

HOUSE BILL 608: Safety Requirements for Elevators.

2023-2024 General Assembly

Committee:	House Rules, Calendar, and Operations of the	Date:	May 2, 2023
Introduced by: Analysis of:	House Rep. Goodwin Second Edition	Prepared by:	Howard Marsilio Staff Attorney

OVERVIEW: House Bill 608 would change elevator safety requirements for certain rental accommodations and require the Building Code Council to amend the North Carolina State Building Code accordingly.

CURRENT LAW: Section 1 of S.L. 2022-56 (Weston's Law) amended G.S. 143-143.7 to require elevators in private residences, cottages, or similar accommodations that are rented for at least 15 days in a calendar year to meet the following requirements:

- The gap between the hoistway face of the landing door and the hoistway face of the elevator car door cannot exceed four inches.
- Elevator doors and gates must be rigid enough to withstand a force of 75 pounds applied horizontally without permanent deformation and without either causing a deflection in the door greater than three-quarters of an inch or displacing the door or gate from its tracks.

If an elevator does not comply with these requirements, the landlord must prevent its operation until it has been brought into compliance.

Section 4 of S.L. 2022-56 required the Building Code Council to amend Section R321 of the North Carolina Residential Code, which governs elevators in one- and two-family dwellings, to be consistent with standards governing the rigidity of elevator car doors and the maximum gap between the elevator car door and the hoistway door established by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) in the 2016 edition of ASME A17.1 and the provisions of that act.

BILL ANALYSIS:

Section 1 would amend G.S. 143-143.7 to require elevators in accommodations rented for 15 days or more in any calendar year to meet the following requirements:

- Horizontal sliding elevator car doors and gates must be designed and installed such that after the car door or gate has been subjected to a force of 75 pounds applied horizontally on a four inch by four inch area at right angles to any location on the car door or gate when fully closed, there is no more than a 4.75 inch gap between the hoistway face of the landing door, the door space guard, or the door baffle, and the hoistway face of the car door or gate, and the door or gate is not permanently deformed or displaced from its guides or tracks.
- Folding elevator car doors must be designed and installed such that after the car door has been subjected to a force of 75 pounds applied horizontally using a four-inch diameter sphere at any location within the folds of the door when fully closed, there is no more than a 4.75 inch gap between the hoistway face of the landing door, the door space guard, or the door baffle, and the

Jeffrey Hudson Director



Legislative Analysis Division 919-733-2578

This bill analysis was prepared by the nonpartisan legislative staff for the use of legislators in their deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.

House Bill 608

Page 2

hoistway face of the car door, and the door is not permanently deformed or displaced from its guides or tracks.

Section 2 would require the Building Code Council and code enforcement officials to follow standards consistent with 2016 ASME A17.1 requirements governing the rigidity of elevator car doors and the maximum gap between the car door and hoistway door in one- and two-family dwellings, except where those requirements are superseded by G.S. 143-143.7, as amended by this act.

This section would also require the Building Code Council to adopt a rule amending Section R321 of the 2018 North Carolina Residential Code to incorporate these standards. The rule adopted by the Council would be subject to the delayed effective date applicable to rules with respect to which 10 or more written objections have been received.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Section 1 of the act becomes effective October 1, 2023. The remainder of the act would be effective when it becomes law.

*Bill Patterson, Legislative Analysis Division, substantially contributed to this summary.