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

File No: 98-0084	INTERPRETATION	Page 1 of 1	
Interpretation Date:	December 17, 2003		
Building Code Edition:	BC Building Code 1998		
Subject:	Openable windows		
Keywords:	bedroom windows, window window restrictors	bedroom windows, window openings, window restrictors	
Building Code Reference(s):	9.7.1.3.(2), 9.7.1.6.	9.7.1.3.(2), 9.7.1.6.	

## Question:

Is there a conflict between Sentence 9.7.1.3.(2) that requires unobstructed openable windows in bedrooms, and Article 9.7.1.6. that requires guards or restrictors on certain windows?

## Interpretation:

No

Sentence 9.7.1.3.(2) requires that all bedrooms in an unsprinklered suite be provided with an unobstructed openable window with a minimum area of 0.35 sq.m. and a minimum dimension of 380 mm. The purpose of this requirement is to provide a potential escape route from the building in the event of a fire.

Except for windows described in Sentence 9.7.1.6.(2), Sentence 9.7.1.6.(1) requires either guards or restrictors be installed on windows where the sill of such windows is lower than 450 mm above the floor level. Such windows cannot be used as an escape route as contemplated in Sentence 9.7.1.3.(2).

The unobstructed openable window as required in Sentence 9.7.1.3.(2) must have its window sill more than 450 mm above the finished floor level in order to avoid the requirement for guards or restrictors.

Refer to Interpretation 98-0063 for further information of window opening mechanisms.

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.