BC BUILDING CODE INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE

A joint committee with members representing AIBC, EGBC, BOABC

File No: 24-0029	INTERPRETATION	Page 1 of 1
Interpretation Date:	August 13, 2024	
Building Code Edition:	BC Building Code 2024	
Subject:	Limited Mobility Stalls	
Keywords:	Plumbing facilities, Accessibility, Limited mobility, Accessible washroom, Urinal, Water-closet stall	
Building Code Reference(s):	3.8.2.8.(6), 3.8.2.8.(7)	
Question:		
 Does an accessible washroom having less than 10 water-closet stalls require a limited mobility stall? 		

2. Does an accessible washroom containing more than 10 water-closet stalls but less than the next increment of 10 require 2 limited mobility stalls?

Interpretation:

1. No.

The requirement for limited mobility stalls of Sentence 3.8.2.8.(7) is applicable when the accessible washroom has a total of 10 stalls.

When 10 stalls are provided, one of these must be designed for persons with limited mobility conforming to Subsection 3.8.3. When 9 or less stalls are provided, limited mobility requirement does not apply.

2. No.

Sentence 3.8.3.6.(7) is applicable for each increment of 10 stalls. When 20 stalls are provided, two would need to be limited mobility. When 19 stalls or less are provided, only one would need to be limited mobility.

The same interpretation applies to urinals in accessible washroom as per Sentence 3.8.2.8.(6).

an Sheke

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.