



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

Wednesday, May 15, 2024, at 2:30 to 4:30 p.m.  
Remote Meeting via Zoom  
For information on how to participate:  
<http://www.whistler.ca/advisory-design-panel>

PRESENT	Mtgs. YTD (3)
D. Skalski, Architect AIBC - Chair	3
M. Donaldson, Public Member – Co-Chair	3
C. Doak, MBCSLA	2
G. Sung, Architect AIBC	2
C. Inglis, Architect AIBC	2
J. Oprsal, MBCSLA	3
C. Comberbach, UDI	3
J. Murl, Councilor, RMOW	3
C. Van Leeuwen, Interim Recording Secretary RMOW	3
M. Laidlaw, Director of Planning, RMOW	2
ABSENT	
M. Barsevskis, Member at Large	1

GUESTS	
B. McCrady, Planning Analyst, RMOW	
M. Mucignat, Planner, RMOW	
D. Venter, DVAD Inc., Applicant	
M. Peatfield, Tourism Whistler	
B. Fisher, Tourism Whistler	
H. Nirenberg, WRM Strata Management & Real Estate Services, Applicant	

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

*D. Skalski recognized the Resort Municipality of Whistler is grateful to be on the shared, unceded territory of the Lílwat People, known in their language as Lílwat7úl, and the Squamish People, known in their language as Skw̓xwú7mesh. We respect and commit to a deep consideration of their history, culture, stewardship and voice.*

**2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Moved By C. Doak

Seconded By M. Donaldson

**That** ADP Committee adopt the Regular Committee meeting agenda of May 15, 2024.

CARRIED

**3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

Moved By C. Inglis

Seconded By J. Oprsal

**That** ADP Committee adopt the Regular Committee meeting minutes of March 20, 2024.

CARRIED

**4. COUNCIL UPDATE**

Council gave first, second and third readings to the proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment to address provincial Bill 44 Small-Scale multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH). The proposed bylaw aims to maintain a degree of employee housing in the additional permitted units. There will be additional bylaw testing with the building and real estate industries once adopted.

**5. PRESENTATIONS AND DELEGATIONS**

**5.1 DP001955: 4010 Whistler Way (Whistler Conference Centre)**

***1<sup>st</sup> Review***

*M. Donaldson declared a conflict of interest and left the meeting.*

D. Skalski invited RMOW Planning Analyst B. McCrady to introduce the application. B. McCrady explained the project as follows:

The applicant submitted a development permit application for comprehensive renovations to the Whistler Conference Centre including roof design changes for snow management, cladding and soffit changes at all building sides, a redesign of the building's entry areas on the south side and new business signs. The design plans are still conceptual and staff requests ADP provide direction on the proposed architectural renovations only at this time so that the applicant can proceed with more detailed drawings, including landscape plans.

D. Skalski invited the applicant, D. Venter, to present the proposal and scope of work. The applicant advised on the following:

The Whistler Conference Centre is a large building. The highest part of the roof is 18 metres above the main floor, and higher as you move to the lower floors. The roof was not designed for a snowy climate with the existing roof having roughly two inches of insulation, causing a multitude of water issues. The current roof design allows snow to accumulate in the valleys, the flashing is damaged, and the building envelope needs repairs.

The proposed scope of work is too large to complete at once and will be phased. The materials and colours in the design are informed by the surrounding buildings, proposing a combination of steel along with lighter and darker woods. The existing wood siding and red detailing will be removed, along with the corrugated roof. Wood accents will be used

in areas where the public can interact with the materials; metal will be used in areas with more exposure.

The application proposes to flatten sections of the roof for snow management. On the surface parking side, flattening the roof would change the scale and how the building presents, making the roof look smaller and soften the massing. Proposed changes to the main entrance include removing the large planters, which were previously installed to catch snow falling from the metal roof, and flattening the roof which eliminates the risk of snow shedding. The envelope is degrading behind the current planters and will require repairs. On the south side of the building, the design proposes a series of flat roofs to catch snow and ice, addressing existing safety concerns, as well as relocating the exit stairs to create a more open and inviting space. The design proposes the removal of landscaping which is currently unmaintained by the neighbouring property (Adara Hotel). The panel members asked several clarification questions about the flat roof, including water management, materials, the possibility of green roof infrastructure, the venting, and transitions from the sloped roof; the lifespan of the engineered wood; changes to circulation patterns, and the scope of work as it relates to integration with the public realm.

The Chair asked for ADP comments on the following: building massing form and character; materials colour and detail; landscaping, accessibility and mobility as requested by staff.

The Panel offered comments as follows:

#### Building massing, form and character

1. Generally supportive of the low sloped roofs, it appears less dominant. Continue to explore reducing the roof geometry.
2. Consider the cost-benefit of the north elevation roof changes. Appears to be a missed opportunity to not make it consistent along the entire roof line. Continue to explore something that complements itself instead of only partial change.
3. Generally supportive of the overall character with the metal and timber materials.
4. The elevations appear to be indirectly improving the public realm in front of the building. There should be greater consideration of the public space as the proposed alterations are creating potential for this space to be more activated.
5. The unifying element is the roof, not the materiality.
6. Consider creating more of an entrance to Rainbow Theatre, this should be expressed more substantially.
7. Consider more consistency around the building to create a seamless elevation.

#### Materials, colour and detail

1. Generally supportive of the materials and colours. The materials contrast well, appear cleaner and more contemporary.
2. Consider how to address the vertical element between the sloped, horizontal roof at the front of the building.
3. Consider how the extended stone columns interface with the ground and transition to the metal roof. Something seems unresolved.
4. Concern was expressed respecting the flat roof material in locations where there is overlook of the flat roofs.
5. For the flat roofs, consider green roofs or a colour that will reflect the sun's energy.

### Landscaping

1. Conceptual as far as landscape - built-in planters at the main entrance are important to soften the building; reduce the amount of hardscape at ground level; contribute to placemaking as people can use the planter walls to sit on.
2. Consider how the space will be used and contribute to a positive impact in the public realm.
3. Consider planters on the north elevation as a cost-effective solution for roof snow shed rather than an inconsistent approach to carving into the roof.
4. Opportunity for roof drainage to be stored for irrigation, run to ground – landscape can contribute to sustainable building goals.
- 5.

### Accessibility and mobility

1. Opportunity to link all the public open spaces; combine steps with seat walls; improve wayfinding to ramps.

The Chair summarized the comments, and the committee supported the following resolution:

**That** the Advisory Design Panel **supports** the proposal of DP001955 if the applicant further develops the project and addresses the ADP comments noted above with municipal staff. The Advisory Design Panel **does request** to see the proposal again.

Moved By D. Skalski

Seconded By C. Doak

CARRIED

*M. Donaldson rejoined the meeting.*

### 5.2 DP001972: 4368 Main Street (Market Pavilion) 1<sup>st</sup> Review

D. Skalski invited RMOW Planner M. Mucignat to introduce the application. M. Mucignat explained the project as follows:

The applicant submitted a development permit application for building repairs and maintenance, including repainting the exterior with a modified colour scheme. The building repairs are minor and will not impact the form and character. Staff requests ADP provide comments on the proposed changes to the colour scheme in accordance with the Whistler Village Design Guidelines and Whistler Village Colour Guide.

D. Skalski invited the applicant, H. Nirenberg, to present the proposal and scope of work. The applicant advised on the following:

The scope of work involves envelope repairs and changing the colours of the façade. Currently, there are five different colours on the building and this proposal seeks to simplify and modernize the exterior while maintaining the Whistler feel. The proposed colour scheme would change the current stucco and siding colours “Richmond Bisque” and “Decatur Bluff” for “Thunder”, extend the use of “Giant Sequoia” to replace features currently stained “Hot Chocolate”, and replace the use of “Scenic Drive” with “Heather

Grey”. This would decrease the number of colours used from five to three. The existing green metal roof remains unchanged.

The Chair asked for ADP comments on the following: materials, colour and detail as requested by staff.

The Panel offered comments as follows:

Materials, colour and detail

1. Generally supportive of the proposed colour scheme and feel that it does not contravene the design guidelines and colour guide.
2. Concern with the green roof and how it interacts with the proposed colour scheme. There is opportunity for a roof colour change to complement the building colour at time of roof replacement.
3. The existing yellow gave a punch and added more depth. The proposed secondary, background and accent colours seem more muted contributing to some loss of character, but overall, no objections.

The Chair summarized the comments, and the committee supported the following resolution:

**That** the Advisory Design Panel **supports** the proposal of DP001972 if the applicant addresses the ADP comments noted above with municipal staff. The Advisory Design Panel **does not request** to see the proposal again.

Moved By C. Comberbach

Seconded By M. Donaldson

CARRIED

## 6. OTHER BUSINESS

### 6.1 Update on Development Proposals

The Advisory Design Panel Terms of Reference identify that the Director of Planning would provide updates to the Panel on development proposals approved/issued subsequent to Panel review.

1. No updates to provide regarding previous development proposals. Councillor Murl spoke to the Zoning Bylaw Amendment for SSMUH in the Council update. The bylaw affects a significant number of parcels of land in Whistler and will allow up to four dwelling units to be permitted depending on parcel size and location, and none of parcels will require form and character development permits.

## 7. TERMINATION

Moved By J. Oprsal

Seconded By C. Doak

**That** the Advisory Design Panel Committee terminate the Regular Committee Meeting of May 15, 2024.

CARRIED



---

Chair, D. Skalski

*Laurie-Anne Bourdon*

---

Recording Secretary, L.-A. Bourdon

On behalf of

Interim Recording Secretary, C. Van  
Leeuwen