

## Lower Mainland Technical Committee of Building Officials

Minutes of the July 13, 2016 Meeting  
Hosted by the District of West Vancouver

**Note:** The opinions expressed by this Committee in the Minutes of this meeting may be of assistance in determining the appropriate use of materials, equipment or methods of construction, but should NOT be considered as Official Building Code Interpretations.

2016 Chairperson: Henry Kuipers      [hkuipers@district.kent.bc.ca](mailto:hkuipers@district.kent.bc.ca)

2016 Co-Chairperson: Jagdeep Johal      [jjohal@tol.bc.ca](mailto:jjohal@tol.bc.ca)

LMTCC Member contact list Coordinator: Belinda Moen      [bmoen@abbotsford.ca](mailto:bmoen@abbotsford.ca)

Date:            July 13, 2016

Location:      District of West Vancouver

### 1.0 **Welcome Attendees:**

Henry Kuipers chaired the meeting, welcomed everyone to the City of and called the meeting to order at 1:00pm.

### 2.0 **Introduction of Members:**

### 3.0 **Appointment of Scribe: Name:** Jonathan Mearns **AHJ:** City of Richmond

The next meeting will be held at the City of Richmond, on Wednesday, September 13, 2016 at 12:00 noon for lunch and 1:00 pm for the meeting.

### 4.0 **Attendance:**

Stacy McSherry	District of West Vancouver
Randy Maki	Aux. District of West Vancouver / City of North Vancouver
Ray Sept	District of West Vancouver
Oscar Sieg	City of Langley
Jonathan Mearns	City of Richmond
Charlie Hoeller	City of Surrey
Shawn Hagan	City of Port Coquitlam
Perry Halabuza	City of Coquitlam
Dave Butler	Village of Lions Bay
Konrad Jaschke	Bowen Island Municipality
Henry Kuipers	District of Kent
Sherry Searle	City of White Rock
Richard Dohmeier	District of North Vancouver
Norman Tong	Squamish Lillooet Regional District

5.0 **Adoption of Minutes:** June 8, 2016 LMTC meeting in the City of Burnaby.

**Motion to adopt:**

**Moved by:** Charlie Hoeller

**Seconded by:** Perry Halabuza

**Discussion:**

**Carried:** Motion Passed

6.0 **Review of Agenda:**

6.1 **Additional agenda items.** Items 8.2-8.11 added.

7.0 **Old Business:**

7.1	<b>3.2.1.1. Building Height Amendment</b>	<b>James Hook</b>
<i>From March meeting: An apparent wording change makes it clearer and more restrictive. This is not really a change as the previous wording said the same thing but in a different format. James will ask NBC National to clarify.</i>		
Tabled		

8.0 **New Business:**

8.1	<b>Bedroom Definition</b>	<b>Belinda Moen</b>
<i>The City of Abbotsford defines a “bedroom” as a room with a door and a closet, and then a window is required that meets Article 9.9.10.1, and a smoke alarm (for un-sprinklered dwellings, and the room doesn’t have an exterior door).</i>		
<i>This has become an issue for us, as we have a subdivision beyond the 10 minute response time, and therefore the ½ the actual limiting distance is used, and as these are quite narrow lots, no windows are permitted on the side yard elevation. We have started to see some innovation whereas the designer builds in an alcove along the side elevations with windows facing each other, rather than the side yard. However, since bedroom is not a defined term, we have insisted that a room labeled as ‘den’, or ‘office’, or ‘sewing’, or any number of things, are bedrooms if they have a closet. Slippery slope, I know, but how do you protect people from themselves?</i>		
<i>The question is “Do other jurisdictions define a bedroom?”</i>		
No. Most jurisdictions rely on the designers for the labeling of rooms. Some enforce the code requirements for a bedroom even if the room is not labeled as such but this is policy based.		

8.2	<b>Rainscreen Products (drainage mats)</b>	<b>Konrad Jaschke</b>
<p><i>Do other jurisdictions accept manufactured drainage mats to provide the rainscreen cavity behind the cladding (ie. Keene Driwall)</i></p> <p>Yes. Most jurisdictions accept these products. This is supported by the products CCMC reports and that these products meet the required thickness and percentage open. Some jurisdictions still also require Part 5 design and approval by a registered professional.</p>		

8.3	<b>Interpretation 120047</b>	<b>Richard Dohmeier</b>
<p><i>Do other jurisdictions accept and apply Interpretation 120047 with respect to roof top access and building height consideration?</i></p> <p>Yes. All jurisdictions present agree with and apply this interpretation.</p>		

8.4	<b>NFPA 13D for Part 9 Row Houses</b>	<b>Richard Dohmeier</b>
<p><i>3.2.5.12(3)(a) permits the use of NFPA 13D only when a building contains not more than 2 dwelling units. Sprinklered row houses containing more than two dwelling units would then be required to be sprinklered to 13R. Some jurisdictions have bylaws requiring buildings to be sprinklered beyond when the BCBC requires it.</i></p> <p><i>Whether required by the BCBC or by building bylaws, do other jurisdictions accept the use of NFPA 13D rather than 13R for Part 9 row houses?</i></p> <p>Regardless of whether the requirement for sprinklers comes from the BCBC or the building bylaw, the agreement was that compliance to NFPA 13R is required; however, most jurisdictions would entertain an acceptable alternative solution for use of NFPA 13D.</p>		

8.5	<b>Acceptance of pot lights without additional air / vapour barrier</b>	<b>Kelly Johnson</b>
<p><i>Do other jurisdictions accept the use of CSA approved "air-tight" pot lights without the use of an additional air / vapour barrier (poly bag)?</i></p> <p>No consensus was reached. Kelly will contact Zachary May with the Building Safety Standards branch to receive further clarification.</p>		

8.6	<b>Requirements for use of spray foam insulation</b>	<b>Jonathan Mearns</b>
<p><i>What are other jurisdictions permitting or requiring with respect to use of spray foam insulation in Part 9 dwelling units?</i></p> <p>No consensus was reached.</p>		

In an unvented roof assembly:  
 Some jurisdictions do not permit spray foam, others accept spray foam but require an alternative solution, and others do not require an alternative solution but still require review and approval by registered professionals.  
 In vented roof assemblies or walls:  
 Most jurisdictions accept without requiring involvement of a registered professional or alternative solution but do require an installer's certificate.

8.7	<b>Potential corrosive discharge of high efficiency furnaces / water heaters</b>	<b>Oscar Sieg</b>
<p><i>Some high efficiency furnaces and water heaters have a potentially corrosive condensate discharge.          Do other jurisdictions review or have requirements to address this?</i></p> <p>Most jurisdictions agreed that this is outside the scope of the BCBC and would not inspect or require anything to address this.</p>		

8.8	<b>Recessed lighting in a horizontal fire separation with a required rating</b>	<b>Sherry Searle</b>
<p><i>What size and amount of openings do other jurisdictions permit in a horizontal fire separation with a required rating?</i></p> <p>For openings such as pot lights, most jurisdiction apply sentences 3.1.9.3.(5) and 9.10.9.6.(8) which permit openings of combustible outlet boxes up to 160cm<sup>2</sup>. Any openings greater than this are required to be boxed out with drywall to maintain the integrity of the separation. The openings can also be installed to the requirements and limits permitted in Appendix D.</p>		

8.9	<b>Duct insulation in Part 9 attics</b>	<b>Charlie Hoeller</b>
<p><i>What insulation value are other jurisdictions requiring for attic ductwork and a ceiling assembly that contains ductwork?</i></p> <p>Duct work in an unconditioned attic is required to be insulated to not less than that required for the wall or RSI 2.78 (R-16). When ductwork is installed within the insulated ceiling assembly then a total minimum RSI 6.91 (R-40) is required with not less than RSI 2.78 between the duct and unconditioned attic.</p>		

8.10	<b>Shipping containers used in Part 9 dwelling units</b>	<b>Norman Tong</b>
<p><i>Do other jurisdictions accept the use of shipping containers in Part 9 dwelling units?</i></p> <p>This needs to be reviewed on a case by case basis. At times the prescriptive requirements of Part 9 can still be met. Where it cannot be proved that the prescriptive requirements can be met then an alternative solution would be required.</p>		

8.11	<b>Four storey single-family dwelling</b>	<b>Sherry Searle</b>
<i>Do other jurisdictions accept a garage access of unspecified width in a single-family dwelling as a “localized depression” for the purposes of calculating grade and building height?</i>		
No consensus was reached. Tabled.		

**9.0 Adjournment of Meeting:**

**Motion to adjourn:**

**Moved by:** Perry Halabuza

**Seconded by:** Charlie Hoeller

**Adjournment of Meeting Time:** 4:00 pm

**Location of next meeting:** City of Richmond

**Date of next meeting:** Sept 14, 2016

**2016 Meeting schedule:**

- September 14, 2016 Richmond
- October ~~12~~, 19, 2016 Coquitlam
- November 9, 2016 Delta
- December 14, 2016 New Westminster

