



**REGULAR MEETING OF
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
MINUTES**

Wednesday, March 26, 2025, at 1:45 to 4:30 p.m.

Remote Meeting via Teams

For information on how to participate:

<http://www.whistler.ca/advisory-design-panel>

PRESENT	Mtgs. YTD (2)
M. Donaldson, Member at Large – Vice-Chair	2
J. Oprsal, MBCSLA	2
C. Doak, MBCSLA	2
H. Liu, Architect AIBC	2
P. McBride, Architect AIBC	2
A. Schroyen, Member at Large	2
J. Murl, Councilor, RMOW	2
M. Mucignat, Staff Liaison, RMOW	
L. Bourdon, Recording Secretary, RMOW	
ABSENT	
D. Skalski, Architect AIBC – Chair	1
Marc Ricou, UDI	0
GUESTS	
B. McCrady, Planning Analyst, RMOW	
L. Renaud, Planner, RMOW	
J. Chapman, Manager of Project Planning	
E. Clemens, Planning Analyst	
T. Oye, Alpine Scaffolding	
M. Vanasse, Kenwood Construction	
A. Terrett, Architect	
J. Morley, Whistler 2020 Development Corp	
D. Siegrist, Architect	
T. Barratt, Landscape Architect	
A. Van Zyl, Landscape Architect	

1. CALL TO ORDER

M. Donaldson recognized the Resort Municipality of Whistler is grateful to be on the shared, unceded territory of the Lílwat People, known in their language as Lílwat7ul, and the Squamish People, known in their language as Sk̓wx̓wú7mesh. 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 P. McBride

That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) adopts the Regular Committee Meeting Agenda of March 26, 2025.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Moved By C. Doak

Seconded By H. Liu

That the ADP adopt the Regular Committee Meeting Minutes of January 15, 2025.

CARRIED

4. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Murl provided a Council update that Whistler 2020 Development Corp obtained support from Council for the Cheakamus Crossing Phase 2 – Mount Fee Rd (Lot 3) and noted the project is under timeline constraints.

5. PRESENTATION AND DELEGATIONS

5.1. ADP's Terms of Reference

M. Donaldson invited the ADP Staff Liaison M. Mucignat to present the ADP's updated Terms of Reference (ToR). M. Mucignat explained the updates as follows:

Following the work of the Legislative Services' Committee of Council Review project, Committees of Council were asked to update their ToR according to the template approved by Council in 2024 with the goal to create more efficient structures focused on Council priorities and to establish a more consistent approach across the committees.

The changes to the ADP ToR consist of updates to reflect the reality of the panel, policy updates and alignment with the approved template.

The main changes are the following:

1. The term Staff Liaison replaces the previous terms used as staff member on the panel, Director of Planning and his or her Delegate.
2. The Recording Secretary is now part of the composition as a non-voting member.

3. Council can designate someone else if the current appointed Councilor is not available.
4. A new section outlines expectations of applicants' attendance and guests for clarity and states they can't vote.
5. Once a year, the Staff Liaison will provide an annual report to the Committee of the Whole
6. As Land Use Contract have been all been discharged, content referencing Land Use Contracts has been removed.
7. The meeting schedule is set in the fourth quarter for the following year.
8. If necessary, the Staff Liaison has the possibility to request in-person meetings, to schedule additional meetings and to cancel or change the date of a scheduled meeting.
9. Attendance of members is now required to be 75 per cent to align with the committee standard.
10. A Code of Conduct section was added and references the Code of Conduct Bylaw.
11. The role of each member is now outlined more clearly.
12. Committee members will now have a bi-annual self-evaluation.
13. The ToR will be reviewed every four years following municipal elections.

M. Donaldson asked the ADP if they have questions regarding the updated ToR. The Panel asked about the self-evaluation. The Staff Liaison will make sure the Panel is informed of what is required and when they need to submit their self-evaluation.

The ADP adopted the following resolution:

Moved By M. Donaldson

Seconded By J. Oprsal

That the ADP updated Terms of Reference be presented for Council approval at a future Regular Council Meeting, with a recommendation from the ADP to adopt.

CARRIED

5.2. DP002013: Nesters Crossing: 8085 Nesters Road – First Review

M. Donaldson invited Planning Analyst B. McCrady to introduce the proposal for a new commercial-industrial building in Nesters Crossing. The project includes surface parking and landscaping work on the parcel. The building will be used as indoor storage on the main floor and auxiliary office and recreational space on the second floor.

B. McCrady invited M. Vanasse to present and provide rationale for the project, as follows:

The proposal consists of a 6,000 sq ft concrete precast building with a 1,200 sq ft mezzanine. The subject parcel has a BC Hydro Right-of Way at the front and is adjacent to the Highway 99 and the Valley Trail. The building will be located at the back of the lot and the entire front and sides will be paved with asphalt. A 2.75 m tall chain link fence will surround the property except under a portion of BC Hydro Right of Way, which will have a composite fence because it is non-conductive. A chain link sliding gate

will be located at the entrance. A picnic area, bicycle storage, required parking stalls and snow storage are planned around the building.

Landscaping proposal will respect required 10 per cent coverage on the parcel while maintaining optimal access for operations. Plantings will be located at the front of the parcel and on the east side along the highway to buffer the chain link fence. Size of trees will depend on their location, mainly if they are within the Right of Way.

The design of the building is similar to adjacent properties. The building facade is simple but sharp with contrasting colors. At the front, steel canopies over the main entrance, windows, overhead doors and the other entrance will bring dimensions to the building, and lights around the building will help locate it. Snow and rain will be contained on the dark flat roof and will drain in the storm management system. Inside, the building is open concept and is accessible by large overhead doors. A recycling area and garbage disposal will be inside the building. The office and the recreational room will be located at the second floor. An accessible washroom will be located on the main floor.

The Advisory Design Panel (ADP) members asked several clarification questions about site lighting, pavement coverage, storm water management, the absence of plantings along the back of the building, the Valley Trail and access to the garbage area, which were answered by the applicant.

The ADP provided the following comments:

Site planning and circulation

1. Generally supportive of the orientation and the site planning due to the BC Hydro Right-of-Way.
2. The site is extensively paved. Suggested to add more vegetation and landscaping buffers on all edges and reduce paving if operations allow.
3. Suggested to clearly mark area for staging of scaffolding.
4. Suggested to tie the storm water management system along the edge to the one in the area.
5. Concern about the snow dump pile in front of the garbage area which might alter its accessibility.

Building massing, form and character

1. Generally supportive of the building mass and the detailing considering the building type.
2. Suggest modulating the front façade to provide relief.
3. Commend the use of the canopy, the doors and the windows.

Materials, colors and details

1. Generally supportive of the materials, colors and details considering the building type.
2. Consider using colors similar to the landscape to help blend the building with the surrounding trees.

Landscape

1. Suggest adding more landscaping around the entrance and the area near the Valley Trail to create a full buffer.
2. Note the planting buffer along the fence is supported.
3. Suggest selecting trees with a lower canopy under the BC Hydro Right-of-Way as taller types of trees will need to be trimmed, and to locate taller trees near the building where they can grow to their full height.
4. Suggest adding vegetated buffer to the western parcel edge.

Accessibility

1. Generally supportive of the accessibility on the site.
2. The recreation room located on the second floor is a missed opportunity.

The applicant's team asked a question regarding the following steps of the ADP Process. The members of the public had no questions.

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

Moved By C. Doak

Seconded By J. Oprsal

That the ADP supports the Development Permit Proposal DP002013 and requests the applicant address the ADP comments with the Planning Department. The ADP does not request to see the proposal again.

CARRIED

5.3. DP002023: 1600 Mount Fee Road (Lot 3): Cheakamus Crossing Phase 2 – 2nd Review

On January 15, 2025, the Whistler 2020 Development Corp proposal was presented to the ADP under the rezoning application RZ001194 and the development permit application DP002023. The rezoning proposal has received the support of the ADP and the development permit proposal received support and was requested to be presented for a second review. The applicant's team addressed the comments of the Panel pertaining to the visitor parking layout to improve circulation and preserve privacy of the apartment units, pedestrian pathways to ensure accessibility, prioritization of the pedestrian space and reduction of vehicular dominance.

Project Architect, D. Siegrist presented the project proposal and rationale. D. Siegrist advised on the following:

The proposal is located on Mount Fee Road where other development projects are underway or completed. Some of them are larger developments (Lot 2, Lot 5 and Lot 8) and to the right, single family buildings are under construction. From the urban planning

perspective, the applicants' focus on the perception of the proposal from the street and how it relates to the other developments. The lot presents a steep grade with solid rock and the Cheakamus River is located behind it. The design concept aimed for a smaller pedestrian scale with a park to the front of the lot accessible from the street and no further grading of the site. The parking spaces will be located underground, and the marked entry of the apartment building would serve as an identifiable element in the landscape.

Since January 2025, the proposal has evolved to respond to the ADP comments. The pathway to the park has been removed and replaced with a wider planting buffer that separates the park from the development. The visitor parking layout has been redesigned to position it further from residential balconies. This reconfiguration enhances privacy and maximizes the green space. A new pathway, seating and a picnic area has been added to the courtyard. The fire access was rerouted to the rear of the parcel providing better site circulation and connection to the river trail. The back entry height was lowered, which facilitated lower grading on the north and east sides resulting in all the retaining walls being lowered. The upper floor of the apartment building has been stepped back to reduce the building massing next to the single-family homes on the adjacent lot. Because of the significant grade drops throughout the site, fencing is required for public safety.

Landscape Architect, T. Barratt presented the proposed landscape plan as follows:

The plan maintained the same landscaping approach with a predominance of a native planting palette and blending with the surrounding. The major changes to note are additional plantings and better accessible pathways throughout the parcel, the reduction in height from 3 m to 1.2 m of the rock stack wall at the back of the apartment building for a safer fire access, the addition of a trench drain in the courtyard and more definition of the landscaping in general.

The ADP members asked several clarification questions about the trench drain, landscape lighting for parking spaces, metal standing seams, postal boxes, glazing on the glass proposed for balconies on the river side, width of the path leading to the river, roof scape, fences, snow drainage on horizontal townhouse features, removal of park connection and visitor parking privacy screens. The applicant's team provided answers for the questions.

The ADP members provided the following comments:

Site planning and circulation

1. Generally supportive of the upgrades to the courtyard, the visitor parking, the plantings and to the pathways.
2. Suggest adding larger buffers and landscaping between the ground apartment units and the visitor parking.

Building massing, form and character

1. Generally supportive of the upgrades pertaining to the roof forms, the façade and the modulation of the apartment building.
2. Appreciate how the proposal inserts itself amongst the other developments.

Materials, colors and details

1. Generally supportive of the materials, colors and details of the buildings.
2. Concerns about ‘oil-canning’ impacting flat building materials. Note that oil-canning has affected a similar development nearby.
3. Concerns were raised regarding details of the parapets’ appearance and snow drainage.
4. Note that the project fits well in the context.

Landscape

1. Generally supportive of the landscaping, more specifically the cohesive approach with the surrounding, the use of planter boxes and trench drain, the height reduction of the rock stack wall, the use of fences and the quantity and size increase in plant materials.
2. Note the landscaping contributes to the overall site and context.
3. Suggest reviewing the trench drain design to ensure proper drainage and functionality.

Accessibility

1. Generally supportive of the accessibility features on the site.
2. Appreciate the improvements to the laundry room.
3. Appreciate that the accessible units are adaptable to the needs if they are not used by someone who require an accessible unit.
4. Suggest adding more flexibility to the accessible units regarding the number of beds which is currently limited to one.

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

Moved By M. Donaldson

Seconded By C. Doak

That the ADP supports the Development Permit Proposal DP002023 and requests the applicant address the ADP comments with the Planning Department. The ADP does not request to see the proposal again.

CARRIED

6. OTHER BUSINESS

6.1. Update on development proposals

The ADP ToR identify that the Staff Liaison will provide updates on development proposals approved/issued subsequent to ADP review.

DP001993: Glacier Lodge – 4573 Chateau Boulevard

M. Mucignat updated the ADP on the proposal reviewed in September 2024 regarding waterproofing membrane repair for the underground parking structure and alterations to the base building in the public realm. The Development Permit has been issued on March 26, 2025.

M. Mucignat also thanked the ADP for their flexibility with the meeting schedule to accommodate the applicants.

7. TERMINATION

Moved By J. Oprsal

Seconded By C. Doak

That the ADP terminate the Regular Committee Meeting of March 26, 2025.

CARRIED



Vice-Chair, M. Donaldson



Recording Secretary, L.-A. Bourdon