BC BUILDING CODE INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE AIBC, APEGBC, BOABC, POABC

Interpretation Date:	INTERPRETATION	
	March 27, 2002	File No:
Building Code Edition:	BC Building Code 1998	98-0045
Subject:	Fast response sprinklers	
Keywords:	Automatic sprinkler system; fast response sprinklers; and occupancies	
Building Code Reference(s):	3.2.5.13.(1); 3.2.5.13.(7); and NFPA 13	Page: 1 of 1

Question:

Are fast response sprinklers only required in residential occupancies and in care or detection occupancies as per Sentence 3.2.5.13.(7)?

Interpretation:

No

Sentence 3.2.5.13.(1) requires an automatic sprinkler system to be installed in conformance with NFPA 13 (except for certain *occupancies* where other standards such as NFPA 13D and NFPA 13R are permitted). Therefore, as a minimum, fast response sprinklers are required to be installed where required by NFPA 13 (which requires fast response sprinklers to be installed in *occupancy* types beyond those defined in the Code). Referring to Sentence 2.7.3.1.(1), it is interpreted that there is no conflict between the Code and the referenced standard (NFPA 13).

Sentence 3.2.5.13.(7) should not be applied in isolation. It clarifies that residential occupancies and care or detention occupancies require fast response sprinklers even though NFPA 13 may not require them. That is, the requirement in Sentence 3.2.5.13.(7) to install fast response sprinklers in residential occupancies and care or detention occupancies is in addition to the requirements of NFPA 13. There is no conflict.

R.J. Light, Committee Chair

The views expressed are the consensus of the joint committee of AIBC, APEGBC, BOABC, and POABC, which form the BC Building Code Interpretation Committee. The purpose of the committee is to encourage uniform province wide interpretation of the BC Building Code. These views should not be considered as the official interpretation of legislated requirements based on the BC Building Code, as final responsibility for an interpretation rests with the local *Authority Having Jurisdiction*. The views of the joint committee should not be construed as legal advice.