



WHISTLER

MINUTES

**REGULAR MEETING OF ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2019 STARTING AT 2:10 P.M.**

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

PRESENT:

Architect AIBC, Peter Lang
Dale Mikkelsen, UDI
Member at Large, Pat Wotherspoon
MBCSLA, Grant Brumpton
Councillor, Duane Jackson
Planner, Roman Licko
Recording Secretary, Karen Olineck

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by Pat Wotherspoon
Seconded by Grant Brumpton

That Advisory Design Panel adopt the Advisory Design Panel agenda of October 16, 2019.

CARRIED

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Grant Brumpton

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

CARRIED

COUNCIL UPDATE

Councillor Jackson provided an update of the most current topics being discussed by Council. Staff plans to be back to Advisory Design Panel with Cheakamus Parcel A project. Building applications have slowed slightly with the majority of application being teardown.

PRESENTATIONS/DELEGATIONS

DP 1712
8080 Nesters Road
2nd Review

The applicant team of Steve Bayly, Shana Peachman, Mons Holdings Ltd; Dustin Christmas, Creus Engineering; Heike Stippler, Heike Deigns Inc; Kristina Salin, KSalin Land Planning entered the meeting at 2:20 p.m.

Roman Licko, RMOW introduced the project. This is a revision to the landscape at 8080 Nesters Road which is a storage facility. There are changes to landscaping and to the building. There were some proposals by the applicant for planting in the ditch which was not supported by the Municipality.

Steve advised on the following:

1. We came up with the idea of a storage facility using shipping containers but the hardest part is the issue of drainage because of the large flat sites.
2. When the landscaping plan was done, the design failed to contemplate drainage into the perimeter ditches and trees were incorrectly shown planted in the ditches. The Municipality is not in support of this.
3. We substituted many of the cedar trees under the powerlines with other species more appropriate for long term maintenance.
4. The other design issue was at the entry with five shipping containers next to a fence and the snow dump area. This caused a lot of problems with snow removal. We removed the gabions as a design feature, in favour of poured in place concrete wall that would support signage and help with snow removal.
5. In the area near the underpass and overpass close to the railway, we added additional planting in that area.
6. The caretaker's building, although a pleasant design, seemed impractical as it was very expensive to build. The crawl space was filled with water because it was the same height as the adjacent ditch. We also had issues with leaking windows.
7. We are now going to a pre-fabricated building design as it is more simplistic, but still meets the design language of the site with deck overhangs and a shed roof.

Christina Salin advised on the following:

1. Compared to many other storage facilities, this facility has a lot of inviting landscaping and is quite beautiful.
2. There are now swales with drain rocks that were not on the original plan depicting where drainage was necessary and instead trees were proposed in that area.
3. There were sculptural gabion walls originally proposed for the front entrance which seemed to be excessive and didn't allow for much planting. There are now concrete walls that allow for more planting.
4. Substitutions were made under the hydro lines with smaller trees being planted.
5. The section that was originally proposed as grass intended for the caretaker, was removed and now planted similarly to the rest of site.
6. Planting proposed in the ditches along the fence line at the top of the swale, was revised to be dogwood as it provides good visual barrier and is low-growing and works well in wet environments.

Dustin Christmas advised on the following:

1. The proposed revision is to the caretaker building and one of the reasons for the revision is that the crawlspace in the previous building had water leakage issues.
2. This building is slab on grade, shed roof, low slope and conforms to the general aesthetics of the Whistler Building Guideline.
3. Cantilever portion of the second storey was removed. We now have a continuous wall from the ground which will be positioned to the east side of the property saddling the valley trail.
4. We are replacing the metal roof with a single pitched roof with eaves on all sides.
5. We reduced the deck space to only be at the south end of the building for simplification of maintenance and construction.

Panel offers the following comments.

Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility

1. Panel in general support of site context and circulation as this is an industrial building on an industrial site.

Building Massing, Architecture Form and Character

1. Panel asked applicant to consider building and architecture details so it is not so monolithic particularly on the side facing the valley trail.
2. Consider increasing deck space to give more protection to the entry with more roof overhang.
3. Enhance roof line to create more character and to better protect the deck and exit stairs.
4. The building can be enhanced with careful nuance of material changes and highlights without adding significant cost.

Materials, Colours and lighting

1. Reconsider building material and colour to add more interest to the building particularly in the area more visible from the valley trail.

Hard and Soft Landscaping

1. In support of raised vegetable or herb planter on the south side of the building. Ensure the planter is irrigated as it is partially covered by the balcony above.
2. Panel member questioned the deletion of gabion walls in favour of concrete walls and asked that the applicant consider the environmental impact of concrete, but at this point the concrete walls are already in place.

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Grant Brumpton

That the Advisory Design Panel supports the landscape revisions as shown and constructed. The ADP generally supports the intent of a more cost effective, simple pre-fabricated building, but would like the proponent to work with the designer to re-introduce some character elements such as an enhanced roofline, building detailing, and architectural interest to better support the initial DP application that will better support the quality of the landscaping, particularly on the public facing sides. The project does not need come back to Panel.

CARRIED

The applicant team left the meeting at 3:05 p.m.

OTHER BUSINESS

TERMINATION

Moved by Pat Wotherspoon
Seconded by Peter Lang

That the ADP Committee Meeting of October 16, 2019 be terminated at
3:15 p.m.

CARRIED

CHAIR: Dale Mikkelsen, UDI

SECRETARY: Roman Licko