


BC BUILDING CODE INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE

A joint committee with members representing
AIBC, EGBC, BOABC

File No: 18-0127

INTERPRETATION

Page 1 of 1

Interpretation Date:	July 20, 2021
Building Code Edition:	BC Building Code 2018
Subject:	Wall Studs Placed On the Flat
Keywords:	Wall sheathing, studs on flat, supported roof length
Building Code Reference(s):	9.23.10.3.(3)(a) & (b), 9.23.17.2.
Question: 1. When applying Clause 9.23.10.3.(3)(a), is Table 9.23.17.2.-A used to determine the minimum wall sheathing thickness which is applied to wall studs that are placed on the flat and that support only an attic not accessible by a stairway? 2. When applying 9.23.10.3.(3)(b), is the 2.1m width intended to be the supported length of the roof?	
Interpretation: 1. Yes Table 9.23.17.2.-A requires a minimum thickness of 7.5 mm for OSB, O-2 Grade, 7.9 mm for OSB, O-1 Grade, and Waferboard, R-1 Grade and 7.5 mm for exterior type plywood. Note that the sheathing must be attached to the studs with adhesive. 2. Yes The wood studs placed on flat as described in 9.23.10.3.(3) are permitted to support a maximum length of roof of 2.1m. a. If there is no roof overhang, the maximum span of the roof joists or roof trusses is $(2.1 \times 2) = 4.2\text{m}$. b. If there is a 0.6m long roof overhang, the maximum span of the roof joists or roof trusses is $(2.1 - 0.6) \times 2 = 3\text{m}$.  <hr/> Patrick Shek, P.Eng., CP, FEC, Committee Chair	

The views expressed are the consensus of the joint committee with members representing AIBC, EGBC and BOABC, which form the BC Building Code Interpretation Committee. The Building and Safety Standards Branch, Province of BC and the City of Vancouver participate in the committee's proceedings with respect to interpretations of the BC Building Code. 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.