

Lower Mainland Technical Committee of Building Officials

Minutes of the September 14, 2016 Meeting
Hosted by the City of Richmond

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

2016 Co-Chairperson: Jagdeep Johal jjohal@tol.bc.ca

LMTC Member contact list Coordinator: Belinda Moen bmoen@abbotsford.ca

Date: September 14, 2016

Location: City of Richmond

1.0 **Welcome Attendees:** Jagdeep Johal chaired this meeting, welcomed everyone to the City of Richmond and called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 pm.

2.0 **Introduction of Members:**

3.0 **Appointment of Scribe:** Darrell Bridge **AHJ:** City of Coquitlam

The next meeting will be held at the City of Coquitlam on Wednesday October 12, 2016 at 12:00 noon for lunch with the meeting starting at 1:00 pm.

4.0 **Attendance:**

Jagdeep Johal	Township of Langley
Oscar Sieg	City of Langley
Norman Tong	Squamish/Lillooet Regional District
James Hook	City of Vancouver
Konrad Jaschke	Bowen Island Municipality
Sherry Searle	City of Whiterock
Darrell Bridge	City of Coquitlam
Charlie Hoeller	City of Surrey
King Luk	City of New Westminster
Jonathan Mearns	City of Richmond
Wil Neish	Corporation of Delta
Nicole Colby	District of West Vancouver

5.0 **Adoption of Minutes:** September 14, 2016 LMTC meeting in the City of Richmond.

Motion to Adopt:

Moved by: Charlie Hoeller
Seconded by: Jonathan Mearns
Carried: Motion Passed

5.0 **Review of Agenda:** Agenda items added: 8.1 – 8.7

Lower Mainland Technical Committee of Building Officials

7.0 Old Business:

7.1	3.2.1.1. Building Height Amendment	James Hook
<i>From March meeting:</i> <i>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.</i> <i>James provided an update that a written request was sent to the NBC committee and he is waiting for a reply.</i>		

7.2	Acceptance of pot lights without air/vapour barrier	Kelly Johnson
<i>Item 8.5 from June meeting.</i> <i>Do other jurisdictions accept a CSA approved “air tight” pot lights without the use of a poly bag?</i> It seems that if the pot light incorporates a flange to seal the poly air/vapour barrier to and the “can” does not contain holes, most jurisdictions will accept the installation without the use of a “poly pan” bag.		

7.3	Spray Foam in an unvented roof space	Jonathan Mearns
<i>Item 8.6 from June meeting.</i> <i>What are other jurisdictions permitting/requiring with respect to using spray foam insulation in Part 9 dwelling units?</i> In an unvented roof assembly some jurisdictions: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Do not permit spray foam,2. Some accept spray foam with an alternative solution, or3. Some accept spray foam without an alternative solution but will require a registered professional design. In vented roof or wall assemblies most jurisdictions will accept spray foam: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. With an certified installer’s certificate, and2. Without an alternative solution. No consensus was reached.		

Lower Mainland Technical Committee of Building Officials

7.4	Four storey SFD	Sherry Searle
<p><i>Item 8.11 from June meeting.</i> <i>Do other jurisdictions accept a garage access of unspecified width in a SFD as a localized depression for the purposes of calculating grade and building height?</i></p> <p>No consensus was reached at the July meeting.</p> <p>Sherry brought three BCAB appeals (No.: 930, 1022A & 1291) for review. Although the general thought was that a driveway that is the full width of the building would not be considered a localized depression, no consensus was reached.</p> <p>Sherry will contact the province for direction on what characteristics should be considered when deciding if these driveways are localized depressions.</p>		

8.0 New Business

8.1	Mobile Retail/Restaurant/Service Businesses	King Luk
<p><i>Vehicles or trailers used to provide a mobile retail or service type business. Would the building department want any involvement with these “mobile buildings” code wise?</i></p> <p>The general consensus is this would be a zoning/bylaw issue. They trailers are vehicles not buildings therefore the building department would not get involved.</p>		

8.2	9.9.10.1.(1). Window Opening Restrictors	Jonathan Mearns
<p><i>A window manufacturer offers a crank style opening device that will restrict the extent it will open to 100 mm. At this point, the device can be over-ridden to allow the window to be opened to meet egress requirements of a window serving a bedroom.</i></p> <p>The general consensus is this constitutes “special knowledge” and would not meet the intent of the code.</p>		

8.3	3.5.3.1. Elevator Control Boxes	Jonathan Mearns
<p><i>Elevator controls have gotten to the point they can be contained in an electrical box/can typically located adjacent to the elevator car door on the uppermost floor. How would other jurisdictions treat this interruption of the fire separation required around the elevator hoistway? Refer to attachment 8.3 for details and pictures.</i></p> <p>The general consensus is it would have to be part of a tested assembly if the box/can was located within the fire separation. Otherwise, it can be located in front of or behind the required fire separation.</p>		

Lower Mainland Technical Committee of Building Officials

8.4	Stretch Code	Jonathan Mearns
<p><i>General information regarding possible future building code that offers multiple tiers for minimum requirements. Charlie Hoeller commented that his understanding is this is being discussed at the RPLC level.</i></p>		

8.5	9.27.1.1.(3). Adhered Stone Tile	Charlie Hoeller
<p><i>How do other jurisdictions deal with adhered stone tile when used as cladding? Part 4, 5 and 9 requirements.</i></p> <p>No consensus for how adhered stone tile is viewed when applying 9.27.</p>		

8.6	Exterior Air Barrier	Sherry Searle
<p><i>How are exterior air barriers dealt with? Are details being required on the plans? Are they inspected in the field?</i></p> <p>No consensus was reached. How jurisdictions handle these varies, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some don't review or inspect, 2. Some don't have an inspection process. I.e: insulation inspection only (building bylaw doesn't include air barriers and rain screen inspection.) 3. If details are provided on the drawings, they will be reviewed in the field. 		

8.7	Large Detached Buildings on Residential properties	James Hook
<p><i>How would other jurisdictions classify this type of building when applying building code requirements?</i></p> <p>Majority agreed that if the detached building serves a residential building and will not contain a residential suite in it, then it will be considered an accessory building.</p>		

9.0 Adjournment of Meeting:

Motion to adjourn:

Moved by:

Oscar Sieg

Seconded by:

Charlie Hoeller

Adjournment of Meeting Time:

4:00 pm

Location of next meeting:

City of Coquitlam

Date of next meeting:

Oct. 19, 2016

2016 Meeting schedule:

- November 9, 2016 Delta
- December 14, 2016 New Westminster