

PROPOSED CHANGE

NBC05-DivB-03.04.06.05.(07)-replace-UE-HSB_ed.doc

MODIFICATION PROPOSÉE

Page: 1 of / de 2

Comment

Commentaires

Document	NBC 2005	Document
Provision	3.4.6.5.(7)	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	Procès-verbaux

EXISTING PROVISION

3.4.6.5. Guards

7) 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 being protected by the *guard* will facilitate climbing.

PROPOSED CHANGE

Replace Sentence 3.4.6.5.(7) as follows:

Other Code Provisions Affected: None

3.4.6.5. Guards

7) Except for guards located within the interior of dwelling units and Unless where 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 being protected by the *guard* will facilitate climbing.

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.

PROPOSED CHANGE

MODIFICATION PROPOSÉE

NBC05-DivB-03.04.06.05.(07)-replace-UE-HSB_ed.doc

Page: 2 of / de 2

Who is affected

Designers, builders and Code officials.

OBJECTIVE-BASED ANALYSIS OF NEW OR CHANGED PROVISION

Provision: 3.4.6.5.(7)

Analysis:

Attributions

[F30-OS3.1]

Objective

OS3 Safety in Use

[Comment](#)

[Commentaires](#)