

CARRIED

The applicant team left the meeting at 3:25 p.m.

File. 7743.01
 Lot A – 1251
 Cheakamus Lake Rd
 2nd Review

The applicant team of Brent Murdoch, Jen Levitt, Murdoch and Co; Rob Laslett, entered the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Roman Licko, RMOW introduced the project. The panel saw 1251 Cheakamus Road phase two project in May of 2019. The project is for two buildings for a total of one hundred units. Some changes were made with respect to the addition of one, two and three bedroom units with storage, balconies and patios. This project meets the parking requirements rather than the 75 percent that we usually apply to housing. The applicant has provided response to panel's round table discussions and summary at the May meeting. We are looking for comments with respect to the overall scheme as it relates to architecture, landscape, form and character and detailing.

Brent advised on the following:

1. This is the first parcel to be brought forward in amongst the larger parcel.
2. The access road has been configured and designed slightly different from what we brought to the panel last time. Subtle manipulations and adjustments had been made to the parcel. A bit more forward thinking has gone on with respect to the trailhead that leads beyond Cheakamus up to Loggers Lake, Black Tusk and beyond. This area gets a fair bit of use.
3. No further development on this but the basic principles and idea that this approach and characteristic of the landscape is a more dominant aspect to the design. The takeaway from the last Design Panel discussion was that these buildings should response to the landscape in a less urban manner.
4. The basic principles of building configuration has been subtly adjusted with the introduction of more variety of units, including three bedrooms units.
5. Still have environmental issues on the fringe of the parcel, with a very substantial knoll in the road. Close to 75% disturbed site at the moment.
6. The last configuration had longer buildings that were near matching parallel buildings. The intent of the building positioning and the subtly of that was to address the conflicting issue of setbacks and environmental concerns but also the ability to identify what we consider to be social living outdoor spaces around the site.
7. A big part of affordable housing is that when you introduce a building of this size, there must be an ability for the building to be livable both inside and outside. Being able to provide outdoor communal spaces, some program is important. The spaces between the buildings has always been designated as an important gathering social space.
8. We have the streetscape with a mandated valley trail which goes across the front of the site and connect to lands beyond.

9. Where the grade permits, there is some interfacing with the patios. The buildings allow for substantial planting in certain locations that are really characteristic to establishing a breaking up of the linear quality of these two buildings.
10. The site line coming down the street is broken up with elevation so that one building is contained and one building is beyond.
11. The second building is screened from the first building with plant groupings so that you see the buildings individually not as a linear urban long block. That is an important aspect we took away from the last meeting.
12. The landscape is an important player here and the buildings are set back to allow the landscape to dominate.
13. We have moved away from street trees like red maple so that the signature aspect of the site is that the landscape is in groupings and massing.
14. The building massing – both ends of the buildings are only three storeys and the main mass is four storeys, which addresses the approach to the building.
15. The ends of the buildings are treated slightly differently to the middle of the buildings with regard to material changes in deck and handrails detailing.
16. Detail and finish are very similar tone and texture used throughout so that the buildings don't get too busy. It is broken up subtly in terms of the rooflines and where those materials changes.
17. The entrances are more significant and taller and more substantial, which was a direct reflection of comments made at the last meeting.
18. The guardrails have been changed slightly – some screening to provide a little bit of texture on the buildings.
19. The scale is brought down and closer to the street to allow some variation in the massing and still trying to find some modesty in the roofline. Elevation is kept quiet simple.
20. At the core of the buildings is the laundry and a larger social space, which becomes an informal gathering space.
21. At the end of both buildings is a winter solarium room for social gathering. The client did not want rooftop decks as social gathering space due to operational and management issues. The spaces are large and bright and provide a place not just for gatherings but for events like kids birthday parties.
22. Building materials remain hardi and horizontal siding, texture woods that run throughout the building. Some lighter tones responding to comments from panel. Still working with durable materials that are economical.

Councillor Jackson advised on the following:

1. We have had progress with BC Hydro to remove the powerline that is restricting the grading. We have a plan for temporary service during construction.
2. We also have support from BC Hydro and FLNRO to remove the culvert that was causing issues. That was recently removed which opens up the ability to introduce a new, smaller development parcel.
3. Part of the roof discussion with the Board was related to the snow management issues. The roof deck wasn't supported by the Board because they did not want that long term management liable issues.

4. Brent's response to the panel's recommendations was supported by the Board. The changes made with the addition of the three bedroom units which provided an architectural solution to the lower floor and the corners were well received.
5. We spent a lot of time thinking about the elevations and being sensitive to the scale and not adding any scale that we didn't need to.
6. Council is excited about the opportunity to provide more employee housing.

Panel offers the following comments.

Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility

1. Panel in general support of the project and appreciates the improvements to the articulation of the façade.
2. Panel noted significant improvement to the streetscape particularly how that street side parking access works.
3. Panel in support of the communal spaces on both the fourth floor and the laundry room. Consider increasing the size of the communal spaces and allow for more programming of these spaces with potential to close them off.
4. Panel appreciates the grain, materials and articulation of the buildings.

Building Massing, Architecture Form and Character

1. Panel appreciates the breakdown of the two buildings to allow for more urban form in a forest setting.
2. Panel appreciates the elegant massing and sophisticated design.
3. Consider the significant grading at the back side of the building and come up with a solution to deal with that along the valley trail.
4. Panel appreciates extension of the central outdoor area and the approach to the building and that it is now part of the landscape.

Materials, Colours and lighting

1. Consider two different colour schemes for the building along with more colour within each building for further breakdown of massing. The colour palette reads as monochromatic and muted.

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Pat Wotherspoon

That the Advisory Design Panel supports the project as shown and the applicant should work with staff to ensure careful attention to meeting grade on sides, that the size of social spaces are appropriate and can be programmed in multiple ways, and to consider possibilities in regard to colour and variation between buildings and explore potential for breakdown of colour within buildings.

1258 Cheakamus Road,
WDC Parcel "A"
Employee Housing
Development
Workshop Review

The applicant team Brent Murdoch and Jen Levitt, Murdoch and Company entered the meeting at 2:15 pm. Councilor Duane Jackson, Chair of the Whistler 2020 Development Corp. (WDC) and Rob Laslett, VP Construction also entered the meeting at 2:15 pm representing the Whistler Development Corporation (WDC).

Mike Kirkegaard, RMOW introduced the project. This is an important project for our community, as it will help address critical housing needs and represents the first project in the expansion of the Cheakamus Crossing neighbourhood. We are looking to build on the success of the existing neighbourhood. Considerable master planning and due diligence work has been done in terms of looking at the development potential of the remaining lands in Cheakamus and advancing this first development project. There is a desire to bring this project forward as expediently as possible. WDC is the entity authorized to develop the lands on the RMOW's behalf, with Councilor Jackson leading the process as Chair of WDC.

As this project advances, it needs to consider and be respectful of existing neighbourhood development and integration with surrounding activities and trail connections and further expansion of the Cheakamus neighbourhood. It is critical to consider the overall Whistler context and the more detailed Cheakamus context, identifying existing neighbourhood character (inclusive of guidelines) and the areas natural landscape. Affordability objectives are key, and it is important to achieve efficiency and value in design and construction, however to be successful, the project needs to consider livability and social aspects. This will support a more stable community and tenure for the WHA.

This site has the potential for a significant number of units and a scale that is larger than neighbouring developments, but not in excess of other Cheakamus developments. It will be vital to ensure that the scale of the buildings is carefully considered and integrated into the landscape and site condition to ensure the buildings are livable and valued by the community. In order to do this, attention must be paid to the outdoor spaces and connection to both street, on the south frontage, and forest ecosystem on the north frontage, as well as on-site open space and play opportunities and perhaps opportunities for better use of stepped rooflines for common terrace space. Further, to enhance livability and long-term tenure and to support couples and families, the units need to consider storage, possibility for in-suite laundry, appropriate parking, and common areas to promote social interaction and quality of life. The WDC and WHA need to consider the composition of units, and understand who the potential tenants are, with consideration to the potential for 3 bedroom units available to young Whistler families. A diverse mix will add stability and complement the family-oriented permanent neighbourhood.

The project is contemplated as a two building development along with the network road extension and streetscapes, trail connections and public spaces. Staff and WDC are seeking a comprehensive review of the project by the ADP in workshop format with sharing of thoughts and ideas. Panel's comments are sought in regard to the general level of support for the

proposed development concept, along with comments on any areas of concern and suggestions to investigate.

Councilor Jackson introduced the applicant team, and work that is being done on affordable construction techniques, along with achieving Step Code 3 for the proposed buildings. This is the first introduction of the design to the ADP, and the applicant team is seeking ADP feedback and comments.

Brent Murdoch Commented on the following.

1. We have to find viable solutions to affordable housing. We are learning from previous projects and detailed investigations. Have worked hard to achieve efficiencies in the design, and create simpler designs that still fit the design objectives of the guidelines and neighbourhood character.
2. This project started with master planning work of Brent Harley and more detailed site planning by IBI group and the objective back then was to provide a livable, attractive and integrated addition to the successful existing Cheakamus neighborhood, along with making the development as affordable as possible, managing construction costs and financial risk, and ensuring financial viability to operate and manage. The objective was to prioritize development of the most accessible and easily developable parcels in Cheakamus, with the potential of 550 additional units on remaining lands.
3. Block A was identified as the priority site and appropriate starting point for the type of homes identified as being most suitable to address the current development context and housing needs. We believe that this site can handle a building of substantial size.
4. The site is effectively a large gravel area cleared for 2010 Games operations.
5. We have to look at the parcel development potential along with getting an access point through the site and a physical design for future development of other parcels beyond. Address riparian areas, important trail networks, and the existing neighbourhood core area.
6. As we move to next phase of development, the character and presence of landscape will be important as it will set precedent for further development. The surrounding hillside and landscape are difficult to develop because of knobby terrain with very little topsoil and lots of rocks. Preservation of fingers of landscape will leave smaller sites, which are more appropriate for the site conditions on future development sites – this will allow for a more balanced natural character than the core of neighbourhood.
7. Addressing grade is critical, as there is considerable grade manipulation around the site and to future adjacent sites. Team and staff need to look at the access road and trail grading comprehensively.

8. Proposed site is the only site with the ability to handle a larger number of units in a cost effective and efficient manner as represented in the architecture.
9. The building footprint provides efficiency in a single underground parking structure with adequate parking.
10. Building is designed to be efficient and cost effective, but looking at opportunities to reduce perceived scale and add articulation.
11. Overall massing of the proposed buildings is three storeys with a fourth storey that steps back on the ends to reduce scale. Strong central centre axis space in overall massing. Alignment of the building massing – askew to each other with subtle difference in variation of material and details. Stepping up of buildings and urban mass in elevations to fit landscape. We are trying to find a rural solution to an urban style building where can get economies of scale, form, and repetition of architectural and construction elements.
12. Details and materials, finishes are looking to learn from other projects and efficiencies. Look for subtle relief and break down of massing. Also trying to find efficiencies with unit types and how to have storage in unit rather than in the parkade.
13. Decks that are pulled back from the building into the mass, translucent glass presence, provides a lightness to the building.
14. Site plan was described. There is a need for some surface parking with the expectation that this street will be quite active. So we are pulling back the parking off the street. Need to provide access to trailheads, traffic beyond, and bigger site thinking will need to determine where these nodes are.
15. Discussed consolidation of roadways and trails.

Roundtable discussion and comments from Panel.

1. Panel in agreement with density, but had a number of concerns related to the massing, articulation, and context in relation to the rest of the existing neighborhood character. The topography of the site as it relates to the building size was also discussed, particularly in regard to exposed parkade foundations and a gentler “coming to ground” of the building. Comments related to livability, unit planning and landscaping were discussed further.
2. Panel appreciates the presentation on the architecture and what the applicant is trying to do with the project. The prominence of the entrance needs to be celebrated more and provided more visual presence on the street. Make sure there is clarity around the access both architecturally and in the landscape. There needs to be more careful consideration of the surface parking spaces and how they are separating the entrance from the street.
3. Panel approved of how the applicant described integration of future development pods and scale with retained natural landscape, this direction is strongly supported. Careful consideration, once this

project is complete, to ensure more diversity of housing in future development sites – both scale and type of housing.

4. Panel noted that as buildings get bigger, there is concern that occupants have less of a chance to get to know or see each other. Use landscaping to provide community-building program. Panel ask that applicant consider providing communal space and emphasis on gathering spaces. The idea of a community garden is supported as it is a low budget solution to bringing people together. Children's play area is another aspect of bringing the community together, contributes to families getting together. Play is only successful if units also accommodate families.
5. Panel noted that parking seems to be an issue and perhaps applicant should have a conversation about whether as an affordable housing project if they need to take on the cost of parking. Panel also questioned if parking outside the building is the right place for parking, as this site has limited amount of open space outside the building and the parking impacts the presence of the building entrance. It was noted a shortage of parking in the existing neighbourhood is an issue and with a single large floorplate, parking can be provided at an acceptable cost. Parking for trailheads is also important, so the open parking on the site needs to be clearly marked.
6. Consider landscape restoration opportunities. The opportunity for restoration of the natural watercourse impacted by previous construction was noted, which allows removal of area from the SPEA and conversion to usable open space.
7. There was significant discussion about the density and building sizes. Small scale buildings are difficult to make work economically. Work on site planning and massing to make the larger buildings fit. Very important to consider architectural tools to improve the buildings connection to the landscape and the street – terracing the buildings on both ends, particularly where the 2 buildings meet to ensure a more 'comfortable' open space between buildings. Street fronting units should also be either in a podium form to alleviate the streetwall and/or should feel as though they offer front doors or eyes on the street to encourage human scale and interactions. Also consider in relation to future pods and typologies fitting in the landscape, with smaller scale dictated by topography.
8. Question was raised regarding capacity analysis of roads for full buildout of the neighbourhood. Concern over single point access to the site and how many residences can get in and out of the neighbourhood safely given the single bridge access point. Concern also over whether or not fire access egress is addressed given the number of additional residences who will occupy the back of the community. It was noted the original forest service bridge could be commissioned into use in an emergency.
9. Panel member commented community desperately needs housing and site can handle this additional density. The site is separate, removed from existing community. Opportunity to achieve density and

affordability. Lands beyond are constrained, so this may be the best opportunity for the immediate needs. Challenge is how fit urban development into rural, wild forested context. How treat landscape, rationalize trails etc. is important. Panel supports the effort to break up long linear blocks and wishes to see more of this with changes to roofline and frontages. Seek to preserve significant landscaping, natural character, consider reducing surface parking, create spaces for building community.

10. There were some comments to consider additional density as an opportunity creating modulation in massing. Additional height may allow for more building articulation and/or terracing and achieve a few additional units, as well as better quality common deck spaces on terraces. The rationale for four story buildings was described.
11. Consider family units, particularly 3 bedroom units for long term rental residency. Who is the market? Who is this development for? Permanent residents, transient employees? Context of adjacent developments is family-oriented units and there are considerable numbers of small children in neighbouring sites that will have a relationship with this building. What are the opportunities for family housing? Is there demand/need? Need to look at data on need, and impact on costs.
12. Consider ground-level design and ground-oriented opportunities, for additional 3 bedroom family units, interface builds community. This could be done in a ground level podium form to provide additional square footage if the foundation slab can be extended cost effectively and depth of units does not become unlivable.
13. Consider building siting and connections to the landscape on the back of the building for better security and access. Integrate with forest service road, create opportunities for greater landscaping, urban design and space in front of buildings.
14. Further discussion of development potential of lands beyond, approximately 200 units on 5 smaller parcels defined by contours, in relation to meeting diversity of housing needs and units provided by current development. This project does need to meet all needs, as future sites will be more compatible with ground oriented housing, townhomes, rowhomes, or smaller multi-family developments.
15. Discussion on opportunity/need for small park spaces, natural areas serving current development and lands beyond as well as considering interface/demands associated with access to recreation sites/areas beyond.
16. Panel cited concern over the status of the Forest Service Road (FSR) and assumptions as to how it integrates with project design. Design assumes road decommissioning and regrading. This is considered a critical assumption. Also the status of the hydro line along the Forest Service Road. It was noted that the hydro line is to be undergrounded.
17. Panel commented on the urban design and transition of the size of buildings in the neighbourhood, discussed as the grain of the

neighbourhood. Buildings are big boxes, two big blocks, consider real moves to break down “grain”, e.g., set back buildings at fourth level, consider three buildings, but note concerns about loss of efficiency, more exterior walls, and additional costs. In return, need to better articulate the long length of the building in a meaningful way. Need to balance cost efficiency with real gestures that make up difference in grain. Also, consider colour, playful colour, as it is a dark location.

18. Consider balcony locations in relation to shared units/tenants and shared access not just from one bedroom.
19. Some discussion around the placement of storage in the unit and bringing biking bikes and other equipment into the unit may cause damage to the corridors. Consideration of a deeper elevator if bringing bikes into units.

Panel Member Summary Comments:

1. The main reason for this project is to satisfy a need for housing and also satisfy affordability. The project should look at this from an affordability aspect. Support size and density on the site given location and nature of site separation from rest of community. Panel concerned that the building is still reading as a box and ask that the applicant consider breaking down the grain of building – provide articulation in a meaningful way.
2. The concern is how to manage higher density in a forest. How to marry such a high density urban type project in such a rural setting. Careful consideration of sitelines and how the building meets the ground is a key.
3. Some panel members are concerned about the lack of sense of place or common language. Reads as a suburban streetscape in a forest setting, the focus seems to be mostly on architecture and less on landscape. What is the sense of place and identity for the building? How does the building meet the public realm?
4. Panel supports the description of the fingers of the forest used to describe establishment of future development sites; consider how to apply on this site with more naturalized landscaping. Site is at the edge of the forest. Make the landscape more forest like, without making it dark or shaded. It was noted that on the south frontage, the slope coming down the hillside is very steep and light getting into these units on the south face will be highly valued. Be careful not to over reforest the frontage, creating shadows.
5. Pay attention to create a sense of articulation without too many different materials, instead consider more massing articulation distinguishable with the entrance. Make sure the building articulation is meaningful. Consider how this can be done through siting, spacing of buildings, breaking down of length of buildings or stepping of buildings. The buildings need to feel human scale.
6. Consider the need for surface parking and the relation to the landscape and sense of place are seeking. Perhaps parking can be accommodated on-site but in a more benign location than directly in front. Remove the parking in the centre and leave the heart of the

site as landscape and have a real sense of entry to the site to improve livability.

7. There is a need for additional semi-public and/or community space. Make certain to provide adequate gathering space for people, especially given the size of the project.
8. Consider three bedroom units, there is panel support for family-oriented units to ensure long-term tenure and stability of the project. Panel noted that there seem to be a lot of underutilized floor plate from property line to property line. There is opportunity there to add family units.
9. Suggestion to explore a podium as an opportunity for three bedroom family units, also as an opportunity to step the building and massing, keeping in mind livability and unit depth. Breaking down massing may allow a simplification of building material palate and overall form.
10. Panel noted that the new street intersection is not addressed in any way and ask the applicant consider addressing it with landscape or architecture as it is the point of entry to this new community.
11. Panel is in agreement that the colour scheme of the building is too dark given the site conditions. Find a more suitable colour pallet, still based in nature but brighter, more colourful.

The applicant team left the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

OTHER BUSINESS

TERMINATION

Moved by Pablo Leppe
Seconded by Julian Pattison

That the Advisory Design Panel Meeting of May 22, 2019 2018 be terminated at 4:20 p.m.

CARRIED

CO-CHAIR: Pat Wotherspoon, Member at Large

SECRETARY: Mike Kirkegaard