

ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENT FORM FOR PROPOSED CODE CHANGES

(This form must be submitted electronically)

IRC-68, R311.7.6

Author/requestor: Richard Lockrem

Email address: rich.lockrem@state.mn.us

Telephone number: 651.284.5868

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Proposed Code Change - Language

Please provide your proposed code change in strikeout/underline format. Provide the *specific* language you would like to see changed, with new words underlined and words to be deleted should be ~~stricken~~. Also, state whether the language contained in your proposal is from a code book or from an amendment currently found in Minnesota Rule. (You may provide the language (electronically) on a separate, attached sheet).

R311.7.6 Landings for stairways. There shall be a floor or landing at the top and bottom of each stairway. The minimum width perpendicular to the direction of travel shall be no less than the width of the flight served or 36 inches minimum. Landing of shapes other than square or rectangular shall be permitted provided the depth that is not less than that of a quarter circle with a radius equal to the required landing width. Where the stairway has a straight run, the minimum depth in the direction of travel shall be not less than 36 inches (914 mm).

Exception: ~~A floor or landing is not required at the top of an interior flight of stairs, including stairs in an enclosed garage, provided a door does not swing over the stairs~~ An interior door is permitted to be located on the top landing less than 36 inches from the top riser, in the direction of travel, provided the door does not swing over the stairs.

Proposed Code Change – Need and Reason

Please provide a thorough explanation of the need for this change and why this proposed code change is a reasonable change. During the rulemaking process, the Agency must defend the need and reasonableness of all its proposed changes. The Agency must submit evidence that it has considered all aspects of the proposal. (You may provide the need and reason (electronically) on a separate attached sheet).

The proposal is based on the 2012 IRC text except for the revision to the second sentence. The inclusion of “or 36 inches minimum” was added to establish a minimum landing width in direction of travel. The

homeowner or designer should not be penalized by having to install a larger landing if they chose to construct a wider stair.

This proposal also requests a revision to the R311.7.6 exception. The code currently does not address the option of having a door at the top of a without requiring a minimum 36 inch landing. The language will apply to doors at an enclosed garage stair, the stair to the basement and if a door were installed at the top of a stair to the second floor of a home.

Proposed Code Change – Cost/Benefit Analysis

Please consider whether this proposed code change will increase/decrease costs or indicate that it will not have any cost implications and explain how it will not. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset somehow by a life safety or other benefit? If so, please explain. Are there any cost increases/decreases to enforce or comply with this proposed code change? If so, please explain. (You may provide the cost/benefit analysis (electronically) on a separate, attached sheet).

There will be no additional costs related to the approval of the proposed amendment.

Other Factors to Consider Related to Proposed Code Change

1. Is this proposed code change meant to:

change language contained in a published code book? If so, list section(s).
IRC R311.7.6

change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

delete language contained in a published code book? If so, list section(s).

delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

neither; this language will be new language, not found in the code book or in Minnesota Rule.

2. Is this proposed code change required by a Minnesota Statute or new legislation? If so, please provide the citation to the Statute or legislation.
NO

3. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a published code book or of an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
NO.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other parts of the Minnesota State Building Code? If so, please list the affected parts of the Minnesota State Building Code.
NO.

5. Who are the parties affected or segments of industry affected by this proposed code change?

Parties affected are, building officials, contractors and designers. There are no new requirements created by the proposal.

6. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

NO

7. Are you aware of any federal requirement or regulation related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the regulation or requirement.

NO