

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENT FORM FOR PROPOSED CODE CHANGES

(This form must be submitted electronically)

### IRC-67, R311.3 (REV 2/3/2012)

Author/requestor: Richard Lockrem

Email address: rich.lockrem@state.mn.us

Telephone number: 651.284.5868

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

---

### Proposed Code Change - Language

Please provide your proposed code change in strikeout/underline format. Provide the *specific* language you would like to see changed, with new words underlined and words to be deleted should be ~~stricken~~. Also, state whether the language contained in your proposal is from a code book or from an amendment currently found in Minnesota Rule. (You may provide the language (electronically) on a separate, attached sheet).

**R311.3 Floors and landings at exterior doors.** There shall be a landing or floor on each side of each exterior door. The width of each landing shall not be less than the door served. Every landing shall have a minimum dimension of 36 inches (914 mm) measured in the direction of travel. Exterior landings shall be permitted to have a slope not to exceed ¼ unit vertical in 12 units horizontal (2-percent).

**Exception:** Exterior balconies less than 60 square feet (5.6 m<sup>2</sup>) and only accessible from a door are to have a landing less than 36 inches (914 mm) measured in the direction of travel.

**R311.3.1 Floor elevations at the required egress doors.** Landings or finished floors at the required egress door shall not be more than 1½ inches (38 mm) lower than the top of the threshold.

**Exception:** The landing or floor on the exterior side shall not be more than 7¾ inches (196 mm) below the top of the threshold provided the door does not swing over the landing or floor.

Where exterior landings or floors serving the required egress door are not at grade, they shall be provided with access to grade by means of a ramp in accordance with Section R311.8 or by a stairway in accordance with Section R311.7.

**R311.3.2 Floor elevations for other exterior doors.** Doors other than the required egress door shall be provided with landings or floors not more than 7¾ inches (196 mm) below the top of the threshold.

**Exception:** A landing is not required where a stairway of two or fewer risers that is less than 30 inches (762 mm) in height is located on the exterior side of the door, provided the door does not swing over the stairway. The stairway height shall be measured vertically from the interior floor surface to the finished grade.

**R311.3.3 Storm and screen doors.** Storm and screen doors shall be permitted to swing over all exterior stairs and landings.

**Proposed Code Change – Need and Reason**

Please provide a thorough explanation of the need for this change and why this proposed code change is a reasonable change. During the rulemaking process, the Agency must defend the need and reasonableness of all its proposed changes. The Agency must submit evidence that it has considered all aspects of the proposal. (You may provide the need and reason (electronically) on a separate attached sheet).

The proposal as prepared utilizes the 2012 IRC text except for the revision to the exception for Section R311.3.2. This revision is based on the 2007 MSBC amendment required by builders during the 2006 IRC adoption process.

Explanation as written in the SONAR for adoption of the 2006 IRC:

There is difficulty meeting the two-riser condition required in the national code. Local builders need approximately 20 inches for many exterior stairs or temporary stairs placed on new homes. These initial stairs are typically built without frost footings and are normally replaced later by decks. If footings and a landing are required it increases unreasonably the current and future costs for homeowners. The 30-inch dimension will allow a reasonable tolerance and equals the maximum requirement for a floor or deck surface without requiring a guardrail in section 312.1. The change is also consistent with the Minnesota R315.1 amendment to the 2000 IRC that changed the handrail requirement from 2 to 4 risers to address common garage stairs.

**Proposed Code Change – Cost/Benefit Analysis**

Please consider whether this proposed code change will increase/decrease costs or indicate that it will not have any cost implications and explain how it will not. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset somehow by a life safety or other benefit? If so, please explain. Are there any cost increases/decreases to enforce or comply with this proposed code change? If so, please explain. (You may provide the cost/benefit analysis (electronically) on a separate, attached sheet).

There will be no additional costs related to the approval of the proposed amendment.

**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).  
**R311.3**

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). **Replaces MR 1309.0311, R311.4.3 which was renumbered in the 2012 IRC to R311.3.**

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?  
**Parties affected are, building officials, contractors and designers. There are no new requirements created by the proposal.**
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