

## PROPOSED CHANGE

NBC05-DivB-03.03.01.18.(04)(a)-add-UE-HSB-A\_v2\_ed.doc

## MODIFICATION PROPOSÉE

Page: 1 of / de 2

### Comment

### Commentaires

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

### EXISTING PROVISION

None

### PROPOSED CHANGE

Add new Appendix Note A-3.3.1.18.(4)(a) as follows:

**Other Code Provisions Affected: None**

**A-3.3.1.18.(4)(a) Guard Design Where Climbability is a Lesser Concern.** The intent of Clause 3.3.1.18.(4)(a) is to allow an exception to Sentence (3) in locations that are not likely to be occupied by young children, such as casinos, nightclubs, prisons, high schools, colleges, office buildings and industrial occupancies.

### RATIONALE

#### Problem

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.

#### 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:** A-3.3.1.18.(4)(a)

**Analysis:** N/A

**PROPOSED CHANGE**

NBC05-DivB-03.03.01.18.(04)(a)-add-UE-HSB-A\_v2\_ed.doc

**MODIFICATION PROPOSÉE**

Page: 2 of / de 2

---

[Comment](#)

[Commentaires](#)