



WHISTLER

MINUTES

**REGULAR MEETING OF ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2016, STARTING AT 2:00 P.M.**

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

PRESENT:

Architect AIBC, Brigitte Loranger
Architect AIBC, Chair, Duane Siegrist
Architect AIBC, Tony Kloepfer
MBCSLA, Julian Pattison
UDI, Co-Chair, Dale Mikkelsen
Member at Large, Pat Wotherspoon
Councillor, Steve Anderson
Senior Planner & ADP Secretary, Melissa Laidlaw
Planner, Amica Antonelli
Recording Secretary, Kay Chow

REGRETS:

MBCSLA, Kristina Salin
Member at Large, Rylie Thiessen

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by Duane Siegrist
Seconded by Dale Mikkelsen

That Advisory Design Panel adopt the Advisory Design Panel agenda of April 20, 2016.

CARRIED

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Moved by Pat Wotherspoon
Seconded by Dale Mikkelsen

That Advisory Design Panel adopt the Regular Advisory Design Panel minutes of March 16, 2016.

CARRIED

COUNCIL UPDATE

Councillor Anderson provided an update of the most current topics being discussed by Council. Provincial Bill 17 introduces amendments to the *Local Government Act* and *Community Charter* for automatic termination of Land Use Contracts (LUC) by 2024, the LUC's will be replaced by zoning.

Nesters Crossing
1st Review
File No. DP1488

PRESENTATIONS

The applicant team of Mark Pedlow and Marie-Claude Vanasse of Kenwood Construction; Andrew Terrett of ATA Architectural Design; Nigel Woods of NSW Holdings Ltd. and Tom Barratt of Tom Barratt Landscape entered the meeting.

Melissa Laidlaw, Senior Planner, RMOW introduced the project proposal to subdivide 1 lot into 3 lots with initial development on 2 of the lots for existing Whistler businesses.

Andrew Terrett advised on the following.

1. This project proposes 2 simple precast concrete, steel and glass industrial buildings on an undeveloped industrial site.
2. The site is constrained by floodways and a BC Hydro right of way. The proposed building locations are the best locations due to the site constraints and have been developed to accommodate vehicle and equipment maneuverability.
3. One of the buildings will be built for use by Coastal Mountain Excavation (CME); the other building for Whistler Connections, a bus service company providing transportation between Whistler and Vancouver.
4. The CME offices will occupy the street fronting portion of their building with the industrial portion at the back. The vestibule component of the main entry may be removed.
5. The Whistler Connection building entrances face Nesters Road and the adjacent property. Fuel storage tanks are well screened behind concrete walls that match the building walls.
6. Patio and deck areas for office employees.
7. Proposing durable insulated concrete panels that will exceed ASHRAE standard. A building modeling exercise will be performed to determine the energy efficiency of the buildings.

Tom Barratt advised on the following.

8. Simple landscaping on a very level site provides some screening.
9. Rain garden system; wide spread low maintenance native planting.
10. BC Hydro planting requirements restricts plant height.

Panel thanked the applicant for a clear and easy to understand presentation package. Panel offers the following comments:

Site Context and Landscaping

1. Panel felt the project design is functional, aesthetically pleasing and appropriately screened.
2. Panel felt the low maintenance plant palette is refined and attractive. There is an opportunity to diversify and increase the amount of planting material and a suggestion that there could be larger scale planting relative to the scale of the building.

3. A panel member suggested that the planting adjacent to the CME building could relate more to the form and character of the building rather than just an extension of the character of the bioswale.

Form and Character

1. Panel recommended continued design development of the building façade to give the appearance of wrapping between the 2 buildings and to increase the visual appearance of the columns at the front entry to improve the sense of entry.

Materials, Colours and Details

1. Panel felt the proposed colours are appropriate.
2. Panel recommended further design development to address building signage and street address.
3. Panel recommended consideration of at grade materials to mitigate dirt and muddiness based on the function of this program.

Moved by Duane Siegrist
Seconded by Pat Wotherspoon

That the Advisory Design Panel supports the project as presented; supports the variances mentioned by planning; and the applicant shall continue to work with staff taking into consideration Panel's comments to resolve building addressing/signage, to integrate at grade materials that would mitigate migration of dirt from truck/machine cleaning area to public roads, to provide a more diverse size and type of planting, to avoid the abruptness of the façade treatment by considering a wrapping appearance, and to provide a more prominent building façade at the front entry.

CARRIED.

The applicant team left the meeting.

Pangea Pod Hotel
1st Review
File No. DP1487

Duane Siegrist declared a conflict and stepped away from the Panel table. Dale Mikkelsen assumed the role of the Chair.

Amica Antonelli, Planner, RMOW and the applicant team of Shamus Sachs, Marc Bricault of Bricault Design; Russell Kling, Jelena Kling of Pangea Global and Duane Siegrist of Integra Architecture entered the meeting.

Amica Antonelli introduced the project proposal to convert 9 timeshare units to hotel rooms, café, a licensed lounge, redesigned entrance, changes in paint colour and size reduction of exterior planters.

Duane Siegrist and Shamus Sachs advised on the following.

1. The building was built approximately 36 years ago and has fallen into disrepair.
2. This project proposes a significant tenant improvement to the interiors of the 2nd and 3rd floors, new entry and lobby, repainting and generally improvements to the building's image.

3. The existing municipal planters will be reduced in size to permit a more visible and improved entry; new wider concrete entry stairs with a glass and bronze anodized aluminum louver canopy over the full stair width, recessed lighting will point down.
4. The 2nd floor will have hotel reception, storage lockers, a café serving light meals, and common area.
5. The existing 2nd floor balconies are small and only permit up to 2 people. The balconies will be enclosed and the space will be repurposed.
6. New recessed single hung windows on the 2nd floor that slide open downward to guard rail height creating the idea of a French balcony. The bronze anodized railings and recesses help to articulate the openings and add texture to the building.
7. Use colour to unite and visually repair a degraded appearance.
8. The proponent has engaged structural, mechanical, electrical, code consultants, a building envelope specialist as well as ongoing work with the RMOW.

Panel thanked the applicant for a well presented project and offers the following comments.

Site Context and Landscaping

1. Panel felt that there needs to be a more unified consideration for the ground plane around the entire building including the retail space. Encourage working with the RMOW Parks Dept. to improve the quality of their planters so that quality is achieved throughout.

Form and Character

1. Panel supports the proposed scale and the form of the changes.
2. Panel suggested taking some of the excitement of the inside and transferring it to the outside, perhaps with more animation of the public realm and integration of the building with the Village Stroll and landscaping enhancements as noted above.

Materials, Colours and Details

1. Panel had mixed opinion regarding the proposed colours and advised care in regard to setting precedence for colours not within the existing Village Guidelines.
2. Panel recommended replacing all of the existing cladding rather than just patching.
3. Panel had some concerns regarding the storage of wet soft goods and personal gear, as people may not leave them in the lockers; ensure that there is an amenity for the goods in the rooms.
4. Panel suggested providing a bike wash station or external/other ground-level bike storage.
5. Panel would ask the applicant to carefully review their elevations and revised planters to see if a railing is required and to remove railing if not; Panel generally supported a modified planter arrangement, but encouraged applicant to work toward 100% replacement of total area – less concerned about retention of the yews.

Universal Design

1. Panel recognized that it is not within their purview but strongly encourages the applicant consider adding an elevator or a stair lift for barrier free access.

Moved by Dale Mikkelsen
Seconded by Pat Wotherspoon

That the Advisory Design Panel generally supports the project as presented but notes concerns regarding universal access and has some concerns about supporting colours that vary from the Whistler Village Colour Guide (noting that the tones selected were generally supportable, but needed to be reviewed with care by the applicant and Staff team). The applicant shall continue to work with staff based closely on the comments provided by the panel, with particular attention to animation of the ground level throughout the building footprint; and staff shall work to develop a coordinated overall landscape plan for all building frontages. Panel does not need to see this project return for further review.

CARRIED.

Amica Antonelli and the applicant team left the meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

Nesters Crossing
8060 Nesters Rd.
File No. DP1483

Staff spoke with the applicant and requested the project return to Advisory Design Panel for a 2nd review. Panel was asked if they would prefer the presentation be given by staff or by the project architect. Panel advised that they prefer the presentation pertaining to the building form be given by the project architect.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Dale Mikkelsen

That Advisory Design Panel adjourn the April 20, 2016 committee meeting at 4:12 p.m.

CARRIED

CHAIR: Duane Siegrist, Architect AIBC

SECRETARY: Melissa Laidlaw