



# WHISTLER

## MINUTES

**REGULAR MEETING OF ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL  
WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 2019, STARTING AT 1:10 P.M.**

**In the Flute Room  
4325 Blackcomb Way, Whistler, BC V8E 0X5**

**PRESENT:**

Architect AIBC, Peter Lang  
Architect AIBC, Pablo Leppe  
MBCSLA, Julian Pattison  
UDI, Dale Mikkelsen  
Member at Large, Pat Wotherspoon  
MBCSLA, Grant Brumpton  
Councillor, Duane Jackson  
Planning Director, Mike Kirkegaard  
Planner, Robert Brennan  
Planner, Roman Licko  
Recording Secretary, Karen Olineck

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Moved by Peter Lang  
Seconded by Pablo Leppe

**That** Advisory Design Panel adopt the Advisory Design Panel agenda of July 17, 2019.

CARRIED

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

Moved by Pat Wotherspoon  
Seconded by Pablo Leppe

**That** Advisory Design Panel adopt the Regular Advisory Design Panel minutes of May 22, 2019.

CARRIED

## COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Jackson provided an update of the most current topics being discussed by Council. OCP back for third reading consideration at the next Council meeting. The Whistler Sports Legacy project was well received by Council. Parcel A – making good progress on feedback from Panel. Hoping to come back to the board soon.

## PRESENTATIONS/DELEGATIONS

File No. CM 114  
1st Review  
4966 Horstman Lane

*The applicant team of Brent Murdoch, Brent Murdoch and Company entered the meeting at 1:20 p.m.*

Roman Licko, RMOW introduced the project. Staff seeks Panel comments. There is a covenant registered on the Horstman Estates which states that proposed dwellings over 5000 square feet require Advisory Design Panel review. This proposal is for more than 5000 square feet.

This project is also proposing to amend the building envelope on the parcel. The existing envelope is offset to one side and there is a smaller setback to the south side. The intent is to expand the envelope to reduce the north side setback and also increase the south setback to be more representative of what is in the current zoning bylaw - six metre setback on dwellings over 5000 square feet.

Brent advised on the following:

1. Horstman Estates has been around for thirty years and part of the subdivision is regulated by the amended Blackcomb Land Use Contract.
2. The majority of the parcels allow for a 2000-3500 square foot dwelling with a few lots more substantial, including this one which has a parcel area of 26,000 square feet.
3. The building envelope is not in keeping with the nature of the site and the size of the site.
4. The applicant team has proposed a revised building envelope, not quite the same as the development covenant would permit. The proposed moderate envelope size would allow placement of the building lower down the slope which will still meet the height regulations.
5. The visual impact to the neighbouring properties has been improved – as the ridgeline of the proposed home is 12-14 feet lower than what it would be for a similar three storey home on that site within the existing envelope. This allows for a more livable footprint.
6. The house being proposed takes advantage of that envelope stretching out a larger floor plate with roughly 6500 square feet on the upper two floors with some excluded space in the basement. This is not an

aggressive approach - meaning we have the potential to do 125% of that main floor plate. This is closer to 45% of the overall footprint.

7. There is a landscape buffer of six metres at the front and there is a tree preservation line that is below the sewer right of way.
8. This project is being developed to DP level for presentation of form, character material etc. for panel review.
9. The only thing offside with the design guidelines is that in the original requirement for cedar shake roof, but not there seems to be more support for a metal roof as it relates to wildfire.
10. General landscaping is really looking at the exterior spaces rather than heavy landscape planting – this will come in time.

Panel offers the following comments

#### **Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility**

1. Panel generally supports the increased building footprint as it relates to the covenant modification.
2. Panel ask that the applicant pay attention to the modified area to ensure that this increased footprint ensures a better design, better sightlines, and more neighbourliness.

#### **Building Massing, Architecture Form and Character**

1. Panel is in agreement with drop in grade and overall height is supported.
2. Form and materials fit well and seem suitable and appropriate.
3. Panel noted design seems to satisfy the privacy of the existing developments and homes and is generally neighbourly.

#### **Materials, Colours and lighting**

1. Panel see no issues with the colours and materials. In keeping with aesthetics of the neighborhood.
2. Panel did note that attention to paving materials on driveway are important given the modified driveway design and location and presence on the street.

#### **Hard and Soft Landscaping**

1. Panel notes that they are unsure of how the building will relate to landscape given that a landscape plan was not provided.
2. Panel noted that some attention will have to be made to the grade changes as a result of the Fortis ROW and the kind of retaining that may impact the rear landscaping.

Moved by Peter Lang  
Seconded by Pablo Leppe

**That** the Advisory Design Panel generally supports the covenant modification as proposed, the design of the building, and appreciates the reduced height and neighbourliness of the proposal and site access, but seeks to ensure that staff

are comfortable with the proposed modification in regard to required variances and the precedence this modification may set – but the panel notes they are not able to comment on landscape, protection of tree covenant, and new pool addition.

CARRIED

*The applicant team left the meeting at 2:10 p.m.*

*The applicant team of Brent Murdoch, Jennifer Levitt; Brent Murdoch and Company, Nicole Baudisch, Sarah McCullough; Whistler Blackcomb entered the meeting at 2:12 p.m.*

File No.  
RZ 1162/DP 1698  
4802 Glacier Lane

Robert Brennan, RMOW introduced the project. This is a preliminary application for Glacier 8. It is very similar in shape and form as the other buildings, but a bit larger. More details will be forthcoming on how the building will be visible from the street. They are taking advantage of an already cleared site. Staff is seeking preliminary panel input.

Brent Murdoch Commented on the following:

1. Glacier 8 staff housing project will provide housing for seasonal employees for Whistler Blackcomb Staff. The need has changed over the years and now we also see year round need for housing.
2. The building is very similar in shape and form as the other buildings.
3. We are pursuing rezoning and development for this project to be done and construction details will be defined as time comes.
4. We saw an opportunity to develop the attic space and increase the height of the building with the tall gable roof which will offer us variation and uses for other spaces, particularly social and common spaces.
5. There is a livability that can be added to the campus above and beyond just a bed.
6. These buildings were built close to twenty seven years ago with a very set floorplan and not a lot of variation between the buildings in terms of front and back common spaces, and the two bedroom configuration. This remains the need of the typical seasonal employee.
7. Architecturally it's a rubber stamp of what already exists with consideration of an elevator for practically.
8. The parking count over the entire campus is very light. To address the light parking, programs such as car rental company Zipcar and shuttle busses are encouraged.
9. There will be improvement to campus garbage and recycling facility – getting more streamlined.

Panel offers the following comments:

**Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility**

1. Panel in support of an elevator to facilitate circulation and accessibility and also day-to-day movement of supplies.

2. General support for the social spaces but ask that the applicant provide appropriate wayfinding/access to those spaces – make sure they are well announced and accessible to all residents. More of a “front-door” presence is needed.
3. Panel ask applicant to further consider parking, or at least have a proper parking needs analysis undertaken to ensure that this project will not require additional spaces – if additional spaces are needed, they should be identified within the current campus area through re-allocation of spaces (i.e. – old garbage area) or re-painting to smaller car spaces.

### **Building Massing, Architecture Form and Character**

1. Panel in support of this project as housing is greatly needed.
2. Panel supports the scale of this project and the general architectural form and unit layout.
3. Panel would like to see a stronger ground-level presence and access to the social and common areas.

### **Materials, Colours and Lighting**

1. The project is too early in design to speak specifically to this, however Panel noted that the colours and materials should be in the context of the existing campus, but the ground level should have some features that highlight the social and welcoming nature of the building.

### **Hard and Soft Landscaping**

1. Panel ask that the applicant consider the overall landscaping for the entire campus and the operational functions of the campus – wayfinding, signage, garbage, parking, etc.
2. Panel ask that the applicant look at landscaping fronting the access road to minimize impact to naturalized areas and ensure privacy, and to enhance and provide outdoor social space.

*Moved by Julian Pattison  
Second by Pat Wotherspoon*

**That** the Advisory Design Panel supports the preliminary plan for Glacier 8 inclusive of elevator and the general replication of the architectural form and unit layout, but would advise the applicant to consider carefully the location of outdoor social spaces, access and programming of indoor social spaces, overall wayfinding of the site, and consideration of parking needs.

CARRIED

*The applicant team left the meeting at 3:10 p.m.*

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**TERMINATION**

Moved by Pablo Leppe  
Seconded by Julian Pattison

**That** the ADP Committee Meeting of July 17, 2019 be terminated at 3:20 p.m.

CARRIED

---

CHAIR: Dale Mikkelsen, UDI

---

SECRETARY: Mike Kirkegaard