



# WHISTLER

## MINUTES

**REGULAR MEETING OF ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 2014,  
STARTING AT 1:37 P.M.**

**In the Flute Room at Whistler Municipal Hall  
4325 Blackcomb Way, Whistler, BC V0N 1B4**

Members - Present

Crosland Doak, MBCSLA, Co-Chair  
Pawel Gradowski, MBCSLA  
Dale Mikkelsen, UDI  
Chris Wetaski, Member at Large  
John Grills, Councillor

Members - Absent

Tom Bunting, MAIBC, Chair  
Dennis Maguire, MAIBC  
Doug Nelson, MAIBC  
Eric Callender, Member at Large

Municipal Staff

Melissa Laidlaw, Senior Planner & ADP Secretary  
Kay Chow, Recording Secretary

Call To Order

Crosland Doak assumed the role of Chair in Tom Bunting's absence.

Council Briefs

Councillor Grills provided an update of current Whistler business activity.

Adoption of Agenda

Moved by P. Gradowski  
Seconded by C. Wetaski

**That** Advisory Design Panel adopt the Regular Advisory Design Panel agenda of March 19, 2014.

CARRIED.

Adoption of Minutes

Moved by P. Gradowski  
Seconded by C. Wetaski

**That** Advisory Design Panel adopt the Regular Advisory Design Panel minutes of January 15, 2014 as amended to change the word "Panel" to "A Panel member" on page 4 item 10; and to change the word "Panel" to "A Panel member" on page 5 Materials, Colours and Details item 2.

CARRIED.

### PRESENTATIONS

4750 Glacier Dr.,  
Snowcrest  
1<sup>st</sup> Review  
File No. DP1341

*The applicant team of Bob Hole, Strata President; Kat Sullivan, Kat Sullivan Design; Annie Millar and Tom Barratt, Tom Barratt Landscape entered the meeting.*

Brook McCrady, Planning Analyst, RMOW introduced the project for a proposed redevelopment of the three units in building one. Staff seeks Panel comments regarding the comparison of the covenant concept plan,

visual harmony of the building façades and incorporation of stone columns.

Kat Sullivan advised on the following.

1. The site is comprised of a two building seven unit development built in 1988.
2. Rezoning for this project completed in 2011. It was envisioned that the individual unit owners would renovate one by one, therefore a hypothetical development plan was prepared.
3. This application proposes a renovation of all three units in building one.
4. No changes to existing site plan.
5. Geographical and visual separation between buildings one and two; separated by a stand of trees. The site is well screened from Glacier Dr.
6. Objectives:
  - Access light and views to the west;
  - mitigate snow shed and ice drip at entry points;
  - create vertical vaulted space within the units;
  - increase function of upper floor space;
  - simplify the structure;
  - upgrade exterior while still respecting building two;
  - expand units, while conforming to zoning, DP and OCP requirements.
7. Proposed expansion of lower floor very similar to rezoning application plans; infill floor area to the west.
8. Expansion to main floor entry ways, remove snow shed from this area; enlarge living room space and get rid of some of the articulation that limits the use of this space.
9. Propose major changes to the third floor, remove and reframe a new roof with load bearing exterior walls; eliminate hip roof design and place gables. Proposed roof slope 10:12, currently 11½:12.
10. Introduction of stone columns adds feeling of weight to entry area.
11. Upgrade garage doors to wood.
12. Natural materials for soffits, doors, beam work, stone. This approach takes away from looking like building two but some of the finishes will be repeated.
13. Similar colours, but a different tone.
14. Metal roof with standard seam, utilize fewer snow retainers, and minimize gutters.
15. Repeat existing siding.
16. Guard rail design not completed. Propose to pick up ideas from the existing guard rail and rebuild in a more contemporary fashion with stainless steel clips.

Annie Millar advised on the following.

17. Maintain existing driveways and signage.
18. Existing mature trees and shrubs at the front of the site will be retained.
19. New paving to permit access to the new entries.

20. Propose to thin the existing stand of over grown conifers at the back of the site to enhance views and allow more light yet maintain the buffer from Glacier Dr.
21. Propose slower growing coniferous trees such as yellow cedar and mountain hemlock, native shrubs, shade loving ferns, perennials.
22. New patios at the back will be dropped 2 to 3 steps, providing a greater sense of open space.
23. Paving and drip strips along edge of building for maintenance access.

Panel offers the following comments.

### **Site Context and Landscaping**

1. Panel recommended using a cautious approach to thinning of existing trees and to review with Staff as the trees are thinned.
2. Panel recommended consideration be given to site fire protection with regard to the tree thinning.
3. Panel recommended that the site soil condition be reviewed after construction and prior to planting to ensure the best soil quality for plant viability.
4. Panel BCSLA members felt the proposed plant material was small and sparse, potentially impacting views and lower level screening.
5. Panel felt that matching the original worn unit pavers would not be possible; pavers should be recycled and replaced with new.

### **Form and Character**

1. Most panel members support the changes to overall form and character, especially the roof design.
2. One panel member was concerned that the over height interior space could be expanded to create more floor space.
3. Panel felt the proposed renovations are consistent with the 2011 rezoning application. There is some variation but panel supports the variation.
4. Panel members support the different details and roof form between the two buildings given the distance and lack of visual connection between the buildings.

### **Materials, Colours and Details**

1. Panel supports the material selection.
2. A panel member suggested using more modern or durable siding materials.
3. Panel supports the proposed improvements at the entries at it relates to snow and weather protection.

### **Green Building Initiatives**

1. Panel felt that this would be a great opportunity to improve the building's energy performance given the significance of the renovation.

Moved by P. Gradowski

Seconded by D. Mikkelsen

**That** the Advisory Design Panel supports the project as presented and does not need to see this project return for further review and the applicant to resolve Panel's comments with Staff.

CARRIED.

*The applicant team Bob Hole and Kat Sullivan left the meeting.*

2007 Karen Crescent  
1<sup>st</sup> Review  
File No.  
RZ1078/DP1339

Chris Wetaski advised that he is a real estate listing agent for one the units. Panel decided that Chris was not in a conflict of interest.

*The applicant team of Andreas Kaminski, AKA Architecture & Design Inc.; Scott Sellers, Diamond Head Development; Shaun Greenaway, unit owner; entered the meeting.*

Amica Antonelli, Contract Planner, RMOW introduced the project. In 2008 the property was rezoned to facilitate redevelopment. The current proposal is more affordable. Proposing major changes including changing from a two storey 7.6 m tall building to a three storey 9.5 m tall building; increase gross floor area from 504 m<sup>2</sup> to 826 m<sup>2</sup>; significant façade change. Staff seeks Panel comments regarding landscape plans, Highway 99 buffer, pedestrian connectivity, façade colours and materials.

Andreas Kaminski advised on the following.

1. The site is located on Karen Crescent and Highway 99, behind the Husky gas station.
2. The existing building is vacant and slated for demolition.
3. Whistler Advisory Design Panel reviewed this project in 2008. The redevelopment was not pursued by the Strata as the proposal was too expensive; the project has remained dormant since then.
4. Objectives:
  - neighbourhood suitability;
  - affordable for the owners;
  - simplify building construction;
  - stay true to the original rezoning concept.
5. Driveway access from Karen Crescent to each of the units.
6. Each unit is 13 ft. wide.
7. Lower floor consists of a garage and stairs up to the main living space.
8. Visitor parking on site.
9. Building layout emulates original curve design, achieved by staggering the units.
10. The building is sited as close as possible to Karen Crescent and away from Highway 99.
11. Views to the mountain are not significantly impacted.
12. Main floor contains kitchen, dining and living spaces. The upper floor contains two bedrooms.
13. Front and back decks; guard rails with frosted glass.
14. Increased glass provides more natural light into units. Canopy for sun shading.

15. Hardi panels on north and south walls.
16. Galvanized metal panel accents between the units.
17. Stained cedar siding.
18. Wood soffits, mostly flat roof with slightly sloping roof at the north and south ends.
19. Roof design retains snow; there are no snow shed issues. Water is directed through drainage into landscape area below.
20. Grade of site on Highway 99 side is at the level of the second floor.

Tom Barratt advised on the following.

21. More effective 5% grade proposed, catch basin storm system.
22. 4 ft. terraced rock stack walls at the ends.
23. Maintain riparian buffer; riparian area plant selection; birch trees at the street front; replant slope area.
24. Full lawn area off the back deck.
25. Streetscape radically enhanced.
26. Drainage through vegetation buffer.

Panel offers the following comments.

#### **Site Context and Landscaping**

1. Panel supports the proposed variances to building height and FSR but felt that those should be offset by addressing the panel's comments in regard to form and material richness.
2. Panel was concerned with vehicle circulation and the practicality of the second parking space, as the interior parking garage is quite tight.
3. Panel felt the highway buffer needs to be maintained and improved with coniferous material for better highway screening.
4. Some panel members felt the building should be pushed closer to the highway while others felt it should be pulled back from the highway and suggested the applicant decide what is appropriate in order to achieve the best circulation.
5. Panel members felt the landscape material was appropriate but had concerns about plant size and suggested that the plant material be larger or increase the numbers. In particular the new slope, the berm seems sparsely planted.
6. Panel recommends an access path to the rear yard for maintenance and other general access.
7. Panel members recommend that a sidewalk be installed along the Karen Crescent frontage.
8. Some panel members suggested exploring the elimination of the island and instead provide direct access from Karen Crescent to the individual garages, eliminating the internal driveway.
9. Panel members felt on-site storm water management should be considered given the adjacency to the riparian environment.

#### **Form and Character**

1. Panel felt the overall roof and building façade was plain and suggested

adding more variety to better articulate and individualize the units to break up the repetition of the eleven units, and also to consider larger roof overhangs.

### **Materials, Colours and Details**

1. Panel supports the lighter materials and colours (as shown on the sample board) but suggested consideration of a Creekside vernacular within the palette of materials colours and details.
2. Panel recommended sound mitigation be handled as a building solution, in addition to any landscape provisions. .

Moved by D. Mikkelsen  
Seconded by P. Gradowski

**That** the Advisory Design Panel supports the requested height and density increase, overall intent and massing of the project as presented and would like the applicant to review Panel comments with the support of Staff; Panel would like to see this project return for further design development review and to address specific Panel comments .

CARRIED.

*The applicant team left the meeting.*

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by P. Gradowski

**That** Advisory Design Panel adjourn the March 19, 2014 committee meeting at 4:24 p.m.

CARRIED.

---

CHAIR: Crosland Doak

---

SECRETARY: Melissa Laidlaw