

BC BUILDING CODE INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE

A joint committee with members representing
AIBC, EGBC, BOABC

File No: 24-0098

INTERPRETATION

Page 1 of 2

Interpretation Date:	September 16, 2025
Building Code Edition:	BC Building Code 2024
Subject:	Accessible Clearance Between Doors in an Elevator Vestibule
Keywords:	Accessible, Doors, Elevator
Building Code Reference(s):	3.8.3.6.(12)

Question:

Does the requirement for doors in series to be separated by 1350 mm plus the width of any doors swinging into the space in the path of travel apply to doors at an elevator vestibule, where a door swings into the vestibule and typical sliding elevator doors are at the opposite side of the vestibule?

Interpretation:

The answer depends on the configuration of the vestibule.

Sentence 3.8.3.6.(12) is inserted below:

12) A vestibule located in an *accessible* path of travel shall be arranged to allow the movement of wheelchairs between doors and shall provide a distance between 2 doors in series of not less than 1 350 mm plus the width of any door that swings into the space in the path of travel from one door to another.

Where a swing door provides the access into an elevator vestibule, a person must pass through the swing doorway to reach the elevator. The elevator doors do not swing into the vestibule because they are sliders. If the wall containing the swing door is parallel to the wall containing the elevator doors, and the width of the vestibule requires movement straight through the vestibule, the swing door will swing into the path of travel through the vestibule to the elevators. In that case, if the door swings into the vestibule, the minimum required distance between the swing door in the closed position and the elevator doors is 1350 mm plus the width of the swing door.



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: 24-0098

INTERPRETATION

Page 2 of 2

For other vestibule configurations, such as the wall containing the swing door at 90° to the wall containing the elevator doors, the swing door may or may not swing into the path of travel. Also, many elevator vestibules are oversized lobbies where occupants can move into the lobby and wait for the elevator. If the elevator vestibule is sufficiently large to accommodate persons in wheelchairs out of the most direct path of travel, i.e., if there is a path of travel that is at least 1350 mm long beyond the swing arc of the swing door, this is considered to comply with Sentence 3.8.3.6.(12).



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.