

PROPOSED CHANGE

MODIFICATION PROPOSÉE

NBC05-DivB-03.03.01.18.(03)(04)-replace-insert-UE-HSB_v2_ed.doc

Page: 1 of / de 3

Comment

Commentaires

Document	NBC 2005	Document
Provision	3.3.1.18.(3); 3.3.1.18.(4)-insert 2010	Exigence
Committee	Use and Egress • Usage et moyens d'évacuation des bâtiments Housing and Small Buildings • Maisons et petits bâtiments	Comité
Minutes	2 nd Meeting JTG-Climbability of Guards; HSB 2005-07.12; UE 6.6.10; EC 30b	Procès-verbaux

EXISTING PROVISION

3.3.1.18. Guards

- 1)** Except as provided in Sentence (4) and Article 3.3.2.9., a *guard* not less than 1 070 mm high shall be provided
- around any roof to which access is provided for purposes other than maintenance,
 - at openings into smoke shafts referred to in Subsection 3.2.6. that are less than 1 070 mm above the floor, and
 - at each raised floor, *mezzanine*, balcony, gallery, interior or exterior vehicular ramp, and at other locations where the difference in level is more than 600 mm.
- 2)** Except as permitted by Sentence 3.3.2.9.(4) and unless it can be shown that the size of openings that exceed this limit does not present a hazard, there shall be no opening that permits the passage of a sphere whose diameter is more than 100 mm through a *guard* serving
- an exterior balcony, or
 - a room, stairway, or space not within a *suite of residential occupancy*.
- 3)** Unless it can be shown that the location and size of openings do not present a hazard, a *guard* shall be designed so that no member, attachment or opening located between 140 mm and 900 mm above the level protected by the *guard* will facilitate climbing.
- 4)** Sentence (1) does not apply to the front edges of *stages* or to loading docks.

PROPOSED CHANGE

Replace Sentence 3.3.1.18.(3) and Insert new Sentence 3.3.1.18.(4) as follows:

Other Code Provisions Affected: None

3.3.1.18. Guards

- 3)** ~~Except as provided in Sentence (4)-2010. Unless it can be shown that the location and size of openings do not present a hazard, a guard~~ *guards required by Sentence (1)* shall be designed so that no member, attachment or opening ~~located between 140 mm and 900 mm above the level protected by the guard will~~ facilitates climbing.
- 4)** ~~The requirements for guards described in Sentence (3) need not apply~~
- ~~where~~ it can be shown that the location and size of openings do not present a hazard ~~to young children (see Appendix A),~~
 - ~~within the interior portion of dwelling units, or~~
 - ~~where guards serve locations where the difference in elevation is less than 1 800 mm between the upper and lower adjacent surfaces.~~
- 4)5)** Sentence (1) does not apply to the front edges of *stages* or to loading docks.

RATIONALE

Problem

PROPOSED CHANGE

MODIFICATION PROPOSÉE

NBC05-DivB-03.03.01.18.(03)(04)-replace-insert-UE-HSB_v2_ed.doc

Page: 2 of / de 3

The requirements regarding climbable guards within dwelling units are seen as overly restrictive without justifiable research and stats.

Justification - Explanation

Statistical data in areas where climbability requirements are not mandated do not seem to indicate a problem with children climbing guards and falling. There were no climbability requirements in the U.S. for several decades (exception was 2003-2006).

- The introduction of climbability requirements in 1970 was not based on any scientific data or statistics.
- There is general confusion among designers and regulators as to how to interpret the current climbability requirements in Part 9.
- NAHB study does not support the need for climbability requirements on guards.
- As balconies are generally not supervised as often as one would supervise a child within a building, the TG was not convinced that the requirements could be relaxed for exterior balconies.
- Reports of children falling off exterior balconies are inconclusive at this point as to what exactly contributed to the fall, i.e. climbing onto an object (e.g. chair) or using the guards themselves.
- The Code cannot be a substitute for parental or guardian supervision.
- Allowing climbable guard designs at locations where the difference in levels presents limited risk of injury was viewed as acceptable when considered in conjunction with the factors above.

At their 30b teleconference, the CCBFC Executive Committee (EC) agreed to remove the term “unsupervised” before “young children” in Clause (4)(a). The EC agreed that trying to enforce the concept of supervision would be very difficult as the degree of supervision could be debated (e.g. no child can be supervised 100% of the time).

Cost implications

None.

Enforcement implications

Can be enforced by the currently available infrastructure without an increase in resources.

Who is affected

Designers, builders and Code officials.

OBJECTIVE-BASED ANALYSIS OF NEW OR CHANGED PROVISION

Provision: 3.3.1.18.(3)

Analysis:

Attributions

[F30-OS3.1]

Objective

OS3 Safety in Use

OBJECTIVE-BASED ANALYSIS OF NEW OR CHANGED PROVISION

Provision: 3.3.1.18.(4)-2010

Analysis:

Attributions

N/A

Objective

N/A

OBJECTIVE-BASED ANALYSIS OF NEW OR CHANGED PROVISION

Provision: 3.3.1.18.(5)-2010

Analysis: Unchanged from analysis for Sentence 3.3.1.18.(4)-2005

PROPOSED CHANGE

NBC05-DivB-03.03.01.18.(03)(04)-replace-insert-UE-HSB_v2_ed.doc

MODIFICATION PROPOSÉE

Page: 3 of / de 3
