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

File No: 98-0078	INTERPRETATION	Page 1 of 1	
Interpretation Date:	September 17, 2003		
Building Code Edition:	BC Building Code 1998	BC Building Code 1998	
Subject:	Fabric Canopies and Marquees		
Keywords:	Fabric, awning, canopy, marquee		
Building Code Reference(s):	3.1.5.5., 3.2.3.20.(1)	3.1.5.5., 3.2.3.20.(1)	

Question:

- 1. Although Sentence 3.2.3.20.(1) for fabric canopies and marquees appears under the subsection for exposure protection and spatial separation, does it imply that a fabric awning is permitted on a building of noncombustible construction?
- 2. Would the fabric awning also have to comply with Article 3.1.5.5.?
- 3. Does testing to CAN/ULC-S109M imply compliance with Article 3.1.5.5.?

Interpretation:

1. Yes.

Since Sentence 3.2.3.20.(1) permits fabric awning, canopy or marquee located within or attached to a building of any type of construction, therefore, if the fabric conforms to CAN/ULC-S109M it is permitted in a building required to be of noncombustible construction.

2. No.

The intent of Sentence 3.2.3.20.(1) is to reduce the probability of fire spread across the surface of the fabric to the other parts of the building. Article 3.1.5.5. addresses the ability of the exterior wall assembly to resist flame propagation up the outside of a building.

3. No.

Since CAN/ULC-S109M required by Sentence 3.2.3.20.(1) is a different test than CAN/ULC-S134 required by Article 3.1.5.5., therefore, fabric in compliance with CAN/ULC-S109M does not imply compliance with Article 3.1.5.5.

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.