



At Building Standards ...

In January it was reported by Tom Young, Executive Director of Protection and Emergency Services, that the Building Standards Unit and the Office of the Fire Commissioner had been combined into one unit known simply as “Building and Fire Safety.”

But what does the merger of these two work units mean to industry? There are three main benefits.

First, reflecting more closely the relationship between the National Building Code (NBC) and the National Fire Code (NFC). The following excerpts are taken from the pages prefacing both the NBC and the NFC.

“A special relationship exists between the National Building Code and the National Fire Code with respect to fire safety. The contents of both Codes must be considered in building design, construction and maintenance....”

“The two Codes have been developed as complementary and coordinated documents in order to reduce to a minimum the possibility of conflict in their respective contents. To aid in their effective application, fire and building officials must be fully conversant with the fire safety standards of both Codes. Such officials should be involved both in the review and approval of plans with respect to fire safety prior to granting a building permit and with the inspections of buildings for fire safety. This is the only way to determine that all known hazards have been considered and a satisfactory standard of fire safety has been achieved.”

Second, a broadened platform for delivery of services to a diverse client base, comprised both of industry professionals and consumers alike. The partitions are down, dismantled by the benefits of delivering building safety provisions from both the NBC and NFC that parallel one another.

Added to these benefits are the resources of the larger Branch. Within Protection and Emergency Services there exists an opportunity to explore new avenues of training and education delivery through the “Public Safety and Sask911 Unit.” §

What's Inside ...

The UBAS Amendment Regulations, 2005	2
SPAG News	2
Interesting Links	2
Objective-Based Codes	3
WETT Saskatchewan Course Schedule	3
Looking Back - Applying Building Codes to Existing Buildings	4
Building Standards contact information	8

Attached to this Issue ...

- SaskPower Bulletin 01-2005
- Appendix to the UBAS Regulations

The Uniform Building and Accessibility Standards Amendment Regulations, 2005

Effective April 6 of this year, the *National Building Code of Canada (NBC) 1995* was amended to better reflect application in Saskatchewan. There are now a total of twenty revisions, variations and modifications to the NBC applicable in Saskatchewan, seven of which are new or modified from amendments first published in 1998. Attached to this newsletter, as published by the Queen's Printer, in whole, is the Appendix to The Uniform Building and Accessibility Standards Regulations. Specific changes are summarized below.

Sentences 3.2.1.1.(3) and (4)

Sentence (3) corrects the illogical assumption in the NBC that allows a mezzanine to occupy up to 40 percent of a storey regardless of provision of rooms or suites within that storey. This change reflects that the area of a suite may contain a mezzanine up to 40 percent of the area of the room or suite. Also continued in this change is the relaxation from the NBC provision that prohibits obstructions greater than 1070 mm above the floor below the mezzanine.

Sentence (4) continues the approach to room or suite rather than storey.

Clause 3.2.8.2.(1)(c)

Clause (c) aligns certain construction requirements for buildings with the application of changes to Sentences 3.2.1.1.(3) and (4) detailed above.

Sentence 3.5.4.1.(1)

Elevator car dimensions are relaxed, with the amendment of sentence (1), when the building is three storeys or less in building height.

Table 3.7.4.2.A

Requirements for more than one water closet serving females is relaxed when the occupant load of an assembly occupancy is 50 or less.

Sentence 3.8.1.6.(1)

Modified from the original amendment in 1998, this change confirms its intended application to suites in residential occupancies such as hotels and motels, rather than dwelling units.

Sentence 9.10.4.1.(1)

This change aligns the mezzanine requirements in Part 9 of the NBC with those changes demonstrated above in Sentences 3.2.1.1.(3) and (4). §

SPAG News

by Tim Macaulay,
Saskatchewan Health

There is no current news to report from the Saskatchewan Plumbing Advisory Group (SPAG). Those who have questions regarding SPAG should contact Tim Macaulay, Saskatchewan Health at (306) 787-7128, fax (306) 787-3237, or e-mail tmacaulay@health.gov.sk.ca.

Interesting Links

www.oe.nrcan.gc.ca/newbuildings/cbip.cfm
www.advancedbuildings.org
www.retscreen.net/ang/menu.php
www.irc.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/cbd/cbd-e.html

Commercial Building Incentive Program
Advanced Buildings Technologies and Practices
RETScreen International
Canadian Building Digest

Objective-Based Codes

Regarding the advent of the new objective-based codes (Building, Fire and Plumbing), a more detailed schedule is now available.

The publication date for the new objective-based codes is late September 2005. Available first in hardcopy (bound and binder), CD versions are intended to be available by December 2005. Users should note that the “User’s Guides – Intent and Application Statements” will only be published on CD.

Transition training is being piloted across Canada in selected locations this spring. The Provinces and Territories are responsible for the delivery of training, and modules are being turned over to provincial/territorial authorities in the fall of 2005.

From publication of the objective-based codes, Building and Fire Safety staff will undertake an internal review of the applicable documents. Comments and inquiries from stakeholders will be encouraged.

It is our intent that the respective National Building Code (NBC) 2005 and the National Fire Code (NFC) 2005 be adopted as soon as reasonably possible.

In further news, discussions and priorities for the next code cycle are well under way. Many technical issues put aside in favour of pursuing the objective-based formats are front and centre again for the next code cycle. §

Wood Energy Technical Training

Wood Energy Technology Transfer Inc. (WETT Inc.) is a non-profit training and education association managed by a volunteer Board of Directors elected by holders of valid WETT certificates. Through its administrative designate, WETT Inc. functions as the national registrar of the WETT program. Through professional training and public education, WETT Inc. promotes the safe and effective use of wood burning systems in Canada.

In carrying out its mandate to promote increased safety and effectiveness, WETT Inc. maintains the Wood Energy Technical Training program (WETT). WETT is offering the following courses in Saskatoon in June.

Code Compliance	June 26-28
Woodburning Systems	June 29-30

All WETT certificate holders are required to successfully complete at least one continuing education credit every five years in order to maintain certification. Members who achieved certification, at any level, or who last took a course in 2000, are required to successfully complete at least one continuing education credit by the end of 2005.

Registration forms can be found on the WETT website at www.wettinc.ca. Register early to reserve your seat. For further information, please call WETT at 1-888-358-9388. §

Looking Back

Reflective of issues building officials continue to wrestle with when it comes to the application of building codes to existing buildings, the following article is as pertinent today as it was when first written. Written by A.T. Hansen, it was originally published in 1984 by the National Research Council's (NRC) Institute for Research in Construction (IRC). It is reproduced here with permission of the NRC, and is one of 250 Canadian Building Digest articles published between 1960 and 1990.

CBD-230. Applying Building Codes to Existing Buildings - A.T. Hansen

This digest explores the process by which building code requirements, which are generally developed for new construction, can be applied to existing buildings.

The application of building regulations to an existing building can be triggered in several ways. An owner may voluntarily wish to rehabilitate a building, change its use or build an addition. Through his application for a permit to do any of these, which is normally required by law, he sets in motion a process by which his building and what he wishes to do with it are scrutinized by authorities in the light of prevailing building legislation. On the other hand, the owner may not wish to initiate changes, but some enforcement authority may decree that the building must be altered for the public good. The triggering process could be a provincial or municipal law directed at a special class of buildings, or a complaint or periodic inspection revealing an unsafe condition. These situations could result in the imposition of building regulations by the enforcing authority to ensure public safety.

Code enforcement agencies have taken different approaches in regulating the rehabilitation, renovation or repair of existing buildings. Although some agencies have developed separate "stand-alone" codes for this purpose, many attempt to apply the requirements for new buildings as contained in their building codes. Since Canada does not have a generally accepted model code for existing buildings, the latter approach would appear to be a practical solution at the present time for many municipalities.

Evaluating the Options

Applying building codes to existing buildings involves somewhat the same analytical process as is required to assess alternate design proposals for new construction: in both cases the alternatives need to be evaluated. The available economic design options are much more limited, however, for existing buildings than for new construction since each existing building presents a unique set of economic conditions or constraints.

Applying building code requirements to a new building is a reasonably straightforward process. Building codes, however, can describe only a limited number of design alternatives without becoming too complicated. Consequently, many combinations of health and safety measures that can satisfy code objectives are omitted. For this reason building codes allow for equivalents where it can be demonstrated that they will provide the level of safety intended by the codes. Innovative or alternate design features usually require special evaluations or judgements to determine whether they meet these safety levels. In evaluating alternate design solutions for both new and existing buildings, the objective of the requirement (or group of requirements) must be known. Usually it can be defined in a broad, general sense. The more specific one attempts to make the objective, however, the more difficult the task may be. On the other hand, if it is not specific enough, the evaluation of equivalent solutions may be impossible. Determining the objective is therefore an essential starting point in the evaluation process.

Once the objective is defined, one must determine whether the alternative solutions will meet it. Since the methods for such evaluation are relatively primitive, subjective judgement normally forms a substantial component of the evaluation process.

(continued on page 5)

(continued from page 4 — Looking Back - Applying Building Codes to Existing Buildings)

Cost-Benefit Implications

The code requirements that establish minimum acceptable levels of health and safety in new construction are developed with an awareness of the cost of the provisions and the constraints they may impose on design. This is balanced by the perceived benefits in terms of safety or health. Although it may be easy in many instances to establish costs with reasonable accuracy, it is not as easy to establish benefits on a quantitative basis. Building code committees must therefore rely on their collective experience and expertise to make such evaluations and judgements.

In effect, the equation of costs and benefits must be balanced for each code provision or set of conditions. For new construction, the cost of a particular provision may be entirely different from that for construction undergoing renovation or rehabilitation. Perceived benefits may be much more expensive to achieve than in new construction if the code provisions are rigorously applied. Since the code provisions are developed primarily for new construction, they may have to be modified to reflect the cost-benefit equation that applies to existing construction. A design solution to achieve a desired level of safety in new construction may therefore be inappropriate for existing construction.

Applying code requirements to heritage buildings gives rise to special problems. Removing or changing an essential historic feature represents a loss of value (or cost) that cannot be determined with precision. The concern for authenticity may be so strong that the feature must be preserved, thus limiting the choice of design alternatives for that type of building.

Life Safety vs. Property Protection

Although building codes are primarily concerned with life safety, the traditional basis for many requirements is property protection. It may be difficult in many cases to distinguish clearly between life safety and property protection requirements, since there is usually a component of each in the other. With some, such as those relating to egress, the main objective is life safety, whereas with others, such as those relating to spatial separation, it is property protection. In the case of structural design requirements, both elements are important. Most building regulations are in this middle ground.

In considering the cost-benefit equation, it is much easier to deal objectively with matters where property protection is the principal component. Where life safety is the main issue, moral and ethical considerations restrain departures from the intent of codified requirements if there is any doubt about significantly increased risk.

Importance of Code Requirements

The code requirements do not all contribute equally to life safety or property protection. Little, if any, written information exists, however, about their relative importance or ranking. The degree to which a requirement can be modified without significantly changing the risk to life or property therefore varies. In evaluating alternative systems or in modifying code requirements for existing buildings, the designer and the enforcing official must exercise considerable judgement.

Structural Considerations

Although alternative solutions more commonly arise in the area of fire safety, they may also be a factor in structural sufficiency considerations. Again, in the case of new construction, applying building codes is relatively straightforward. Design loads and design procedures are well established and codes make provision for unusual structures that may require special consideration. In most cases it is possible not only to assign costs accurately, but benefits as well. For an existing building, however, the cost of increasing the strength of an existing structure may exceed the potential benefits. As a result, some compromise may have to be sought, such as restrictions on future use.

(continued on page 6)

(continued from page 5 — Looking Back - Applying Building Codes to Existing Buildings)

Where a building has been standing for many years, and its condition or its relationship to adjacent buildings has not changed significantly, one may consider the building to be field tested. If a roof has withstood the effect of snow and wind for 50 or 60 years and shows no signs of distress, one may reasonably assume that it will continue to provide adequate service. The same may be assumed for walls in relation to wind loads. Earthquake loads are more difficult to assess on this basis because of their irregular occurrence. Nevertheless, some assessment may be made in the light of the recorded seismic activity of the area where the building is located.

Where the use of a building changes significantly, and new floor loads are introduced for which the building is not designed, then the only solution may be to increase the load-carrying capacity by modifying the structural components.

Typical Examples

Consider the problem of evaluating an existing apartment building which, because of some legal triggering mechanism, is to be upgraded. Suppose the building has corridors 1000 mm wide. If the occupant load is relatively low and does not require, say, more than one unit of exit width (550 mm) to satisfy the occupant load requirements of a building code, is it reasonable to require the corridor to be enlarged to 1100 mm which would normally be required in the case of new buildings?

The reason for requiring a 1100 mm minimum width for corridors is not known for certain, but presumably it is to allow two full units of exit width which would theoretically allow two people to walk side by side or to pass each other. It also facilitates the movement of furniture into and out of suites and establishes a level of convenience for the use of the corridor.

This requirement also has an essential life safety feature in that it provides sufficient width to allow for rapid evacuation of a floor area in a fire emergency. However, in this example the occupant load does not dictate two full units of exit width, so that a slight reduction should not significantly affect egress in an emergency.

If the corridor width were increased from 1000 mm to 1100 mm in a building about to be constructed, there would probably be no additional cost except for the possible loss of rentable space. In existing construction, however, the cost includes the demolition and reconstruction of the partition. Although the benefits are presumably the same in both cases, the cost may be justified for the former, but not for the latter.

Suppose the same existing building has two stairways serving the common corridors, one of which is unenclosed. If the cost of enclosing the stair is exorbitantly high because of the building layout, is it justified to require the stairs to be enclosed?

This is a much more serious problem. The enclosure of exit stairs has been a cornerstone in building regulations for many years. The obvious purpose is to restrict or prevent the spread of fire and smoke from floor to floor and to provide a safe egress route for the occupants. There have been numerous instances of life loss attributed to open stairs. Unless other compensating measures are taken to meet the objectives of the enclosure requirement, the stairs must be enclosed.

Since the exit stair is open to the corridors, one might try to isolate the egress path from the rooms or suites, where fires are most apt to originate. This can be done by ensuring that the fire separations between the corridors and adjacent rooms or suites are built to the same level of protection required for the separation of exits. In addition, the doors to the suites should have the same level of fire protection as would be required for doors to an exit enclosure. If the floor area in question is not large, and if the building is only four or five storeys high, one might consider providing a fire separation across the corridor. This would establish two zones so that people on the fire side could pass through the fire

(continued on page 7)

(continued from page 6 — Looking Back - Applying Building Codes to Existing Buildings)

separation to an area of safety. Additional safety conditions may also have to be considered, depending on the size, construction and configuration of the building to satisfy the need for a reasonable level of safety for that situation.

As one final example, suppose the same building was built in an era when it was fairly common to have heavy timber floors, and masonry walls up to five or six storeys high. Under modern code requirements, such buildings are required to be of fire-rated noncombustible construction and would not be permitted to have structural wood floor systems. It may not be economically feasible to replace the combustible structural components with noncombustible ones. If the building needs to be upgraded to provide an adequate level of safety, is it reasonable to insist that the building meet all the requirements for noncombustible construction?

It can be generally rationalized that fire-rated noncombustible construction is specified to reduce potential fire severity. Such construction reduces the combustible fuel or fire load by restricting the combustible elements permitted and limits the extent of building involvement in fire through compartmentation at each storey. The minimum rating specified for structural members is intended to prevent premature structural collapse in an uncontrolled fire. Limiting the flame spread rating of combustible components reduces the rate of fire progress. The combined effect of all these measures makes the fire easier to extinguish before it becomes too large.

The noncombustibility requirement has both life safety and property protection components. Life safety implications arise if either fire growth or structural collapse occurs so rapidly that the occupants are trapped in the building before they can be safely evacuated. The larger the building, the more time is needed to escape and the more significant the life safety component becomes. Although establishing a size limit on a combustible building of a particular occupancy is based to some extent on tradition, such decisions are arrived at essentially on the basis of collective committee judgement. Since no articulated basis exists for the specified limits in codes, determining an acceptable alternative is not easy. Other factors should also be considered. Older buildings with heavy masonry walls, even though they are technically combustible, have to their advantage major noncombustible components that do not contribute to a potential fire problem. In addition, heavy timber floors are not as easily ignited in a minor fire, nor are they consumed as rapidly as light wood-frame construction.

Several design options may be considered to compensate for the combustible floor system. Additional protection in the form of gypsum board or lath and plaster, for example, could be provided to prevent the ignition of the floor structure for a length of time equal to the fire resistance rating required for the assembly. Such thermal barrier protection, when properly applied, should effectively neutralize the effect of having a wood structural system for the time specified.

Adding a sprinkler system can also be considered. Although sprinkler systems should not be considered as a panacea in overcoming all building deficiencies, they do provide the designer with a reliable and effective tool that can be used in a variety of situations to help compensate for other deficiencies. When the building appearance is to be retained for esthetic or historic reasons, it may be the only practical alternative. By carefully considering the nature of the deficiencies and compensating for them, it may be feasible to raise the level of fire safety in such buildings to meet the spirit, if not the wording of the code without requiring other extensive and more costly changes.

The preceding examples merely illustrate how building codes could be used to apply to existing buildings. They are not intended as universal solutions because each existing building presents a unique set of conditions and must be evaluated accordingly. It may be necessary in some cases to apply the requirements as laid out in the code for new construction because there may be no reasonable alternative. In other cases, compensating measures may be required such as early-warning systems, compartmentation, or additional egress facilities including fire escapes.

(continued on page 8)

(continued from page 7 — Looking Back - Applying Building Codes to Existing Buildings)

Summary

1. The reason for the code requirement that the alternative design is intended to satisfy should be determined as precisely as possible. This would include establishing whether the requirement is for life safety or property protection.
2. The relative importance of the requirement should be evaluated, particularly with regard to life safety.
3. A cost-benefit assessment should be made if this is practicable.
4. On the basis of these considerations, it should be determined whether there is a reasonable basis for accepting the proposed design solution.

To successfully apply building codes to existing construction, two qualities are necessary: a knowledge of the subject and a constructive attitude. Both the designer, who develops the alternate solutions, and the building official, who must ensure that the standard for public safety has been maintained, have a responsibility to use the code effectively. Where reasonable and constructive attitudes prevail, it is usually possible to arrive at mutually satisfactory design solutions for most existing buildings; however, without adequate knowledge and experience such decisions cannot be made with reasonable confidence. §

The contents of this newsletter are for information and discussion purposes only and are not to be relied upon in any particular situation without the express written consent of Building Standards personnel. Material appearing in this newsletter (other than reprinted material) may be reprinted without permission, provided credit is given and a copy of the publication in which the material appears is sent to Building Standards.

Comments, suggestions and constructive criticism about this newsletter are welcomed.

For further information on items or for additional copies, please contact:

**Saskatchewan Corrections
and Public Safety
Building Standards
310 – 1855 Victoria Avenue
Regina SK S4P 3V7
General Inquiries (306) 787-4113 or
buildingstandards@cps.gov.sk.ca
Fax (306) 787-9273
www.cps.gov.sk.ca/safety/building**

William (Bill) Hawkins, Chief Building Official
(306) 787-4517 whawkins@cps.gov.sk.ca

Vacant, Assistant Chief Building Official
(306) 787-4519

Shelly Toniello, Administrative Coordinator
(306) 787-3642 stoniello@cps.gov.sk.ca

HAVE THINGS CHANGED? Please send us your corrections.
WOULD YOU LIKE YOUR OWN COPY OF THIS NEWSLETTER?
Please submit the following information to the address/fax/e-mail noted above.

Name _____ Title _____

Municipality/Company _____

Address _____

City _____ Province _____ Postal Code _____

Phone _____ Fax _____ E-mail _____