



WHISTLER

MINUTES

**REGULAR MEETING OF ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2019 STARTING AT 2:10 P.M.**

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

PRESENT:

Architect AIBC, Peter Lang
Architect AIBC, Pablo Leppe
Architect AIBC, Derek Fleming
MBCSLA, Julian Pattison
UDI, Dale Mikkelsen
Member at Large, Pat Wotherspoon
MBCSLA, Grant Brumpton
Member at Large, Ben Smith
Planning Director, Mike Kirkegaard
Planner, Stephanie Johnson
Recording Secretary, Karen Olineck

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Ben Smith

That Advisory Design Panel adopt the Advisory Design Panel agenda of September 18, 2019.

CARRIED

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Moved by Pat Wotherspoon
Seconded by Julian Pattison

That Advisory Design Panel adopt the Regular Advisory Design Panel minutes of July 17, 2019.

CARRIED

COUNCIL UPDATE

Mike Kirkegaard provided an update of the most current topics being discussed by Council. A number of projects from Planning came to Council including the discharge of a Land Use Contract (LUC) for the Bayshores neighbourhood. We currently have a number of neighbourhoods and major development areas that were developed under the LUC in the 1970s and 1980s. The Province has legislated their termination with timelines for communities to adopt zoning by the end of 2022.

A number of Employee Housing projects were also on Council's agenda. Seven projects have been brought to Council thus far. Council recommended that five continue with the process. There are apartment projects in single family neighborhoods with market components to help reduce rent, to make them affordable and to allow for different tenure types. At the last Council meeting, the Hillman Project on Westside Road was given permission to proceed by Council. The rezoning project in Cheakamus Crossing received first and second readings.

The Rainbow Ridge Development project was also brought forward to Council. Council decided not to proceed with this project based on issues related to lack of new access to the development.

DP 1688
7226 Fitzsimmons Rd N
1st Review

PRESENTATIONS/DELEGATIONS

The applicant team of Inga Roecker and Allie Shiell, AIR Studio; Tom Barratt, Tom Barratt Landscape Architects entered the meeting at 2:25 p.m.

Stephanie Johnson, Planning Analyst RMOW introduced the project. This proposal is by the BC Conference of the Mennonite Brethren Church to construct a new place of worship. Approximately 800 square metres in size and is located in DPA #19 and is subject to the DPA guidelines for protection of natural environment and protection of development from hazardous conditions.

In conjunction with the rezoning application for this subject property a restrictive covenant was registered on title as a condition requiring that the form and character of any proposed Community Church on this site be reviewed by Advisory Design Panel.

Staff is requesting review of this project based on universal design guidelines for Site Planning, Form and Character, Building and Landscape Design and Snow Management.

Inga advised on the following:

1. We are excited to work with the Church Community to get their vision realized and to expand programming and ministry space to better serve its members.
2. What was most important to the client was to have an informal gathering space rather than traditional use of space. A communal

kitchen where the congregation can be served and events can be catered, is also central to the programming of the Church. Classrooms and a multi-purpose room are also proposed.

3. The applicant seemed happy with the configuration and the discussion was around how this would look on the site.
4. The parking location was chosen because of the existing access easement and statutory right of way in this location. A point to note is that parking spaces will not always be full; however, the rezoning process required 66 spaces and this proposal accommodates that.
5. The main entrance has accessible parking near the loading zone.
6. The building was slightly angled to distinguish it from the residential homes. We felt it should stand on its own.
7. We are hoping to have an environmentally sound building with the material choices and would use a stacked effect to facilitate air current from the building. We will be utilizing natural rather than artificial light and working with cross ventilation is also proposed. We are considering working with fibrous cement board, but this material is not finalized.
8. The use of stain glass at the entrance and street elevation is proposed.
9. Wherever overhang exists on the building, we are considering the use of wood paneling, and also the use of wood in the interior of the building.
10. We were conscious of the elevation to housing along the site and are attempting to bring the scale down. The building is one storey to ao that is can appear more residential in scale.

Tom Barratt advised on the following:

1. This is a large scale site without a large budget. We have to work within this parameter.
2. This is a flat open site and to make this work and meet the flood level, we are going to lift the driveway up to allow for better drainage – fairly deep ditches.
3. There will be more concentrated planting of perennial and maple near the large entry plaza and also a lot of grass mixture which will fit nicely into the neighborhood.

Panel offers the following comments.

Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility

1. Consider better context and renderings to show integration of building to the neighbourhood.
2. Screening of cars is imperative and multi-use surfaces is strongly supported for play and gathering.

3. Panel noted that parking on south side is problematic and is fundamental to the neighbourliness of the Church. Further consideration for screening and sensitivity.
4. Panel noted that parking will impact the quality of the arrival space and interaction of coming and going; needs to be a front plaza with consideration of grades and accessibility and other needs such as bike racks and seating.
5. Carefully consider site grading and drainage in regard to how the site is accessed/utilized.

Building Massing, Architecture Form and Character

1. Panel in agreement that scale and massing is appropriate.
2. Panel ask client to give careful consideration to the aesthetic of the roof, particularly in regard to the mechanical systems that may inevitably need to be added despite Passive goals.
3. Panel will need to see the mechanical and structural needs of the building to fully understand the potential site impacts.
4. Panel would like more consideration and evolution of the design on the north side of the building facing the majority of neighbouring homes.

Materials, Colours and Lighting

1. Panel noted that clear simple forms and sophisticated detailing and use of materials will be important. Panel like this simple palette, but it will be very challenging to deliver well.

Hard and Soft Landscaping

1. Panel recommends better screening to the north side and asked applicant to consider its contextual relationship to neighbours, particularly if there is not an extensive landscaping treatment.
2. Panel noted that there needs to be a correlation between the building and the landscape – they need to have a dialogue; landscape forms for play; water, movement and connection.
3. Panel noted that landscape needs further attention to increase the quality of spaces as a public building.
4. Consider opportunities to preserve trees on the northeast and east end of site; review survey and field truthing.
5. Pay attention to reducing total number of parking stalls at entry-way and along the south aspect to minimize impacts to neighbouring home. Consider gaps in the parking for additional planting and softening of the south edge.
6. Panel asked applicant to focus on multi-use aspect of the larger parking area at the east end of the site.

Moved by Ben Smith
Seconded by Peter Lang

That the Advisory Design Panel would like to see this project return for a more thorough review once the building, building systems, site, and landscape design is more advanced, with strong attention paid to rationalizing the site layout and its relationship to its neighbours and landscape, while seeking resolution in materiality, thoughtful parking, multi-use/integrated spaces, neighbourliness, and an opportunity for a residential unit.

CARRIED

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

OTHER BUSINESS

TERMINATION

Moved by Pablo Leppe
Seconded by Ben Smith

That the ADP Committee Meeting of September 18, 2019 be terminated at 3:20 p.m.

CARRIED

CHAIR: Dale Mikkelsen, UDI

SECRETARY: Mike Kirkegaard