

4. Panel would like to see the architect explore matching the municipal guardrail on the side of the patio with the proposed guardrail to that it is complementary.

Accessibility

5. The Panel noted the patio is not accessible as it is mid-level, and questioned if the Building Code would allow that.

That the Advisory Design Panel supports the proposal and requests the applicant work with staff to address the ADP comments. The Advisory Design Panel does not request to see the proposal again.

Moved by P. DuPont
 Seconded by M. Donaldson

CARRIED

The applicant team left the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

B. Murdoch entered at 3:40 p.m.

D. Brownlie entered at 3:45 p.m.

File No. DP001848
 2077 Garibaldi Way
 1st Review

Melissa Laidlaw, RMOW staff, introduced the

Development Permit Application for a development consisting of 14 employee-restricted residential townhouse units contained in two seven-plex buildings and 6 market residential townhouse units contained in two triplex buildings.

This proposed development was previously reviewed by the ADP on June 2, 2021 under Rezoning Application RZ001144, wherein the ADP provided comments on the site planning, circulation, density, massing and the preliminary landscape plan for the proposed 20-unit townhouse development. At that meeting, the ADP was unanimous in their support of the rezoning/density proposal but recommended that the applicant work further on the unit articulation and massing of the seven unit buildings, interior end layouts, and site circulation related to the driveways of the market housing units.

B. Murdoch, architect, presented the proposal:

- The architectural form, colours and materials have evolved.
- The back to back unit layout allows for a more substantial planted area in front of the units.
- One looks at the roofscape as they drive down into the site, therefore the roofs are articulated.
- South side and north side of building have end windows.
- For the employee buildings, each unit is identifiable as a distinct unit. Two distinct outdoor areas with difference purpose and character.

R. Velenosi entered at 4:10 p.m.

Site Context and Landscaping

1. Panel noted that the improvements at the townhouse entries and the larger planting islands in front of the building improves the streetscape.

2. Panel commented that the landscaping is robust and friendly, but cautioned the use of paper birch beside a driveway.
3. Panel appreciated that there are two outdoor amenity spaces that residents can use, and support incorporation of the natural rock features into the play space.
4. Panel commented that there may be limited sun to the open amenity space, but recognized there are other nearby park areas to walk to.
5. Resolve grading at rear of employee townhouses.

Form and Character

1. Generally, Panel is pleased with the proposal, previous comments have been well addressed. The panel appreciated the having good drawings to review
2. Panel felt the scale and density has come together really well. The facade articulation and form has evolved nicely, with a clean rhythm.
3. The form and character is suitable and contemporary.

Materials, Colours and Details

1. Panel liked the nice combination of materials that respect wildfire guidelines, noting also that the materials match each other and reflect the contemporary vision for Whistler.
2. Panel felt the balconies are a little lean.
3. Panel suggested the rear elevation for the triplexes may be further articulated, with an opportunity to improve the bottom floor elevation like on the front.
4. Panel recommends a lighter colour for the roof to break up the two slopes and reduce the heat island effect.
5. Panel suggest roof overhands on all roofs would be beneficial for Whistler's climate.
6. The panel found the balconies were "tight – and would prefer more private outdoor space.
7. The panel requests that surface mounted vents and mechanical items be shown on exterior elevations and roof plan drawings.

That the Advisory Design Panel supports the proposal, and appreciates the high quality of proposal and design, and requests the applicant to work with staff to address the ADP comments. The Advisory Design Panel does not request to see the proposal again.

Moved by P. DuPont
Seconded by M. Donaldson

CARRIED

OTHER BUSINESS

- June 15 ADP meeting will be held in person. The meeting will include two site visits followed by lunch and an in person meeting at MYAC.

MOTION TO TERMINATE

Details

10. Several types of units have a 'dark 2nd bedroom' i.e. no window. Although these spaces are permitted by a BC Building Code due to presence of sprinklers system, unless it is a storage room, the livability of this space as a second bedroom, den, baby room or office space is questionable. Whistler needs more bedrooms, not storage rooms.

Moved by: B. Martin
Seconded by H. Owens

That the Advisory Design Panel would like the proposal to be revised and come back prior to advancing the rezoning with particular attention to the west side massing, details, planting, roof lines, circulation both driving and pedestrian, internal livability of the units and consideration for an increased density if it demonstrates a benefit and addresses other concerns.

CARRIED

Applicant Team and RMOW Manager of Project Planning, John Chapman left meeting at 4.06 PM.

File No RZ1144

3rd Review

2077 Garibaldi
Way

RMOW Planner, Roman Licko and the Applicant Team of Brent Murdoch of Murdoch and Company along with Dave Brownlie entered the meeting at 4.10PM. Councilor Jackson also re-joined the meeting.

Roman Licko introduced the rezoning proposal which has previously been reviewed twice by the panel; August 2020 and in December 2017. This is a mixed use project proposing 14 employee townhouse units and six market triplex homes.

Brent Murdoch advised on the following:

1. This Garibaldi Way proposal predates the RMOW call to provide for more affordable housing.
2. The area is disturbed and completely cleared. On the south east of the site is Aspen Drive made up of duplex and triplex homes. Garibaldi Way is mostly single family homes with town houses.
3. The 20 meter tree buffer setback from Highway 99 has been challenging to comply with.
4. Due to the current construction environment where builders and contractors are struggling to provide affordable housing alongside market developments at a reasonable cost, the applicant discussed the site plan and massing, rather than going into too much architectural detail. Current construction and plumbing prices are escalating at 30%.
5. The finished grade will be brought up 1.5-2m higher to reduce the steep driveway gradient down to the site.

6. The length of the access road has been extended to reduce road grades. The garbage room and mailbox kiosk will be located at the top of the site off a layby to reduce larger vehicles coming down into the main housing area.
7. There is a designated fire lane along the top and a designated area for snow dumping.
8. As you drive down to the buildings, the road will be 6 meters wide which will be narrowed to 4 meters but still wide enough for fire trucks to set up properly if necessary and snow removal vehicles.
9. There are 48 parking stalls.
10. The landscaping will be casual rather than substantial and towards the south east side of the site, there is an area to be enhanced as a passive playground taking into account the natural rocky terrain and landscape.
11. All four buildings have been pushed back from the road to ensure turnaround and backing out is possible.
12. A new retaining wall bylaw will make it possible to create retaining terraces in a challenging area without any other variance requirements.
13. The additional fill planned means the site will be at the same or below the site lines of the existing adjacent Aspen Drive buildings.
14. The existing floor plans are provided as a guide today and more clarity will be provided at a later date. The town houses are larger in size and will accommodate young families and “empty nesters”. There will also be a garage with good storage. The buildings are consistent with neighboring development areas.
15. Due to low confidence with actual building costs at this time, the overall form, color and texture will be confirmed at a later date to ensure that the buildings are economically possible.

Panel offers the following comments:

Site Context and Circulation, including Accessibility

1. Panel questioned how the triplexes are proposed to back out of their parking stalls, also that some driveway access may be blocked by cars in an adjacent driveway.
2. The area between Building B & C i.e. “the Hammerhead” appears to be a lot of asphalt which could be better used as green space. The panel also suggested the “Hammerhead” be flipped to the opposite side of the lane in front of the duplex houses to create a more quality community space. This could also relieve any potential parking/ access issues depending on the Fire Department requirements.
3. The Panel recognize the difficulties designing a triangular site but are overall in agreement that the circulation has been improved and the designers have addressed the previous concerns about snow clearing, amenity space provision and turning radius.

Building Massing, Architecture Form and Character

1. Panel suggested that the southern exterior wall of each “seven-plex” building could be made into a living/ kitchen space rather than the current proposal which has stairwells.
2. Panel would like more detail on the elevations of the site and how the longer “seven-plex” units are going to be broken up including form and finishes.

Landscaping

1. Panel support the landscaping proposals as they exist.
2. The Panel discussed the merits of trying to enlarge the outdoor area by reducing the 20 meter tree buffer between Highway 99 and the site. It was confirmed by the representatives of the RMOW Planning department that the 20 meter highway tree buffer should remain.

Moved by H. Owens
Seconded by G. Brumpton

That the Advisory Design Panel are unanimous in their support of this rezoning/ density proposal but recommend that the applicant work further on the unit articulation and massing of the seven unit buildings, interior end layouts and site circulation related to the driveways of the market housing units.

CARRIED

Applicant Team left meeting at 4.50 PM.

Other Business

Planning Bulletin
for Gross Floor
Area Exclusions
of Detached and
Duplex Dwellings
– In-Ground
Basement Floor
Areas and Other
Exclusions

RMOW Director of Planning, Mike Kirkegaard and Councilor D. Jackson presented an update and some context about the Planning Bulletin and how the RMOW have been tackling this issue about over height crawl spaces in buildings that are built on sloping terrain.

The sloping nature of Whistler’s topography was allowing detached and duplex dwellings to be built with an opportunity to have space in the lower level i.e. “Crawl Spaces” that would later become a habitable area without a permit which raised safety and form considerations.

In 2012 the RMOW made it a priority to address the issue of unpermitted over height crawlspaces. An amendment to the Zoning Bylaw created regulation in which basements could be excluded from the calculation of maximum gross floor area if the lowest floor is more than 50% below ground. With this regulation change, developers became more creative in terms of other exclusions e.g. mechanical, stacking and stepping. In 2016 the RMOW further refined the Zoning Bylaw regulations permit “in-ground basement floor area” to be excluded from the calculation of maximum gross floor for detached and duplex dwellings. The exclusion applies to the lowest floor of the dwelling