



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

CHAIR: Pat Wotherspoon, Member at Large

SECRETARY: Mike Kirkegaard, Director of Planning