


BC BUILDING CODE INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE

A joint committee with members representing
AIBC, APEGBC, BOABC, POABC

File No: 06-0060

INTERPRETATION

Page 1 of 2

Interpretation Date:	June 15, 2010
Building Code Edition:	BC Building Code 2006
Subject:	Residential caretaker suite in medium hazard industrial occupancy
Keywords:	Medium hazard industrial, residential caretaker suite, occupancy separation, fire-resistance classification, suite separation
Building Code Reference(s):	3.1.3.1.(1), 3.1.3.2.(2), 3.2.2, 3.3.1.1, 3.3.4.2.(1)
Question:	<p>An industrial building classified Group F Division 2 has a 2,531.5m² building area, and includes a 181m² residential caretaker suite at the 2nd level. This combination is permitted by Sentence 3.1.3.2.(2) and is intended to limit residential use in a medium hazard industrial occupancy to one residential caretaker suite, directly related and ancillary to the principal industrial function.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Is the residential suite considered a major occupancy requiring application of Subsection 3.2.2 at the 2nd level based on a Group C classification?2. Is a major occupancy fire separation required between the residential suite and the industrial occupancy?3. Is a suite to suite separation required per Articles 3.3.1.1 and/or 3.3.4.2.?
Interpretation:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. No. Since the residential suite is a caretaker suite permitted under Sentence 3.1.3.2.(2), and is intended to be directly integral and ancillary to the principal industrial function, it is not considered a major occupancy and would not require application of Group C classification to the entire building, at the 2nd level, for the purposes of Subsection 3.2.2.2. No. Sentence 3.1.3.1.(1) requires fire separations between different major occupancies in accordance with Table 3.1.3.1. <p> R. J. Light, Committee Chair</p>
<p>The views expressed are the consensus of the joint committee with members representing 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 <i>Authority Having Jurisdiction</i>. The views of the joint committee should not be construed as legal advice.</p>	

BC BUILDING CODE INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE

A joint committee with members representing
AIBC, APEGBC, BOABC, POABC

File No: 06-0060


INTERPRETATION

Page 2 of 2

The caretaker suite is typically an integral and ancillary function of the industrial use and is not considered a separate major occupancy. The NRCC User's Guide – NBC 1995 Fire Protection, Occupant Safety and Accessibility (Part 3) confirms that fire separations between different occupancies are only applied when it is determined adjoining uses are considered major occupancies, and indicates on p. 7: "This does not exempt these major occupancies from the requirements in Section 3.1 that adjoining major occupancies must be separated from each other, even though they occupy less than 10% of the floor area."

3. Yes.

Sentence 3.3.4.2.(1) indicates any residential suite must be separated from the remainder of the building by a 1h fire separation, unless a 45 minute fire separation is permitted under Sentence 3.3.4.2.(2).



R. J. Light, Committee Chair

The views expressed are the consensus of the joint committee with members representing 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.