

Minutes – Regular Meeting of Advisory Design Panel Committee – Resort Municipality of Whistler  
January 15, 2025

**2. REVIEW OF MEETING PROCEDURES AND ADP MOTIONS**

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

**3. NOMINATION AND SELECTION 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 December 31, 2025. Through member discussion, vote and acclamation the following positions were filled:

Moved By C. Doak

Seconded By H. Liu

**That** ADP Committee nominate D. Skalski as chair and M. Donaldson as co-chair.

CARRIED

**4. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Moved By C. Doak

Seconded By P. McBride

**That** ADP Committee adopt the Regular Committee meeting agenda of January 15, 2025.

CARRIED

**3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

Moved By J. Oprsal

Seconded By M. Donaldson

**That** ADP Committee adopt the Regular Committee meeting minutes of September 18, 2024.

CARRIED

**4. COUNCIL UPDATE**

Councilor Murl informed the Advisory Design Panel that Council is working on a policy to update the Building Bylaw and the Zoning Bylaw in spring and that the new Housing Strategy Committee on which he is chairing will have their first meeting next week.

**5. PRESENTATIONS AND DELEGATIONS**

**5.1 RZ001194 & DP002023: 1600 Mount Fee Road (Lot 3): Cheakamus Crossing Phase 2 - 1<sup>st</sup> Review**

D. Skalski invited RMOW Planner L. Renaud to introduce the application. L. Renaud explained the project as follows:

The applicant has submitted a rezoning application and a development permit application for 1600 Mount Fee Road, Lot 3, in Cheakamus Crossing Phase 2. The project proposes a five-storey apartment building with 105 dwelling units and 20 townhouses over a common parking garage. The intent of the zoning application is to allow a change in use from “townhouses for employee housing” to “apartments and townhouses for employee housing,” increase the gross floor area (GFA) by 4,700 m<sup>2</sup>

from 4,300 m<sup>2</sup> to 9,000 m<sup>2</sup>, increase the floor-space ratio (FSR) from 0.5 to 1.05, increase building height by 7.3 metres from 10.7 metres to 18 metres, increase the site coverage by 15 % from 20 % to 35 %, reduce the building separation from 6 metres to 4.7 metres, and reduce parking standards to one stall per apartment units and two stalls per townhouse plus a visitor parking allowance.

L. Renaud invited the application team, D. Siegrist and T. Barratt, to present the proposal and rationale. D. Siegrist advised on the following:

The project is located on Lot 3 on Mount Fee Road up in the Cheakamus Valley where other housing developments are either finished or under construction. The site is made of rock with a slab sloping up to the back leading to a significant drop down because of the river ravine. The project proposes two types of residential buildings: townhouses and one five-storey apartment building. The townhouses are framing the entrance, and the apartment building is located to the back. A park connected by a walkway is in the northwest corner of the lot.

The general approach regarding urban planning is to have a project that fits with the adjacent buildings based on the perception of the overall developments from the road and to improve the pedestrian scale. The design approach focuses on the relationship to the grade with the goal to fit the project into the existing rock grading without removing more rock slab and to not raise the buildings unnaturally.

To respond to the street, the parking garage is located off to the side closer to the street, integrating a clear marker in the distance at the entrance of the apartment building. Connectivity of the site is achieved by a network of walkways, pathways, a street and a roundabout. Accessible parking, visitor parking and drop off areas are located next to the apartment building. Shared amenity areas, storage and bike storage are scattered throughout the site while an elevator is centrally located to access all levels. A green buffer is created by the angled townhouses, framing the outdoor space while maintaining solar access to the courtyard due to their lower form.

The townhouses are designed with the intent to avoid repetition and have movement. Their entryways and patios are marked using angles, materials (wood, stone, metal cladding) and palette which break the scale down while creating a strong presence to the street. Each design displays similar proportions of materials with different shapes and forms.

The townhouse configuration responds to family housing market. Units are bright and connected to grade on both sides (rear private patio and mudroom with glazed doors), are flexible (dining room can be moved in different locations, rooms can be converted to dens) and offer privacy (master bedrooms located on the quieter side). They also included exterior storage connected to the street for outdoor equipment.

For the apartment building design, the proportion of trim work is the same without copying and is tearing down to create a transition to the South. The design seeks to achieve a softer feeling on the outside compared to adjacent developments with lighter/thinner guardrails on the glazed balconies, predominance of wood to add warmth and break down the scale and wrapping roof to connect the various elements of the building together.

The choice of palette and textures are limited to products in line with wildfire requirements and chosen for their maintenance characteristics and durability.

T. Barratt presented the proposed landscape plan for the site and advised on the following:

The existing rough graded second growth site presents challenges for landscaping. The landscape design seeks to keep a relationship to the surrounding green spaces and trails and maximizing livability of the neighbourhood while responding to the constraint brought by the slab without opting for further blasting. The trail network connects to the riverside trail, the native planting chosen to adapt to grow on a slab, like smaller trees and shrubs, avoiding planters to protect the slab and conifers in periphery of the forest to respect Fire Smart guidelines. Conifers will instead be planted towards the entry way. A rock stack wall of three to four metres is surrounding the buildings. The main courtyard is an open lot area connected to the trails and the fronting park. The open green space will be a naturalized area with native plants planted one metre off-center. Lastly, sitting areas and recreation features will be present in the park.

The Panel members asked several clarification questions about the proposed change in density, tenure of the units, site circulation, accessibility, amenity space, visitor parking and snow storage which were answered by the applicant team. The Panel provided the following comments:

Overall rezoning proposal (use, density, building height, site coverage, parking standard)

1. Generally supportive of the employee housing and changing the use to include apartments to give a greater variety of unit types for the community.
2. Note that the site was intended to be a transition lot for the neighbourhood in the parcelization plan.
3. Mixed opinions regarding planning rationale for justifying the increase in density and form of buildings on the site in relation to the neighbourhood development.
4. Concern that the apartment building is generally perceived as being too tall and overbearing in relationship with the adjacent development, the park and the Cheakamus River trail. Consider reducing the apartment building by one storey.
5. Note that the project parameters reflect the constraints of the site and the intent to avoid grading the slab further. Suggest modifying the grade to lower the appearance of the apartment building.
6. Supportive of the gradual increase in building height with townhouses at the front and bigger apartment building in the back to fit with the surroundings and breaking down edges of the apartment building to reduce massing appearance to reduce the scale of the building.
7. Supportive of the reduction of parking stall requirements to one per units.
8. Suggest replacing underground stalls by E-bikes storage and charging stations.
9. Concerns about the pavement and the roundabout that are taking over the entry sequence and that car circulation may cause safety concerns at the pinch point. Suggest considering a T-shape turnaround instead.
10. Concern that the rock wall three to four metre in height could cause safety issues. Suggest terracing or working on the grading.

11. Comment that it would have been more appropriate to locate the park with the rocky outcrop on the subject site versus the designated park site.

#### Site planning & circulation

1. Supportive of the location of the buildings on the site.
2. Generally supportive of the park which would benefit to the entire street.
3. Supportive of the split entry to the parking garage which clears the courtyard from most of the vehicle circulation.
4. Concerns that the vehicle access road is dominating compared to the pedestrian experience.
5. Concerns about the location of the at-grade parking stalls and impact to pedestrian circulation and adjacent units. Suggestion to prioritize the pedestrian circulation between buildings on the site.
6. Note that the proposal fits within the bylaw requirements of 1.4 metres to the building face but note issues related to site circulation and to the proximity of car hoods to the patios and balconies.
7. Suggest moving visitor parking to the underground parking garage, reducing stall number further or exploring other options to prioritize the pedestrian experience.
8. Point out that the Official Community Plan speaks to reducing number of required spots to prioritize public and active transportation options.
9. Note that the snow dump is cutting off the space in front of the apartment building, which is not practical nor realistic.
10. Suggest to improve the access off the podium down to the park as it is noted that there is only one way to it.

#### Building massing, form and character

1. Supportive of the design of the roof which creates multiple views rather than one focal large mass.
2. Supportive of the use of wood with a focus on way finding and entry marking.
3. Supportive of the composition, forms and modulations of the buildings.
4. Appreciative of the step down in massing of the apartment building on the south side adjacent to the neighboring family housing. Suggest to integrate a similar shaving on the river side where it will appear like a seven-storey tall building.
5. Supportive of the slight differences in designs between the two building types to strengthen their identity.
6. Concern that the five-storey apartment building appears too bulky compared to the two-storey townhouses.
7. Note that the main wing wall appears quite deep and might shade certain units. Consider studying the impact of this main wall on units' light access.
8. Supportive of the material selection and massing attenuation.
9. Suggest integrating bigger fenestration to the townhouses.

#### Materials, colour and detail

1. Overall supportive of the colour palette and the materials. These elements are attractive and fit with the natural surroundings and the other developments.

2. Supportive of the use of wood and note that it highlights without being overwhelming.
3. Suggest reviewing the design and materials of balcony railing to ensure they are attractive looking.
4. Note that the laundry room appears tight and is a missed opportunity as a social gathering place. Suggest adding windows.

#### Landscape

1. Generally supportive of the overall landscape proposition and note that it is a great attempt to blend with the surroundings.
  2. Supportive of the palette of native plants and the integration of naturalized planting areas, including the use of deciduous trees for safety reasons.
  3. Note that the plants chosen are small compared to the 18 metres tall building and do not help scale the building down. Note that plugs are not commonly used for urban developments.
  4. Suggest integrating feature trees to the proposal to add character and match with the rendering.
  5. Supportive of the open lawn as a multipurpose area for residents and neighbours.
  6. Note that the space to the south-east is unrefined and has minor issues. Consider adding definition to the design details allowing family and other users to occupy this space.
  7. Supportive of the connection to the park and suggest exploring other opportunities to connect to the park and to adjacent trails.
  8. Consider exploring other ways to connect the landscape to the podium but understood that the context makes it difficult.
  9. Suggest adding plantings and degree of details used to describe the left entry side to the right entry side.
  10. Suggest converting the visitor parking into a more pedestrian friendly area and to add fronting planting for privacy if stalls can't be removed.
  11. Suggest increasing landscape buffer between the parking garage intake and the park and between the parking garage roof and the townhouse patio by adding planters.
  12. Note that the buffer on the right-hand side lacks details. Opportunity to increase the buffer and to use similar species and planting located on the left side of the entry.
  13. Consider planters as an option to provide separation.
  14. Consider a more esthetic option than a chain-like fence to delimit the fire path since it might be used frequently by residents.
- 
12. Note that the edge conditions are severe along the park.
  13. Concern about the rock stack wall around the perimeter since it adds a storey to the apartment building.

#### Accessibility and mobility

1. Note the path to access the park has a 7 % grade at some points and understand the challenges related to the site. Suggest to reduce the pathway grade to 5 % by adding a wall and grading in the park or considering other scenarios.
2. Note the sidewalk is narrowing closer to the apartment building which raised concerns regarding accessibility for wheelchairs. Suggest ensuring universal accessibility throughout the whole site, including the laundry room.

3. Note that there is only one path to the park. Suggest to consider adding other options. Suggest raising the grade in the park or tier the path instead of using a rock stack wall.
4. Supportive of the additional accessible units but concerns they all have only one bed which will not be adapted to the needs and situations of certain family types. Suggested to add additional queen size beds to accommodate for various family units.
5. Suggest adding accessible parking stalls in the underground parking garage to match with the number of accessible units proposed.

The committee supported the following resolution:

Moved By C. Doak

Seconded By D. Skalski

**That** the Advisory Design Panel does not support the proposal RZ001194 and requests that the applicant considers reducing the mass of the apartment building and reducing the surface parking, and that the Advisory Design Panel does request to see the application again.

DEFEATED

Moved By P. McBride

Seconded By H. Liu

**That** the Advisory Design Panel **does** support the rezoning application RZ001194 as presented in full.

CARRIED

Moved By D. Skalski

Seconded By M. Donaldson

**That** the Advisory Design Panel **does** support the DP002023 proposal and does request to see the proposal again addressing two primary comments about massing and surface parking.

CARRIED

## 6. OTHER BUSINESS

### 6.1 Update on Development Proposals

The ADP Terms of Reference identify that the Director of Planning or designate will provide updates on development proposals approved/issued subsequent to ADP review.

#### 1. RZ001183: Whistler Sports Legacies

Staff is still working with applicants on the proposal before it proceeds to Council.

## 7. TERMINATION

Moved By J. Oprsal

Seconded By H. Liu