



WHISTLER

MINUTES

**REGULAR MEETING OF ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2019 STARTING AT 12:20 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
AIBC Derek Flemming
AIBC Pablo Leppe
Councillor, Duane Jackson
Senior Planner, Roman Licko
Planning Analyst, Tracy Napier
Planning Analyst, Stephanie Johnson
Recording Secretary, Karen Olineck

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by Dale Mikkelsen
Seconded by Pat Wotherspoon

That Advisory Design Panel adopt the Advisory Design Panel agenda of November 20, 2019.

CARRIED

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Moved by Dale Mikkelsen
Seconded by Peter Lang

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

CARRIED

COUNCIL UPDATE

Councillor Jackson provided council updates. There is still a lot of discussion about private sector housing. Glacier 8, Vail employee housing received first and second reading and will proceed to Public Hearing.

Council will make slight changes to the timing of Council budget period to allow the community time to provide input.

PRESENTATIONS/DELEGATIONS

DP 1686
1st Review
2131 Lake Placid Road

The applicant team of Dean Skalski, Skalski Architecture and Carly Scholz, Nita Lake Lodge, entered the meeting at 12:35 p.m. Crosland Doak, phoned in.

Tracy Napier, RMOW introduced the project. This is a proposal of extension of the rooftop terrace at the Nita Lake Lodge. This is in the development permit area #12, located in Creekside. The original DP did have a rooftop terrace which is currently constructed but isn't as large as what was originally approved. The proposal is now coming in line with the original DP proposal. Staff is asking for comments on architectural details, material, colours and planting plan.

Dean advised on the following:

1. The Client wants to extend operations on to the second floor of the patio located at Nita Lake Lodge.
2. In order to update the roofing membrane on the second floor, currently a green roof area, the only access is through unit 204.
3. The proposal is to expand/upgrade that area and upgrade the roofing membrane.
4. The current terrace size is 158 square meters, including landscape, smaller planter area, a new trellis feature and a raised deck.
5. The final component proposed is a new guardrail inset along the edge between the hardscape and the green roof. We wanted to bring it back away from the edge of the building line to minimize the visual impact from the street or lake. This also aligns with some of the existing guardrails that are already in place.
6. The portion of the guardrail around the raised deck is glass. Side elevation has all traditional guard rail up until the raised deck. The lakeside elevation also has the glass guardrail with some traditional guardrail details.
7. In order to rent this out for events, units 202 and 203 needs to be rented out to have access to the accessible washrooms.

Crosland advised on the following:

1. The hardscape level – The paving area has been expanded using the 18 inch pavers that is throughout the roof terrace of the hotel.
2. Drain rocks surround the building and no planting comes up against the building face. We are trying to keep planting away from the

building face by using unit paver retainer, with the exception of where the guardrails are located.

3. The wood deck will be FSC certified wood, western red cedar or another hardwood that is not tropically sourced.
4. Softscape – The four main trees will be relocated on the terrace and we will use the same type of trees throughout the project. We have also added some pine trees to give mass to either side of the trellis unit.
5. There will be cedar trees planted between the neighboring property and the hotel and the rest of the planting will be adjusted to the environmental conditions.
6. The south east and west exposure will be a mixed of evergreen and deciduous shrubs, with seasonal grasses appropriate to a rooftop environment where there is a fairly low consumption of water and can handle snow dumped because they rejuvenate every year. There will be evergreen and taller shrubs in between units.
7. The original units have unremarkable view looking out at river rocks, so we will be adding a ribbon of planting but keeping the drainage medium in place next to the terrace. This is a better solution to elevate the quality of the rooms.

Panel offers the following comments.

Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility

1. Panel generally supports the project.
2. Panel supports the setback from the edge of the building which provided separation between public and private realm.

Materials, Colours and lighting

1. Panel ask applicant to maintain the detailing of the building and keep materials and selection that represents the consistency of the building.

Hard and Soft Landscaping

1. Panel not in support of exposed membrane and ask applicant to consider cladding with stone.

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Derek Flemming

That the Advisory Design Panel supports the plan as proposed and is in support of the original DP and encourages staff to work with the applicant to ensure details are well executed and consistent and safety measures are included for long term maintenance.

CARRIED

The applicant team left the meeting at 12:55 p.m.

DP 1688
2nd Review
7226 Fitzsimmons Rd

The applicant team of Inge Roecker and Allie Shiell, Air Studio and Tom Barratt, Tom Barratt Ltd, entered the meeting at 1:05 p.m.

Stephanie Johnson, RMOW introduced the project. This is a proposal by the British Columbia Conference of Mennonite Brethren churches to construct a new place of worship approximately 790 square metres in size. The subject property is located in DP areas # 19 which is titled Residential Estate Lands and is subject to DVP Guidelines for protection of the natural environment and protection of development from hazardous conditions. This is a fairly unique request for feedback from the panel because we recognize that there are not form and character guidelines within the existing development permit area #19. We are looking for feedback on the proposed form and character of the facility based on not having these guideline embedded in the DPA#19.

Inge advised on the following:

1. At last visit to the panel, there was a lot of discussion around trees on site but the trees are all on neighboring properties and not on our site.
2. At the last panel meeting, panel mentioned that parking was very dominant and we have addressed this by splitting the parking into groups with tree pockets in between.
3. We have now indicated cycle parking which was lacking in the last rendering. Not much has changed in the overall building but more fine tuning on the edges.
4. There was also a request to also look at the back façade which is really the front façade for all the neighbours. We came up with a similar language as the front but not on a large scale.
5. The zoning does not allow an auxiliary building for the refuse, so we have indicated a nicely design structure outside the building for garbage area.
6. The entrance provides a warm inviting space to meet on a Sunday and if there are other events, this area can be opened up and has protection from the elements.
7. The north façade which was very straight, now have a similar language as the front façade.
8. The rendering gives you a first look at the material selection. We are considering swisspearl for the outside of the building and all the overhang will be wood paneling.

Tom advised on the following:

1. There was concern over how much vegetation there is on neighbouring property but we have corrected most of the trees and the conifers are off site.
2. There is some vegetation across the whole site between the building and the residences. Resilient or native planting.
3. There was concern over removing the ditch where the parking is located and that most of the vegetation will be removed, however that is not the case, because the ditch was part of the clearing of the site and most of that vegetation stayed on the neighbours lawn. With the additional planting we are proposing, this may not be much of an issue as first thought.

4. We want to maintain that look of grass and meadow on the site. High tall grass that could be mowed as well as perennial where all the species are intermixed to pick up on what is on the site naturally.
5. The planting will blend with what's in the neighbourhood. It won't be a formal looking landscape but will add character to the site.
6. In the middle of the site, there is still opportunities for a lawn and which will be sod and will also have hydroseeding.

Panel offers the following comments.

Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility

1. Panel in support of some of the changes to the recommendation made at previous meeting.
2. Panel ask the applicant to reconsider the location of the accessible parking stall with its close proximity to the front of the building which does not provide an inviting presence.
3. Ensure the site grading particularly the one percent across the lawn is sufficient enough to get snow and moisture off the lawn in a timely manner.
4. Panel noted that garbage access will require further planning from the applicant as it may pose a problem in terms of accessibility and odor.
5. Pay attention to the building frontage and entry in a way that better re-engages the community.
6. Panel appreciates the use of the multi-surface space and consideration for toddlers.

Materials, Colours and lighting

1. Panel largely supports the material choices and ask the applicant to pay close attention to the detailing.

Hard and Soft Landscaping

1. Panel noted the landscape area and entrance need more attention to detailing. Consider softening of the entrance as it reads harsh and barren.
2. The landscape concept and use of the existing landscaping is welcomed as it provide counterpoint to the clean modern aesthetic to the building.

Moved by Pat Wotherspoon
Seconded by Pablo Leppe

That the Advisory Design Panel supports the revisions made to the details of the building and the enhanced landscaping, shared parking/play, and added articulation to all sides of the building, and appreciate the careful use of materials and building planes, but request that the applicant work closely with staff to ensure that the building frontage and entry is celebrated or articulated in a way that more warmly engages the street, visitors, and community and addresses critical elements around detailing and materials and that the applicant should return to Panel to present final decisions on materials, detailing, and entry including accessible parking. Further, the panel supports a rezoning for an ancillary building or additional FAR for an employee restricted residential unit if the applicant chooses to do so.

CARRIED

The applicant team left the meeting at 2:20 p.m.

RZ 1162/DP 1698
2nd Review
4802 Glacier Lane

The applicant team of Brent Murdoch, Jen Levitt, Murdoch and Co; Brian Good, Vail Resorts, entered the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

Robert Brennan, RMOW introduced the project. This project is returning to Design Panel in response to panel recommendations. The applicant has provided more finishing to the building and has added more detailing in terms of landscaping and added an elevator and is working on finalizing the ground floor as a mixture of dwelling units and employee service uses. Staff is looking for comments from panel on how the applicant responded to the recommendations made at the last meeting.

Brent advised on the following:

1. Fundamentally the building is the same. Form and Character is similar with a lot of the work that is been done today. Some updates with regard to materials and finishes to reflect the embellished finished and materiality. But it is a very modest building.
2. Discussions between staff and client had a lot to do with the operational aspects on how this building will fit in the complex.
3. Issues of parking, garbage access and access to the village and around the site and bit more fine tuning of reconfiguration with respect to landscape around the building.
4. Vegetation provides a fairly strong buffer between the ski runs and the campus of housing.
5. Public approach to the building across Glacier Drive is quite tucked in.
6. With respect to parking, we did an overview of all the parking on site and recognize that if this was a standalone project, we would be deficient a fair number of parking. We added a number of parking stalls where we could and optimize the layout and the hard surface with a bit of reconfiguration.
7. We relocated the garbage and recycling facility which was not efficiently used. We positioned that facility in a more central position on site. We felt that this is an improvement.
8. The parking issues is mostly dealt with through operational needs through bus services and shuttles and ride share programs to compensate for the additional housing.
9. With respect to the site plan at the last meeting, we had a fair bit of road that was taking out some vegetation at one end of the building and repositioning of the building to allow for some servicing to be a little bit more efficient.
10. In order to cut back on the overall footprint of the building, we are looking at a fairly subtle shift in the building positioning to maintain as much of the existing forest and reduction in grading of the rock wall around the corners of the building to minimize the impact to the existing site.

11. An elevator has been added to the building as a key attribute to the building code requirements. From an operational perspective, a fairly important feature. Little to no impact on unit count.
12. The ground floor has always been designated as flexible space in the overall scheme of the campus. Some of the units internally scaled and layout for people with mobility challenges.
13. The ground floor suites can also be used as a health and wellness space for those who require that service.
14. The remainder of the lower floor has always been left as open-ended and nimble for use by operations as a space for a casual beer and social hub for the campus.
15. The exterior of the space will serve as a gathering place in the warmer months. This is not a fussy landscape or detail planting plan simply because the nature of the building. It's a bit raw and therefore has to be robust.
16. The level of building performance will likely be on-par with everything else, which is better than a step two code.

Panel offers the following comments.

Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility

1. Panel in general support of the project and noted the slight improvements in terms of context of the campus and existing buildings.
2. Panel asked that the applicant to reconsider the entrance to the common space and pay careful consideration to access of movement and clarity of movement.
3. Panel in agreement that the social space needs to be differentiated and that consideration should be given to the bedrooms on the ground floor in terms of better access to light, privacy and security.

Building Massing, Architecture Form and Character

1. Consider ground floor elevation with the undifferentiated concrete wall and provide more detailing in the form of horizontal lines.

Materials, Colours and lighting

1. Consider the amount of glazing on the windows on the ground elevation to provide better access to light and to make a more welcoming façade.

Hard and Soft Landscaping

1. Panel recommends that the applicant maintained as much green space as possible.

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Pat Wotherspoon

That the Advisory Design Panel generally supports the project and encourages the applicant to work with staff to ensure attention is paid largely to the ground floor in regard to privacy and separation of ground level units, access to natural light, better clarify movement around the building (and recommended provision of eastside access), and better define public and gathering spaces through the building architecture and detailing.

CARRIED

The applicant team left the meeting at 3:25 p.m.

File. 7743.01
Lot A – 1251
Cheakamus Lake Rd
2nd Review

The applicant team of Brent Murdoch, Jen Levitt, Murdoch and Co; Rob Laslett, entered the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Roman Licko, RMOW introduced the project. The panel saw 1251 Cheakamus Road phase two project in May of 2019. The project is for two buildings for a total of one hundred units. Some changes were made with respect to the addition of one, two and three bedroom units with storage, balconies and patios. This project meets the parking requirements rather than the 75 percent that we usually apply to housing. The applicant has provided response to panel's round table discussions and summary at the May meeting. We are looking for comments with respect to the overall scheme as it relates to architecture, landscape, form and character and detailing.

Brent advised on the following:

1. This is the first parcel to be brought forward in amongst the larger parcel.
2. The access road has been configured and designed slightly different from what we brought to the panel last time. Subtle manipulations and adjustments had been made to the parcel. A bit more forward thinking has gone on with respect to the trailhead that leads beyond Cheakamus up to Loggers Lake, Black Tusk and beyond. This area gets a fair bit of use.
3. No further development on this but the basic principles and idea that this approach and characteristic of the landscape is a more dominant aspect to the design. The takeaway from the last Design Panel discussion was that these buildings should response to the landscape in a less urban manner.
4. The basic principles of building configuration has been subtly adjusted with the introduction of more variety of units, including three bedrooms units.
5. Still have environmental issues on the fringe of the parcel, with a very substantial knoll in the road. Close to 75% disturbed site at the moment.
6. The last configuration had longer buildings that were near matching parallel buildings. The intent of the building positioning and the subtly of that was to address the conflicting issue of setbacks and environmental concerns but also the ability to identify what we consider to be social living outdoor spaces around the site.
7. A big part of affordable housing is that when you introduce a building of this size, there must be an ability for the building to be livable both inside and outside. Being able to provide outdoor communal spaces, some program is important. The spaces between the buildings has always been designated as an important gathering social space.
8. We have the streetscape with a mandated valley trail which goes across the front of the site and connect to lands beyond.

MINUTES

Regular Advisory Design Panel Meeting
November 20, 2019, Page 9

9. Where the grade permits, there is some interfacing with the patios. The buildings allow for substantial planting in certain locations that are really characteristic to establishing a breaking up of the linear quality of these two buildings.
10. The site line coming down the street is broken up with elevation so that one building is contained and one building is beyond.
11. The second building is screened from the first building with plant groupings so that you see the buildings individually not as a linear urban long block. That is an important aspect we took away from the last meeting.
12. The landscape is an important player here and the buildings are set back to allow the landscape to dominate.
13. We have moved away from street trees like red maple so that the signature aspect of the site is that the landscape is in groupings and massing.
14. The building massing – both ends of the buildings are only three storeys and the main mass is four storeys, which addresses the approach to the building.
15. The ends of the buildings are treated slightly differently to the middle of the buildings with regard to material changes in deck and handrails detailing.
16. Detail and finish are very similar tone and texture used throughout so that the buildings don't get too busy. It is broken up subtly in terms of the rooflines and where those materials changes.
17. The entrances are more significant and taller and more substantial, which was a direct reflection of comments made at the last meeting.
18. The guardrails have been changed slightly – some screening to provide a little bit of texture on the buildings.
19. The scale is brought down and closer to the street to allow some variation in the massing and still trying to find some modesty in the roofline. Elevation is kept quiet simple.
20. At the core of the buildings is the laundry and a larger social space, which becomes an informal gathering space.
21. At the end of both buildings is a winter solarium room for social gathering. The client did not want rooftop decks as social gathering space due to operational and management issues. The spaces are large and bright and provide a place not just for gatherings but for events like kids birthday parties.
22. Building materials remain hardi and horizontal siding, texture woods that run throughout the building. Some lighter tones responding to comments from panel. Still working with durable materials that are economical.

Councillor Jackson advised on the following:

1. We have had progress with BC Hydro to remove the powerline that is restricting the grading. We have a plan for temporary service during construction.
2. We also have support from BC Hydro and FLNRO to remove the culvert that was causing issues. That was recently removed which opens up the ability to introduce a new, smaller development parcel.
3. Part of the roof discussion with the Board was related to the snow management issues. The roof deck wasn't supported by the Board because they did not want that long term management liable issues.

4. Brent's response to the panel's recommendations was supported by the Board. The changes made with the addition of the three bedroom units which provided an architectural solution to the lower floor and the corners were well received.
5. We spent a lot of time thinking about the elevations and being sensitive to the scale and not adding any scale that we didn't need to.
6. Council is excited about the opportunity to provide more employee housing.

Panel offers the following comments.

Site Context and Circulation, including accessibility

1. Panel in general support of the project and appreciates the improvements to the articulation of the façade.
2. Panel noted significant improvement to the streetscape particularly how that street side parking access works.
3. Panel in support of the communal spaces on both the fourth floor and the laundry room. Consider increasing the size of the communal spaces and allow for more programming of these spaces with potential to close them off.
4. Panel appreciates the grain, materials and articulation of the buildings.

Building Massing, Architecture Form and Character

1. Panel appreciates the breakdown of the two buildings to allow for more urban form in a forest setting.
2. Panel appreciates the elegant massing and sophisticated design.
3. Consider the significant grading at the back side of the building and come up with a solution to deal with that along the valley trail.
4. Panel appreciates extension of the central outdoor area and the approach to the building and that it is now part of the landscape.

Materials, Colours and lighting

1. Consider two different colour schemes for the building along with more colour within each building for further breakdown of massing. The colour palette reads as monochromatic and muted.

Moved by Peter Lang
Seconded by Pat Wotherspoon

That the Advisory Design Panel supports the project as shown and the applicant should work with staff to ensure careful attention to meeting grade on sides, that the size of social spaces are appropriate and can be programmed in multiple ways, and to consider possibilities in regard to colour and variation between buildings and explore potential for breakdown of colour within buildings.

OTHER BUSINESS

TERMINATION

Moved by Dale Mikkelsen
Seconded by Pablo Leppe.

That the ADP Committee Meeting of November 20, 2019 be terminated at
4:32 p.m.

CARRIED

CHAIR: Dale , Architect AIBC

SECRETARY: Roman Licko