

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

### IRC-8, R302.2.2-R302.2.4

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

---

### Proposed Code Change - Language

**R302.2.2 Parapets.** Parapets constructed in accordance with Section R302.2.3 shall be constructed for *townhouses* as an extension of exterior walls or common walls in accordance with the following:

1. Where roof surfaces adjacent to the wall or walls are at the same elevation, the parapet shall extend not less than 30 inches (762 mm) above the roof surfaces.
2. Where roof surfaces adjacent to the wall or walls are at different elevations and the higher roof is not more than 30 inches (762 mm) above the lower roof, the parapet shall extend not less than 30 inches (762 mm) above the lower roof surface.

**Exception:** A parapet is not required in the two cases above when the roof is covered with a minimum class C roof covering, and the roof decking or sheathing is of noncombustible materials or approved fire retardant treated wood for a distance of 4 feet (1219 mm) on each side of the wall or walls, or one layer of  $\frac{5}{8}$ -inch (15.9 mm) Type X gypsum board is installed directly beneath the roof decking or sheathing, supported by a minimum of nominal 2-inch (51 mm) ledgers attached to the sides of the roof framing members, for a minimum distance of 4 feet (1219 mm) on each side of the wall or walls and there are no openings or penetrations in the roof within 4 feet (1219 mm) of the common walls.

3. A parapet is not required where roof surfaces adjacent to the wall or walls are at different elevations and the higher roof is more than 30 inches (762 mm) above the lower roof. The common wall construction from the lower roof to the underside of the higher roof deck shall have not less than a 1-hour fire resistance rating. The wall shall be rated for exposure from both sides.

**R302.2.3 Parapet construction.** Parapets shall have the same fire resistance rating as that required for the supporting wall or walls. On any side adjacent to a roof surface, the parapet shall have noncombustible faces for the uppermost 18 inches (457 mm), to include counterflashing and coping materials. Where the roof slopes toward a parapet at slopes greater than 2 units vertical in 12 units horizontal (16.7 percent slope), the parapet shall extend to the same height as any portion of the roof within a distance of 3 feet (914 mm), but in no case shall the height be less than 30 inches (762 mm).

**R302.2.4 Structural independence.** Each individual *townhouse* shall be structurally independent.

**Exceptions:**

1. Foundations supporting *exterior walls* or common walls.
2. Structural roof and wall sheathing from each unit may fasten to the common wall framing.
3. Nonstructural wall and roof coverings.
4. Flashing at termination of roof covering over common wall.
5. *Townhouses* separated by a common 1-hour fire resistance rated wall as provided in Section R302.2.

### Proposed Code Change – Need and Reason

There are two separate sections of the Residential Code dealing with buildings adjacent lot lines. Section R302.1 and Table R302.1(1) provides requirements for all buildings regulated under the Residential Code including dwellings, accessory structures, and townhouses. There are no requirements for parapets for these structures even though they may be permitted to be constructed to a lot

line, be of unlimited area, and be unlimited in number. R302.2.2 requires a parapet for townhouses at the very location where it is not required for any other structure. Townhouses are required to have sprinkler systems. It is inconsistent to require parapets for one structure and not for the next, especially when the more restrictive rule applies to the building with sprinkler protection. The proposal is to delete the parapet requirements for townhouses to bring the rules in line with those for all other structures regulated in the Residential Code.

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

The proposed change will reduce construction costs.

## 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).

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).  
2012 IRC R302.2.2

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