Building and Fire Codes apply to all municipalities through Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-253 (rev. to 1987); See Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-252 (§ 1200.1 of the Building Code incorporates the State Fire Code). The legislature, through § 29-252 and § 29-254 has set forth a statutory scheme for amendments to the building code. This scheme includes the opportunity for a municipality to propose amendments which may be either applicable to all municipalities or, subject to certain conditions, restricted to such municipality. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-254(a). See also Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 29-256, 29-292 and 29-296 (providing for

Honorable Nicholas Cloffi
Page 3

review process of the building and fire codes). Moreover, the statute also provides penalties for violations of the Fire Safety Code. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-295 (rev. to 1987). The broad scope of this legislation demonstrates an intent by the legislature to occupy the field of building and fire safety regulations.

R. B. Benson & Co. Inc. v. Town of Trumbull, supra at 580.

In enacting the Fire Safety Code and the Building Code the legislature manifests an intent to provide for uniformity throughout the State of Connecticut in the field of building and fire safety regulations. Local ordinances affecting the areas regulated by these codes would destroy that uniformity. See Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-253(a); Edward v. Code Enforcement Committee, 13 Conn. App. 1, 9 534 A.2d 617 (1987).

Although some of the relevant statutes and provisions of the building and fire safety codes may have been amended since the decision in R.B. Benson & Co. Inc., the amendments do not affect the outcome of this advisory opinion.

Based on the foregoing reasons, it is our opinion that the provisions of the Connecticut Fire Safety Code, the Connecticut State Building Code and Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-315, with regards to automatic fire extinguishing systems, preempt the field so as to preclude local ordinances on the subject.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD BLUMENTHAL
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Henri Alexandra
Assistant Attorney General

RB/HA/ec