

BC BUILDING CODE INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE

A joint committee with members representing

AIBC, EGBC, BOABC

File No: 18-0175

INTERPRETATION

Page 1 of 2

Interpretation Date:	April 19, 2022
Building Code Edition:	BC Building Code 2018
Subject:	Wall exposed to another wall in sprinklered compartments
Keywords:	Exposure, D _o , unprotected opening, fire compartments
Building Code Reference(s):	Division B: 3.2.3.14.(1), 3.2.3.14.(2), 3.2.3.14.(3)

Question:

Sentence 3.2.3.14.(3) exempts the separation distance (D_o) in Sentence 3.2.3.14.(1) in sprinklered fire compartments that are not on opposite sides of a firewall. However, Sentence (3) does not explicitly mention fire resistance rating requirements of Sentence 3.2.3.14.(2).

For fire compartments that are not on opposite sides of a firewall, do the fire separation requirements of Sentence 3.2.3.14.(2) still apply if the compartments are sprinklered?

Interpretation:

No.

Sentence 3.2.3.14.(1) requires unprotected openings in the exterior wall of a fire compartment to be separated by a distance (D_o) of unprotected openings in a separate fire compartment when the walls are at an angle of less than 135°. The distance (D_o) is calculated based on the greater limiting distance of the 2 exposing building faces and the angle of exterior walls relative to each other.

Sentence 3.2.3.14.(2) requires the exterior walls to have a fire resistance rating commensurate with the required fire rating between the fire compartments and the remainder of the building. The fire resistance rating of the exterior walls shall be measured from the point of intersection to a distance (D_o) calculated in Sentence 3.2.3.14.(1).

Unless the compartments are on opposite sides of a firewall, Sentence 3.2.3.14.(3) waives the requirement to determine the distance (D_o) when the compartments are sprinklered.

Sentence (2) requires the fire rating to be applied at a distance (D_o), but in certain circumstances, (D_o) is not required to be determined in accordance with Sentence (3). In that instance the fire resistance rating required in Sentence (2) cannot be applied because the value of the distance (D_o) is not known.

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.

BC BUILDING CODE INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE

A joint committee with members representing
AIBC, EGBC, BOABC

File No: 18-0175

INTERPRETATION

Page 2 of 2

Although Sentence 3.2.3.14.(3) only mentions Sentence 3.2.3.14.(1), the values determined in Sentence (1) are necessary to apply Sentence (2). Therefore it logically follows that the waiver in Sentence (3) applies to both Sentences (1) and (2).



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.

2022-04-19