

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

IRC-5, Table R302.1(2)(rev 11-28-11)

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

Proposed Code Change - Language

TABLE R302.1(2)
 EXTERIOR WALLS—DWELLINGS WITH FIRE SPRINKLERS

EXTERIOR WALL ELEMENT		MINIMUM FIRE-RESISTANCE RATING	MINIMUM FIRE SEPARATION DISTANCE
Walls	Fire-resistance rated	1 hour—tested in accordance with ASTM E 119 or UL 263 with exposure from the outside	0 feet
	Not fire-resistance rated	0 hours	3 feet*
Projections	Fire-resistance rated	1 hour on the underside	2 feet*
	Not fire-resistance rated	0 hours	3 feet
Openings in walls	Not allowed	N/A	< 3 feet
	Unlimited	0 hours	3 feet*
Penetrations	All	Comply with Section R302.4	< 3 feet
		None required	3 feet*

For SI: 1 foot = 304.8 mm.

N/A = Not Applicable

a. For residential subdivisions where all dwellings are equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler systems installed in accordance with Section P2904, the fire separation distance for nonrated exterior walls and rated projections shall be permitted to be reduced to 0 feet, and unlimited unprotected openings and penetrations shall be permitted, where the adjoining lot provides an open setback yard that is 6 feet or more in width on the opposite side of the property line.

Delete footnote a.

Proposed Code Change – Need and Reason

It is reasonable to delete this footnote because the code doesn't define what a subdivision is and there is no way to apply this footnote in a fair manor. Could a subdivision be one lot, two lots? It may be possible to use this philosophy when an area is first platted but it becomes very problematic to try to apply this to existing lots because it requires all of the properties in an area to have fire sprinklers. Existing buildings will not have sprinklers. Furthermore, it gives special treatment to a lot owner if there is open space on an adjoining lot. This effectively limits what that adjoining lot owner can do based on "the neighbor got there first". How do you deny a permit to a homeowner because of something an adjoining owner did? Code philosophy has always been based on the correlation of a building located on its own lot with no credit being given for space on an adjoining lot that is not under the jurisdiction or the owner in question. This code section is so confusing that it will result in a lack of uniformity where ever it is used. This code change is necessary to avoid confusion and treat all property owners equally. This proposal is reasonable because it continues to provide a minimum level of fire and life safety while not creating a special class of property owners.

Proposed Code Change – Cost/Benefit Analysis

This proposal will not result in any cost increases.

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 Table R302.1(2)

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