

ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENT FORM
FOR PROPOSED CODE CHANGES
(This form must be submitted electronically)

IRC-32, R202

Author/requestor: Rick Davidson
Email address: rdavidson@ci.maple-grove.mn.us
Telephone number: 763-494-6061
Firm/Association affiliation, if any: AMBO

Proposed Code Change - Language

Section R202 Definitions

TOWNHOUSE (IRC version). ~~A single-family single dwelling unit constructed in a group of three two or more attached units in which each unit extends from foundation to roof and with a yard or public way on at least two sides.~~ Each dwelling unit shall be considered to be a separate building. Separate building service utilities shall be provided to each dwelling unit when required by other chapters of the State Building Code.

Proposed Code Change – Need and Reason

In the last code change cycle, it was found necessary to include a Minnesota amendment for the term “townhouse” because of perceived deficiencies in that term in the IRC. However, the term with deficiencies was not deleted from the code so there are currently two different and conflicting definitions for the term “townhouse”. The Minnesota amended version is proposed for deletion in a separate submittal because it was a part of a larger, more conflicted amendment. The intent is to include portions of the former amendment into the existing IRC definition. That definition follows for reference:

TOWNHOUSE. A single family dwelling unit constructed in a group of two or more attached units in which each unit extends from the foundation to the roof and having open space on at least two sides of each unit. Each single family dwelling unit shall be considered to be a separate building. Separate building service utilities shall be provided to each single family dwelling unit when required by other chapters of the State Building Code.

The Minnesota amendment defined a townhouse as having two or more dwelling units. That amendment is proposed for the current IRC definition as necessary to maintain the intent of the original amendment. The IRC definition is proposed to be further amended to delete language reference open space on two sides. It is necessary to delete this language because the code does not require open space on two sides for dwellings so there is no perceived health or safety benefit. Furthermore, the code does not state how much open space is required. The space could be 1 inch or 100 inches. Therefore the rule is arbitrary and without any benefit. It cannot be enforced.

The place for open space and yard requirements is in local zoning ordinances.

Therefore it is reasonable to amend the current term “townhouse” to include language in from the former Minnesota amendment and to delete unenforceable terms to ease the understanding of the code by all users and to achieve uniform enforcement.

Proposed Code Change – Cost/Benefit Analysis

This proposal will have no impact on the cost of construction.

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).

2012 IRC **Section R202 Definitions**

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?

Code officials, building designers, contractors, building owners

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