



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.