



WHISTLER

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 2022, STARTING AT 1:30 P.M.

Held at MYAC In Person

PRESENT	Mtgs. YTD (3)
D. Jackson, Council Representative	3
T. Kloepfer, Architect AIBC, Chair	2
H. Owens, Architect AIBC	3
P. DuPont, MBCSLA	3
J. Oprsal, MBCSLA	3
B. Martin, UDI	2
M. Donaldson, Member at Large	3
M. Laidlaw, Manager of Development Planning, RMOW	3
J. Wynott, Recording Secretary, RMOW	3
J. Gresley-Jones, General Manager, Resort Experience, RMOW	1
M. Kirkegaard, Director of Planning, RMOW	1
J. Chapman, Manager of Projects Planning, RMOW	1
T. Napier, Planner, RMOW	1
R. Licko, Planner, RMOW	1

REGRETS	
D. Venter, Architect AIBC	1
K. Lammie, Member at Large	0

GUESTS	
Doug Ramsay, RWA	
Cindy Brenneis, RWA	
Scott Romses, RWA	
Kim Perry, Perry and Associates	
Robert Toth, Beedie Living	
Brent Murdoch, Murdoch + Company	
Jane Song, AKA Architecture	
Anni Terrett, ATA Architectural Design Ltd	
Andrew Mitchell, Strata Manager - WRM	
Nicholas Waissbluth, Waissbluth Architecture Office Inc	

File No. RZ001165
1400 & 1600 Mount
Fee Road
1st Review

A presentation of preliminary design concepts for developments on Lots 2 and 3 on the Cheakamus Crossing Phase 2 lands for review and preliminary comment.

Cheakamus Crossing Phase 2 Lot 2

B. Murdoch presented the site plan and designs for Lot 2 which includes two 3-storey apartment style buildings. He discussed the arrangement of the site, design considerations and floor plan layouts. Overall the buildings step down in scale from the core to the perimeter townhomes.

The Committee had the following comments;

Site Planning and Circulation

1. Residents can access the building through the underground parking, which is great in the winter.
2. Concern was raised regarding the number of stairs to access the front door of Building D.
3. Consider covering the outdoor ramp to reduce snow clearing requirements.
4. Incorporate renaturalization of the site

Building Massing, Form and Character

1. The Panel supported the design direction and appreciated the site visit to add further clarity to the project.
2. Setbacks allow for privacy from adjacent buildings.
3. Entry to building D parkade could use more attention and enhanced attractiveness.
4. The buildings do not tower over the open space.
5. Building massing works well with the grading of the site.
6. The Panel supported the overall scheme of Cheakamus Crossing Phase 2 progressing from higher density to lower density along Mount Fee Road.
7. The Panel felt that the scheme was consistent with the intent of zoning, previous ADP comments and Multi Family Guidelines.
8. Consider alternate unit options (ie shared kitchens) to promote affordability.

B. Murdoch left.

Cheakamus Crossing Phase 2 Lot 3

J. Song, AKA Architecture reviewed the site plan and designs for Lot 3 which comprises of townhouse buildings with exterior access corridors.

The Committee had the following comments;

Site Planning and Circulation

1. Consider opportunity for front courtyard to be a pedestrian plaza with pavers and firetruck access only (if fire access required), and visitor parking relocated to parkade to reduce surface parking.
2. Alternatively, consider opportunity to stack parking stalls off internal access road if hammerhead is not required.
3. The Panel supports how the rock is accentuated and commented that there is opportunity to expand on this between lots 2 and 3.
4. The Panel encourages a more formal connection from the site to the park otherwise the residents will establish one.

Building Massing, Form and Character

1. The building massing and density presented is generally improved over the previous design.
2. This type of building typology is supported by the Panel. It is good to have a variety of housing options available to the public.
3. Buildings in front fit into landscape, however consider diversification in height or colour to break up the massing.
4. The middle building seems tight to the other two buildings, investigate options to free up a bit by pushing and pulling so the buildings read as three separate buildings.
5. The setbacks and privacy to adjacent buildings is well done.
6. Cover will be needed for the exterior building stairs and walkways.

J. Song left at 3:45pm

N. Waissbluth, A. Terrett, A. Mitchell, R.Licko entered at 3:45pm

~~File No. DP1779
#204-2067 Lake
Placid Road
1st Review~~

R. Licko introduced the application for a proposal for a canopy at #204-2067 Lake Placid Road. The proposal is to cover the existing patio with a glass and steel canopy supported by a wood post and beam structure.

N. Waissbluth presented the design and discussed the structural and aesthetic components for the project.

The Committee had the following comments;

Site Planning and Circulation

1. The Panel supports a roof cover in this location, commenting that it's a good investment for year round use and to activate this edge.
2. The Panel commented that the two columns in the middle reduce circulation.
3. A snow study is required.

Materials, Colour and Detail

1. The wood colour would be better suited to match the trim colour of the building.



**REGULAR MEETING OF
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL COMMITTEE
MINUTES**

Wednesday, February 15, 2023 at 3:15 to 5:00 p.m.
Remote Meeting via Zoom
For information on how to participate:
<http://www.whistler.ca/advisory-design-panel>

PRESENT	Mtgs. YTD (1)
J. Oprsal, MBCSLA, Chair	1
C. Inglis, Architect AIBC, Co-Chair	1
G. Sung, Architect AIBC	1
B. Martin, UDI	1
C. Doak, MBCSLA	1
M. Barsevskis, Member at Large	1
J. Murl, RMOW Councilor	1
M. Laidlaw, Manager of Development Planning, RMOW	1
K. White, Recording Secretary RMOW	1
ABSENT	
D. Venter, Architect AIBC	1
M. Donaldson, Member at Large	1

GUESTS	
J. Chapman, Manager Planning Department RMOW	
L. Tremblay Renaud, Planning Analyst RMOW	
B. Murdoch, Murdoch & Company Architecture and Planning Ltd., Architect AIBC	
D. Jackson, Whistler Development Corporation	
N. Godfrey, Whistler Development Corporation	

1. CALL TO ORDER

M. Laidlaw recognized the Resort Municipality of Whistler is grateful to be on the shared, unceded territory of the Líl'wat People, known in their language as Líl'wat7úl, and the Squamish People, known in their language as Skwxwú7mesh. We respect and commit to a deep consideration of their history, culture, stewardship and voice.

2. REVIEW OF MEETING PROCEDURES AND ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MOTIONS

M. Laidlaw discussed the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) meeting procedures, terms of reference, conflict of interest and motions.

3. NOMINATION AND SELCTION OF CHAIR AND CO-CHAIR

M. Laidlaw invited ADP members to discuss and propose by vote or acclamation the ADP Chair and Co-Chair positions that will be in effect until 31, December 2024. Through member discussion, vote and acclamation the following positions were filled:

B. Martin nominated / C. Doak seconded and members voted: Jergus Oprsal, Chair

B. Martin nominated / C. Doak seconded and members voted: Caroline Inglis, Co-Chair

CARRIED

4. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved By C. Doak

Seconded By M. Barsevskis

That ADP Committee adopt the Regular Committee meeting agenda of 15, February, 2023.

CARRIED

5. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Moved By B. Martin

Seconded By M. Barsevskis

That ADP Committee adopt the Regular Committee meeting minutes of 14, December, 2022.

CARRIED

6. COUNCIL UPDATE

J. Murl provided a Council Update on the topic of today’s presentation and the focus of Council on Housing. He also noted that community discussion is ongoing regarding Rainbow Park future redevelopment.

7. PRESENTATIONS AND DELEGATIONS

7.1 DP001925: 1400 Mount Fee Road Employee Housing Apartment

J. Oprsal invited L. Tremblay Renaud to introduce the proposal for new employee housing in Cheakamus Crossing Phase 2. Whistler Development Corporation (WDC) has applied for a Development Permit to authorize the construction of a new 3 story, 30-unit employee apartment building (Building A) at 1400 Mount Fee Road (Lot 2A) in the Cheakamus Crossing Phase 2 neighbourhood.

The preliminary design was reviewed by ADP at their June 15, 2022 meeting. At that time, the ADP requested the applicant to address: (1) entry to the building; (2) recommended naturalization of the site; and (3) consider covering the outdoor ramp to reduce snow clearing requirements.

B. Murdoch, the project architect, provided an overview and site context of Lot 2A (1400 Mount Fee) and Lot 2B (1450 Mount Fee) and noted the Lot 2B building will be delayed and presented at a future ADP meeting

The Lot 2A site plan has been affected by recent inflation, cost of construction, and supply chain delays resulting in the building design configuration being simpler with a modest approach.

There are two vehicular access points to the site; one shared with 1340 Mount Fee Road to access the underground parking and one providing visitor parking to the front door of the Lot 2A building.

The building configuration is a mixture of 1 and 2 bed units with deck space and outdoor areas directly off the building in a simple fashion.

The building is wood frame with two pedestrian entries into the building. The roof is flat and drained internally to reduce snow shed. Generous overhangs protect the building envelope and decks.

The standing seam metal siding can be varied and reinforces the vertical quality with landscape so the building recedes into the forest. The white areas of the building is considered a refreshing look, especially when there is snow on top of the building roof

The palette of colour is detailed in a durable fashion as this will be a WDC rental building ownership. The landscaping is limited and will fill in.

The ADP members asked questions of which B. Murdoch responded.

The Chair asked for ADP comments on the following: site planning + circulation; building massing form and character; materials, colour and detail; landscape – hard and soft; and accessibility; including comments on the following as requested by staff setbacks; privacy in relation to Lot 2B; and landscape and open space.

Site Planning & Circulation:

1. The principal access to the building is a little bit underwhelming and is not clear. ADP is seeking for one prominent entry and overall pedestrian access improvement.
2. Consider extending the roof so it partially covers the ramp at the front of the building.
3. Improve the pedestrian path that connects from the parkade to the sidewalk on the street.
4. ADP support the offset of Lot2A and 2B and having one building located back of the other from the street.
5. Firetruck access is generally not clear, specifically between both visitor parking spaces between the two proposed buildings.

Building massing, form and character:

1. ADP supports the massing and the simple form and character and finds it is very appropriate for what it is as a rental building.
2. The massing and materials work well in the context of adjacent buildings and landscape.
3. Not sure why all of the storage is labelled as bike storage, as tenants will likely also have other storage needs.
4. One member felt the generous roof element could be bolder like the cut-out at the elevator

Materials, colour and detail

1. The ADP generally supports the materials, colours and details as presented; they have been well thought out and all materials have been tested and proved out in this community already.
2. Some suggestions to consider as follows: consider white indents in the balconies to help punch the balcony detail; consider reducing the white crown below the roof and bring the standing seam to the top of the windows so roof appears floating; consider an element more related to the standing seam at the main entrance to reduce the heaviness.
3. White is a bold statement that we don't see often, try the white and see how it works out.

Landscape and Open Space

1. ADP suggest possible integration of a wildflower meadow instead of lawns due to complex maintenance, simplification of landscape, more evergreen material. Suggest to extend the rock drip line outwards another foot.
2. The ADP acknowledged that the landscape as a subtractive landscape that is cut out of the forest and suggest a simplification of the landscape with a dozen or so large trees and a wildflower meadow instead of lawn due to complex maintenance.
3. Encourage more evergreen planting without being coniferous; tree sizes are tiny, recommend a few larger feature trees to grow and complement the building.
4. Encourage robust planting at the entrance and Mount Fee Road for a new vision of the entrance.
5. Recommend budget for amenity space with picnic tables, play equipment.

Accessibility/Mobility

1. ADP would like to see integration of the ramp and stairs and more direct access from the sidewalk for ramp users.
2. Consider sheltered waiting areas for people with mobility challenges as the existing benches are not under cover.
3. Consider a sidewalk connection to the parkade entrance for those with mobility challenges.

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

Moved By J. Oprsal

Seconded By M. Barsevskis

CARRIED

8. OTHER BUSINESS

There was none.