



Canadian Standards Association  
Mississauga, Ontario  
**To the Part I Committee**

---

Subject No. 3076

Chair: R. Leduc

Date: November 25, 2002

---

Title: Outlets at Intermediate Stair Levels, Rule 26-710(n)

---

**Submitted by:** Louis Itiniant of 293 Armadale Ave., Toronto, Ontario, M6S 3X5 on March 22, 2002

**Proposal:** Amend Rule 26-710(n) to include "Outlets at Intermediate stair levels".

**Reasons for Request:** To avoid long extension cords a code was included that requires outlets not to be more than 12 feet apart. The landing 'outlet' is analogous to the outlet spaced in all the other rooms to avoid long extension cords.

**Supporting Information:** On straight stairways between floors, at 45 degrees, the distance is 12 feet. (The vertical distance between floors is 9 feet, 8 feet wall plus beam, ceiling drywall and flooring.) The 12 feet does not include the landing dimensions. By placing an outlet on each intermediate stair level the 12 foot code can apply both stairs upwards from the landing outlet as well as stairs downwards from the landing outlet.

This outlet could function as a source of power for (a) a vacuum cleaner, (b) a night light to avoid turning on bright hall lights while others are asleep, (c) a telephone and table lamp, space permitting; listing the most obvious uses.

**Chair's Comments:** Current Rule 26-710(n) requires at least one receptacle for each 10 m of length in public corridors and stairways. The submitter is suggesting that receptacles be installed at "Intermediate Stair Levels". Taking into consideration the submitter's "Supporting Information", current Rule 26-710(n) would see a receptacle at approximately every 2nd landing for a multiple storey building.

The proposal has the effect of halving the 10m requirement. I would interpret the submitter's request as an amendment to Rule 26-710-(n) as follows:

"...in each 5m of length or fraction thereof."

**Subcommittee Deliberations (1<sup>st</sup> round):**

Only 7 of 13 members responded but all responses disagreed with the proposal. All of the comments centred around reasons such as:

- Not a safety issue

- Code intended as a minimum standard. If additional receptacles or phone outlets are preferred, it is a design issue at the discretion of the owner.
- Insufficient substantiation for the proposal
- Original Rule already accommodates vacuums. They come with longer cords (5 m or so) than regular appliances

I declare the Subcommittee to have reached consensus on a:

**Subcommittee recommendation:**

To reject the proposal and close the subject.