



WHISTLER

MINUTES **REGULAR MEETING OF ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL** **WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2020, STARTING AT 12:05 P.M.**

Via Teleconference Zoom

PRESENT:

Member at Large, Pat Wotherspoon
Architect AIBC, Peter Lang
Architect AIBC, Derek Fleming
Member at Large, Kerr Lammie
MBCSLA , Grant Brumpton
UDI, Brian Martin
Director of Planning, Mike Kirkegaard
Councilor, Duane Jackson
Recording Secretary, Karen Olineck

REGRETS:

Architect AIBC, John Saliken
MBCSLA , Paul DuPont

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Derek Fleming

That Advisory Design Panel adopt the Regular Advisory Design Panel agenda of October 21, 2020.

CARRIED

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Moved by Derek Fleming
Seconded by Brian Martin

That Advisory Design Panel adopt the Regular Advisory Design Panel minutes of August 19, 2020.

CARRIED

PRESENTATIONS/DELEGATIONS

RZ 001165
1st Review
1340 Mount Fee Road

The applicant Councilor Duane Jackson, entered the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

Mike Kirkegaard, Director of Planning, introduced the project and presented a summary of the staff report to the ADP on this project. This included a history of the 2010 Games Community Land Bank grant and the “Upper Lands”, the UR1 zoning that is in place for these lands, the master planning process that been conducted, the current zoning process to provide for parcelization and phased development of the Upper lands, the zoning approach and the request for ADP review.

The Master Planning process for the remaining undeveloped CLB lands led to prioritizing the Upper Lands for the next phase of the Cheakamus Crossing neighbourhood, as the existing neighbourhood is essentially built out with recently completed and approved projects. The CLB agreement mandates the use of the lands for affordable employee housing with an allowance for limited market development to financially support this mandate. The Upper Lands have existing zoning that permits certain development potential, with a maximum gross floor area of development and a range of housing types that was determined and put in place for the Upper Lands at the time of the initial Athlete’s Village development. Traffic studies and road layouts that accommodated the development potential for the Upper Lands were also done at that time. At this point, the proposed rezoning is to develop a parcelization plan for the upper lands and an allocation of the permitted density across the lands in various forms of housing that would meet different segments of the employee demographic for long term potential. The objective is to have ready to go parcels that can be phased over time to meet the community’s housing needs. There currently is a long waitlist through the Whistler Housing Authority for both ownership and rental housing and there is still a recognized need for additional employee housing despite the Covid situation. Council and the community continue to identify provision of additional employee housing as a priority.

The Whistler 2010 Development Corporation (WDC), an independent corporation of the RMOW, has beneficial ownership of these lands, and are responsible for the development of the lands for the purposes of employee housing. The WDC along with their team has now prepared a parcelization plan including logical subdivisions of those lands. The identified potential development concepts for each of those parcels and different suitable development types for the identified parcels are being presented for review.

The plans and this process are the basis for zoning parameters to be incorporated in the updated zoning for the lands, which will specify maximum density potential, housing types, building heights, setbacks, and other zoning regulations for each parcel.

Staff is seeking Panel’s review and comments on the overall layout of the planned development and the allocation of density and housing types and how it complements the existing neighborhood and the natural topography and

landscape. Staff is also seeking Panel's review and comments on the individual parcel plans. Overall, the zoning process is not seeking to change the maximum density allocated to lands and no additional density is proposed beyond what is currently permitted. The materials for review included context plans, individual parcel plans and 3d modelling of potential development.

Duane Jackson, on behalf of the WDC, made the applicant presentation, and provided the following overview:

1. This project has been to the Advisory Design Panel previously and we are now identifying potential parcelization of the lands.
2. The project team has created models and templates to test out the land use, scale and contours and access.
3. This was an exercise in seeing how to optimize the density in a productive way and provide diversity of housing types and use the available land and future lands once the existing Forest Service Road is decommissioned.
4. There was a lot of productive comments from panel last year with respect to Parcel A and the two buildings and as a result, we were able to slightly improve the shift in the second building, the offset and the distance between the two buildings.
5. One of the biggest constraints for development of the Upper lands is the existing forest service road which is located right behind the proposed Parcel A building. The second impact on Parcel A is the Streamside Protection Enhancement Area for the existing wetland that also determines the closest proximity to the SE corner of building B. That dictates the optimum location of building B and the ramp that get downs to the mezzanine.
6. To achieve parking, we needed two levels of parking on building B and lower level of building A.
7. Panel suggestion at the last year's meeting was to push the building as far out at the back as possible to create more landscape opportunities and reintroduce the forest. Planning supported this suggestion and as part of the approved Development Permit, approved the 2 metre setback from the NE corner of building A.
8. The Parcel A development and Mount Fee Road extension have received conditional development permit approval and provided the road layout and access points to the further parcels.
9. The Forest Service Road is a challenge and is not in the control of the WDC, however, plans and agreements are being put in place for its decommissioning. The FSR is for recreational and industrial use and during the process of this development, it has to stay open and be maintained for emergency access for BC hydro to Black Tusk and all the recreational users and for industrial logging through the construction phase of the Parcel A development.
10. The assumptions about the road (Mt. Fee Road extension) is that it will be a public road with public transit and a full valley trail that will eventually connect to the core of Cheakamus Crossing Phase One. The road is tied to the contours of the existing topography to reduce the cuts and fills.
11. The potential site called D1 is disturbed site with portions of the existing FSR, which given its context adjacent to a hillside is a good site for an apartment type development of three to four stories.
12. The other portion that is created between the new road and the FSR is the smaller infill site B which is left over after the FSR is abandoned. The site

will provide an opportunities to change scale and rhythm from the larger Parcel A buildings to a smaller residential scale as development transitions further up Mt. Fee Road extension.

13. One of biggest challenges WDC has that affects the community, is the cost of infrastructure and offsite work that compounds the cost of this road which is somewhere between four and five million dollars. The more density that can be attached to that infrastructure, the greater the efficiencies for creating affordable housing.
14. For Parcel C there is an existing knoll that does not have any substantial vegetation on it, and it is identified as an ideal site because it is high up, gets a lot of sun and does not disturb the existing trail network and is separated from the road. There also exists a tree buffer between the neighbouring parcels. That parcel is considered for potential for a medium size development.
15. The upper zones of D2 and D3 is a planted forest and is seen as an opportunity to partner with WDC and harvest this in various phases to take advantage of the fact that there has been quite a bit of effort to establishing this planted zone.
16. The most extreme part of the upper lands which is parcel E, is a complex land area because there are lots of little ridges and gullies and some extreme contours, which is not ideally suited to affordable housing.
17. Not much time has been spent on parcel E other than to recognize the natural access points and the wetland that constrains the road orientation. Some established trails that are difficult to move and some steep cliffs, as well as achieving road grades of no more than 8 percent limit the development area and road network on this parcel.
18. WDC has reviewed the proposed developments looked at this from a civil engineering point of view; all of the servicing design and drainage needed to be designed into this cul de sac for fire access, bus, hydro, trucks, has been considered
19. The challenge for WDC, the RMOW and WHA is how to fund this project. Previously, WDC built the Athlete's Village and we were fortunate enough to have millions of dollars in subsidies and contributions at that time. We no longer have these contributions and subsidies and so we are now looking for ways to cover the cost of development and recover debt.
20. In order to do so, the portion of site identified as D3 will be allocated for market sales. This will be open to Whistler residents for the first period of time and we anticipate doing this immediately after the rezoning process to try to presell those lots, which will assist with funding the infrastructure. The subdivision will be a compact 17 lot mixed single family and duplex development.
21. The D2 site is recognized as development for ownership for residents, to respond to the robust Whistler Housing Authority waitlist for both ownership and rental.
22. The D2 parcel is relatively easy to develop and would be ideal for family ownership. We looked at a combination of two and three bedroom stacked townhouse units and underground parking with additional parking at grade.
23. The D2 is constrained by the market parcel on the easterly property line and the very steep drainage ravine to the SE. There is a gentle open forest that will be left as green zone. The rocky knoll that was planted as a forest, is seen as an opportunity to provide the least amount of disturbance as there

is a need to get up to the living level which also provides at grade access to the townhouses.

24. The biggest challenge for D2 is blasting for the central underground parking which will only be for the parking and will allow all the other buildings to be built on rock, reducing the necessary disturbance.
25. We have anticipated public transit. There is a bus stop at the corner of Mount Fee and Cloudburst. In consultation with BC transit, this is the logical route for transit to come up and turn around in a pullout zone that allows transit to reset their schedule without disturbing the neighbourhood.
26. There is significant traffic that accesses Loggers Lake and staff would prefer that this was not a parking lot and that vehicles park in some organized recreational parking lots near the highway and that people bus, walk or ride to the amenities.
27. There may be opportunity for bigger density on the D1 site and opportunity to add lower floor because of the contours. This site is considered appropriate for a three to four storey apartment development.

Panel offers the following comments.

Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility

1. Panel generally supports the parcelization and efforts made to address the topography and site constraints such as the Forest Service Road, housing type and density.
2. Consider access and location of the surface parking for parcels C and D1 by pushing off to the sides or tuck behind the buildings so parking is not between the buildings and the road way.
3. Panel noted that the garage entrance from D2 to D3 seem to work against the over goal of maximizing the market value of D3 and ask the applicant to reconsider.

Building Massing, Architecture Form and Character

1. Panel asked the applicant to consider tailoring the zoning to each parcel and have a clear vision of what it is the applicant wants to achieve.
2. Panel noted that the proposed development of apartment buildings on D2 with its close proximity to D3 could pose a problem given the proposed setbacks for D3. Consider appropriate setbacks and zoning for parcels D2 and D3.
3. Panel also noted that building height of 18 meters to be excessive and ask the applicant to reconsider the building height. Panel suggests that the scale of development should match the guidelines and parcel specific zoning in order to achieve the height and massing desired.
4. Panels suggests combining parcels B and C and move some density to loosen up D2 which can be an advantage to the overall scheme.

Hard and Soft Landscaping

1. Panel ask applicant to consider increasing the landscape buffer between D2 to D3 to create more of a livable situation.
2. Consider more developed space and playground and have it connect to Riverside Trail and maintain the natural wilderness character of the River Side Trail.

3. Find opportunities to integrate more landscape into the development with the forest and existing natural landscape.

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Derek Fleming

That the Advisory Design Panel commends the applicant on the work done to date and generally supports the proposed parcelization and density allocation across the parcels and recommends that the applicant consider the following comments: a scale transition of building height, form and character as one moves up the street; consideration of combining parcels B and C; clarity on units types and building heights in each of the parcels; address concerns about the interface between parcels D2 and D3 including building heights, consideration of landscape buffer and appropriate setback between the parcels and reconsideration of access from parcel D3 to D2; further consideration of daycare size and location; achieving a sensitive context to the forest setting and that the draft Bylaw be brought back to panel for review prior to the public hearing.

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Brian Martin

CARRIED

OTHER BUSINESS

Panel to convene special meeting on November 4th at 1:00 p.m. to review Bylaw for RZ001165 prior to the public hearing.

The applicant left the meeting 2:34 p.m.

TERMINATION

Moved by Derek Fleming
Seconded by Peter Lang

That the ADP Committee Meeting of October 21, 2020 be terminated at 2:34 p.m.

CARRIED



WHISTLER

MINUTES REGULAR MEETING OF ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2020, STARTING AT 1:00 P.M.

Via Teleconference Zoom

PRESENT:

Member at Large, Pat Wotherspoon
Architect AIBC, Peter Lang
Architect AIBC, Derek Fleming
Architect AIBC, John Saliken
UDI, Brian Martin
Director of Planning, Mike Kirkegaard
Councilor, Duane Jackson
Recording Secretary, Karen Olineck

REGRETS:

MBCSLA, Paul DuPont
Member at Large, Kerr Lammie
MBCSLA, Grant Brumpton

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Derek Fleming

That Advisory Design Panel adopt the Regular Advisory Design Panel agenda of November 4, 2020.

CARRIED

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Moved by Derek Fleming
Seconded by Brian Martin

That Advisory Design Panel adopt the Regular Advisory Design Panel minutes of October 21, 2020.

CARRIED

PRESENTATIONS/DELEGATIONS

RZ 001165
2nd Review
1340 Mount Fee Road
Cheakamus Crossing
Neighbourhood Phase 2
"Upper Lands" Rezoning
Parcelization Plans

Mike Kirkegaard, Technical Director of Planning, presented the staff report and described the work that has been undertaken subsequent to the ADP's first review of the proposed rezoning parcelization plans. The applicant has worked with staff to develop revised plans that address previous comments from the Panel and staff, and have taken into consideration other comparable developments within Whistler, including their zoning parameters.

Revisions to the plans have largely focused on further refining and tailoring the zoning parameters for each parcel area, with the overall direction of integrating the future neighbourhood development within the surrounding forested setting, and transitioning the massing and scale of development to a lower density and finer grain as the new neighbourhood extension moves further up Mount Fee Road away from Parcel A and the existing neighbourhood.

Mr. Kirkegaard then presented the requested format for ADP review, first focusing on the overall parcelization plan and then on the individual plans and illustrative development concepts for each parcel area. He then introduced each of the plans followed by ADP questions, comments and recommendations. Duane Jackson representing the applicant, Whistler 2020 Development Corporation, responded to questions and provided additional details regarding the parcelization plans, site conditions and design rationale.

Overall Parcelization Plan

Staff presentation:

1. Overall there is a transitioning of the scale of the development from the Parcel A apartment development, reflected in the housing forms, building sizes, densities, heights, and siting, moving further up Mount Fee Road.
2. For Parcel B/C, the idea is to do an apartment type building with opportunity for a second smaller building that is setback from the existing Streamside Protection Enhancement Area (SPEA) that could be a smaller apartment, townhouses or a daycare. The proposed Floor Space Ratio (FSR) of 0.4 reflects constraints on usable site area for the SPEA and topography with steep slopes.
3. Parcel D1 on the the side of Mt. Fee Road, located against the steep hillside, is planned for two apartment buildings that are smaller in size than the Parcel A buildings, with an FSR of 0.6.
4. Parcel D2 is planned as a townhouse site with an FSR of 0.5.
5. Parcel D3 is planned for market single family and duplex dwellings with an overall floor space ratio of 0.35.

ADP Review Recommendation

That the Advisory Design Panel asks the applicant to be cognizant that where there are apartment developments, there should be building articulations in the actual façade of the building, including stepping the building height as per Parcel A at the ends of the buildings. Where Panel have asked for a landscape buffer along the road, there needs to be flexibility for perforations for access points and other considerations such as sidewalks and common open space areas. There is now a discernible transition in building typology and height as one moves up the road from Parcel A. Panel is generally supportive of the parcelization plans, the layout of the lots, the proposed building forms, the setbacks and the building heights. Panel notes that there may be an opportunity on individual parcels, such as B/C to consider additional density with design guidelines that may be incorporated in the zoning to address the breaking down of the massing and the provision of adequate landscaping to reflect the forested character.

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Derek Fleming

CARRIED

Area Parcelization Plans

Staff presented revisions to each Area plan as follows:

Parcel B-C

1. Building setbacks have been increased on the front and rear of the Parcel to avoid a suburban type streetscape along Mt. Fee Road, similar to the design for Parcel A, with the buildings set back to provide room for naturalized landscape opportunities to reinforce the forested setting, and to increase the buffer on the rear to the Riverside Trail. The front setback has been increased from 6 metres to 7.6 metres and the rear from 6 metres to 12 metres. A setback of 6 metres to the SPEA has also been added.
2. The building heights have been reduced from 18 meters to 10.7 metres, indicative of three-storey apartments or townhouses.
3. For this site, the apartment units have been identified as having a maximum size of 100 square metres, as opposed to larger 175 square metre units as permitted as the maximum under existing zoning.
4. The recommended overall FSR has remained at 0.4. This was based on a comparison with other townhouse and apartment projects in Cheakamus Crossing and around the municipality, their site conditions and what was considered to be successful. Comparable projects were in the range of 0.4 for townhouses and 0.6 for apartment developments. The 0.4 was determined to be suitable given the impact of the SPEA being offset by provision of underground parking.

Parcel D1

1. This continues to be a proposed apartment development with two buildings that may be connected with a common entry. Setbacks have been increased from 6 metres to 7.6 metres.

2. There have not been a lot of changes to this site except that setbacks have been increased from 6 meters to 7.6 metres at the front along Mt. Fee Road, and from 6 metres to 9 metres at the rear.
3. Building height has been decreased from 18 metres to 13.5 metres to accommodate four-storey buildings with stepped roofs at the third level.
4. Maximum apartment unit size was decreased from 175 to 140 square metres for this site.

Parcel D2

1. There have been a number of changes so that the scale of the proposed townhouse development better fits the site and adjacent context. The setback to the adjacent single family and duplex dwellings on D3 has been increased from 4 metres to 7.6 metres allowing for a significant landscape buffer between the two sites. The rear setback has been increased from 4 metres to 7.6 metres, the side setback adjacent to the common open space area has been increased from 4.0 to 6.0 metres and the front setback has been increased from 6 to 7.6 metres.
2. Overall, the maximum density has decreased from of 0.6 (typical of apartments) to 0.5, with common underground parking.
3. Maximum building height has been reduced from 18 metres to 10.7 metres, allowing for 3-storeys above ground.
4. Maximum unit sizes have been specified at 140 square metres. Apartment has been removed as a potential housing form so as to help create diversity of form and housing opportunities in the neighbourhood extension and reinforce the transitioning of scale.

Parcel D3

1. For this site staff have worked closely with the applicant to protect the quality and character of the Riverside Trail and the riparian setbacks from the Cheakamus River.
2. Rear setbacks to the SPEA and Riparian setbacks have been increased from 3 metres to 5 metres, however, staff is recommending a further increase to 6 metres. This is achievable by decreasing the strata access road width by one metre, which is still consistent with RMOW engineering standards for strata roads.
3. Staff have discussed the possibility of having part of this lot dedicated to the municipality to serve as a nature conservation area for the trail and the trail setback.
4. The underground parking access easement between D2 and D3 has been removed as recommended by the ADP, as it detracts from the quality of this market development, was not functional, and also allowed for an additional lot.
5. Lots 1, 2 and 3 have been reconfigured to remove two access points from Mt. Fee Road with a single driveway access now between lots 1 and 2, and with lot 3 accessed from the strata road. This helped address safety concerns associated with these access points.

Parcel E

1. This area is less defined and is recommended as appropriate for duplex, single family or townhomes. Apartments have been removed as a potential use given their larger footprint and taller urban form which is not considered to be well-suited for this ridge-top area. Development in this area is expected to be smaller scale and integrated within the landscape.
2. Setbacks have been increased from 6 metres to 7.6 metres, and building heights have been adjusted to 8 metres for single family and duplex dwellings and 10.7 metres for townhouses.

Park Open Space

This open space area is approximately 1.2 acres with about 1200 square metres identified as a flat park like area and the remainder retained as a forested character, with trail access to the Riverside Trail.

ADP Review and Recommendation

Parcel B/C

Panel offers the following comments on Parcel B/C

Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility

1. Panel is in general support of the site plan and noted that the scale of the site lends itself to apartment development.

Building Massing, Architecture Form and Character

1. Panel generally supports the changes made to this site; consider flexibility in the zoning to support more density.
2. Panel noted that there may be an opportunity to increase the floor area through an L shape plan and make the building form more useful.

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Derek Fleming

That the Advisory Design Panel supports providing flexibility within the zoning for more density with the removal of the Forest Service Road, and more building height with articulation and stepping down from three storeys to two storeys at the ends of the buildings. Panel supports the FSR that was assigned but if there is an opportunity for the usable site area to increase, then there is an opportunity for the FSR to have a corresponding increase and that should be captured in the the zoning.

CARRIED

Parcel D1

Panel offers the following comments on Parcel D1

Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility

1. Panel in agreement that this site is suitable for apartment development.

Building Massing, Architectural Form and Character

1. Consider integrating into the zoning stepping of the building mass from three storeys to four storeys.
2. Panel notes that there is ample room on the side yards to provide for stepping the building, particularly the end that is facing the single family and duplex residences in area D3.

Hard and Soft Landscaping

1. Panel recommends landscape buffer provisions be included in the zoning to ensure the site and building reflect the forested character of the area, and soften building scale.

Moved by Brian Martin
Seconded by Peter Lang

That the Advisory Design Panel supports the apartment development concept for site D1 subject to the provision of building articulation; consider stepping from four storeys to three storeys at the ends, especially where it faces the lower density residential development in area D3. Provide a landscape buffer along Mount Fee Road with flexibility for access and other common space considerations.

Parcel D2

Panel offers the following comments on Parcel D2

Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility

1. Panel supports the proposal on site D2 as the proposed development is a significant improvement from the previous one.

Building Massing, Architectural Form and Character

1. Panel notes that the new proposal for this site is less crowded and the housing typology is well suited for this site.

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Brian Martin

That the Advisory Design Panel supports the townhouse development and the applicant is commended for the improvements to the massing, setbacks, and neighborliness to site **D3**.

Parcel D3

Panel offers the following comments on Parcel D3

Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility

1. Panel welcomes changes to this site plan, including the increase in setbacks and supports the configuration as presented.

Building Massing, Architectural Form and Character

1. Panel in supports the form and character as presented and notes a significant improvement from the previous scheme.

Moved by Derek Fleming
Seconded by Brian Martin

That the Advisory Design Panel is pleased with the improvement to the siting and massing on Parcel D3, including increased setbacks and supports the development as proposed.

Parcel E

Panel offers the following comments on Parcel E

Building Massing, Architectural Form and Character

1. Panel supports the residual density, the building height and setbacks on Parcel E.

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Derek Fleming

That the Advisory Design Panel supports the basic allocation of floor area, setbacks, building typology and uses on Parcel E.

Common Open Space

Panel offers the following comments on Park Open Space

Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility

1. Panel supports the concept and location of the park open space especially its' central location and close proximity to trails.

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Derek Fleming

That the Advisory Design commends the applicant on the location of the proposed space as being central to the community. Panel supports the trail-way connections that are being provided as well as the programming of the space for playground and forested areas which meet the goal of bringing the forest into the community. Panel requests that detailed design for the open space come back for panel review when completed.

OTHER BUSINESS

TERMINATION

Moved by Derek Fleming
Seconded by Peter Lang