



PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

SACRAMENTO VALLEY ASSOCIATION OF BUILDING OFFICIALS

Committee Chair: [Paul Klein](#) PH: 530-538-7541
Vice Chair: [Mark Wood](#) PH: 530-757-5610

Committee Supported Responses Code Review Committee Question/Survey for October

MEMBERS

- [Carey Boyd](#)
- [Jon Delling](#)
- [Ryan Devore](#)
- [Richard Essenwanger](#)
- [Alan Klee](#)
- [George Kellogg](#)
- [Don Little](#)
- [Steve Merck](#)
- [Michelle Menszer](#)
- [Dave Newman](#)
- [Gary Scott](#)
- [Robert Stetson](#)

Subject: Mechanical Equipment in a 1-Hr Ceiling Assembly

1. Per CBC Section 703, would your jurisdiction allow mechanical equipment to be placed between the membranes of a 1-hr fire resistive roof-ceiling assembly?

	YES		NO
5	50%	5	50%

Comments by Spokespersons

- Appears to reference the wrong code section. But, in general, the answer is yes with penetration or access ratings required.
- Maybe with listings for equipment, combustion air, dampers etc.

Comments by Non-Jurisdictional Spokespersons

- It would depend on the system used, but in most of the ones I have seen, the primary fire resistance comes from gypsum applied to the bottom chord of the truss. The attic access would need to be dealt with.
- This is commonly done when there are heating units in an attic for instance in a senior residence facility. As long as there are dampers at the ceiling, it should not be a problem. Otherwise, you would have to put all of the mechanical units on the roof, which doesn't make a lot of sense and would not be allowed by the Planning Departments in most jurisdictions.

Code Review Committee Supported Response

1. Subject: Mechanical Equipment in a 1-Hr Ceiling Assembly:

No, given the State Fire Marshall's code interpretation #05-022 issued 9/1/2005 and a discussion with John Taeker from Underwriters Laboratory (UL).

Subject: Occupancy Separation and Aggregate Area Calculation

2. Two buildings have been combined so they could be assumed to be one building (per section 503.3 exception) due to the location on the property. The buildings contain two occupancies: Building A contains a B-occupancy, and Building B contains an A occupancy. Would your jurisdiction require an occupancy separation?

	YES		NO
10	100%	0	0%

Comments by Spokespersons

- Occupancy separation based on level of A-occupancy and on physical locations of buildings w/ respect to each other and requirements of CBC Table 5-A.
- Yes per Table 3-B.

- Way too vague to answer directly. Should be determined on a case by case basis. But, in general, the answer is yes.
- 2. We would only require one of the walls to provide the occupancy separation.
- No if an A-3.
- 2. Could depend on some additional information which is not given herein.

Comments by Non-Jurisdictional Spokespersons

- Probably, but depends on the distance between buildings. If they were 20+ feet apart I may not require it.
- 2. They either need to be separated to an assumed property line per Table 5-A or they would have to have an occupancy separation between them. However, I suppose the argument could be made that, since they are not right next to each other, the fire danger is not as great as if they had a shared wall.

Code Review Committee Supported Response

2. Subject: Occupancy Separation and Aggregate Area Calculation

Due to lack of responses and vagueness of question, the Code Review Committee will rephrase the question and present it at a later time.