University of Colorado
Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Meeting Notes

Date:	Thursday, August 11, 2016
Time:	8:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Location:	Daniel's K-12 Room A327, Osborne Center for Science & Engineering, University of Colorado Colorado Springs

DRB members present:
Don Brandes, Rick Epstein, Victor Olgyay, Michael Winters, Teresa Osborne (ex officio), and Carolyn Fox, University Architect and DRB Liaison for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs ("UCCS").

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:
Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker.

Prior to convening the public portion of the meeting, the Board took a tour of the UCCS Campus with Ms. Fox and other UCCS Facilities Management representatives.

Mr. Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the presentation portion of the meeting to order at 12:33 p.m.

12:30 - 2:00 Ent Service Center – UCCS

Architects: Keys + Lauer Architects, Colorado Springs, Colorado

Presenters: Victor Lauer, Keys + Lauer Architects
Lisa Carpenter, Keys + Lauer Architects

UCCS Campus
Presenter: Carolyn Fox, Executive Director, Construction & Planning, University Architect, UCCS Campus Planning & Facilities Management

Description: Concept Design Submission for an approximate 5,000 sq. ft. building for a new branch of the Ent Credit Union ("Ent")

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

Mr. Brandes welcomed the representatives from Keys + Lauer Architects after which he reviewed the Board review process completed to date and explained the expectations of the process going forward, including the conceptual submission being presented at this meeting.

In response to a question from Mr. Winters, Mr. Lauer reviewed the anticipated schedule for construction, noting that his firm is hoping to complete construction documents in February 2017 in order to bid the project for a construction start no later than April 2017. Mr. Lauer will confirm with his clients whether there will be a groundbreaking dedication celebration in September,

2016, and will further confirm if a project illustrative or graphic may be required for the celebration. He did not think the date was fixed for the groundbreaking and there is some flexibility. Mr. Brandes noted that, ideally, any public illustration or graphic of the project would be reviewed and supported by the DRB. Mr. Lauer indicated that the conceptual and schematic design resulting from the DRB review would, in his opinion, be acceptable to Ent. He then reviewed portions of the submittal package, including the site overview, site access and site design, site design options, a proposed landscape concept site summary and palette, a civil site design plan, and proposed building design options.

The Board discussed with Mr. Lauer and Ms. Carpenter the proposed site, parking and drive-thru plans; trail/pathway connections; concerns identified by the civil site design plan; flipping the floor plan of the building and integrating it with the roof plan and lighting options; and the building layout, massing, design, materiality and landscaping options.

After the Board discussed the conceptual submission in executive session, Mr. Lauer and Ms. Carpenter returned to the meeting, and the Board provided the following direction for the schematic design submittal package:

Site and Landscape Considerations:

- Regarding the existing conditions survey: increase the scale and level of clarity and notation so the Board can review the site from the Lane Center to the edge of the roadways. Existing conditions should note, at a minimum; existing contours and grade elevations, utilities, horizontal and vertical controls, vegetation, the proposed building FFE and the UCCS monument, and other significant site features that will be removed or remain in place.
- Identify adjacent trail and pathway improvements and explore how these existing trails may provide a linkage to and from Ent and UCCS. Suggest on-site improvement to these UCCS linkages which may benefit both UCCS students and Ent. Illustrate trail and pedestrian linkages to the north and to the south to show how the on-site trails connect to the larger context.
- Develop a site development plan (architect, landscape architect and civil engineer) that accommodates both vehicular access, parking and pedestrian movement patterns. Explore options that reduce the need for two-way drive lanes. Avoid awkward pedestrian crossings from parking areas to the bank entry. The conceptual site plan should clearly integrate building location and assumed FFE, parking, walkways, bio-swales, water quality ponds, final grading, site cross-sections, off-site visual analysis, surface and sub-surface utilities, landscape improvements, signage and lighting.
- Create a conceptual landscape architectural plan for the entire area that encompasses City ROW, adjoining UCCS property, and the Ent site. The intent would be to illustrate how the “area” could eventually be improved in a comprehensive and unified manner to serve Ent, UCCS and the City. Develop a “landscape theme and context” for the site that suggest appropriate planting treatments, irrigated and non-irrigated areas, grading, drainage, lighting, signage and other site improvements. Refer to both City and UCCS landscape guidelines. The landscape concept should not be broken down according to the various land ownerships, but instead should be seen as an integrated approach.

Architectural Considerations:

- Utilize the building design of option #2 as a starting point for the development of the design; mirror the floor plan as discussed during the meeting.
- Simplify the massing, make it more consistent on all four sides, and create a more horizontal emphasis by changing the proportion of the base and upper zones. This can be achieved by raising the base area (the zone from grade to top of windows) in order to create a larger proportion to the base and a small proportion to the top; for example, consider raising the base area to a 10' head height for the window, reducing the overall height from 18' feet to approximately 16' and reducing the 3' parapet.
- Regarding the clerestory design, tie the clerestory window locations to the interior functionality of the plan of the building. Orient the clerestory with a north/south orientation and place the walls inboard from the exterior walls so that its appearance on the exterior is minimized to further simplify the design. Place the windows to maximize the daylighting function of the interior of the building, while minimizing solar gain and glare. Utilize the mass of the clerestory to provide screening for the mechanical systems on the roof.
- Simplify the materials by reducing the number of materials and making one material more predominant; if possible, consider using the campus "signature" stone used at the Roaring Fork Dining Hall (which is a good example to review in terms of articulation of materials); consider using metal for accents (for example, using exposed steel for the columns of the canopy and surrounding the windows rather than as large elements of the building), glass for windows, and if using wood, consider treating it as a ceiling element at the entry, similar to what has been done at the UCCS student recreational center and the Roaring Fork Dining Hall.
- Regarding the canopies, consider aligning the height of the canopy with the 10' horizontal datum line at the top of the windows (mentioned above) which would help further articulate the horizontality of the building. Consider the canopy depth and structural design to create a unified approach to form and material that reinforces the overall building concept.

Sustainability Considerations:

- As noted in the meeting notes from July 14, 2016, set a quantitative energy goal, such as 30kbtu/sqft/yr EUI (energy use intensity); create an energy model of the building in order to determine how this goal affects and informs the architectural design; for example, providing direction regarding the design and placement of the clerestory window, the design of the roof, etc.
- Also set a quantitative daylighting goal such as 70% daylight autonomy (DA) metric and model the building in terms of daylighting and layout, determine light spots and dark spots, if the number, size and/or placement of the windows throughout the building should be changed in conjunction with the top lighting from the clerestory, keeping in mind that while using a lot of glass can be appealing in terms of the architectural design, doing so can also be problematic in terms of controlling energy so daylighting, energy, architectural and directional (i.e., west-facing or north-facing windows) components should be considered in combination with each other when designing glass elements so these elements can be articulated in such a way that they don't become an energy or an operational liability and using the angles of sunlight should inform the architecture and become itself a design element.

- Consider utilizing natural ventilation to create a building that is comfortable, has air movement, etc.; explore how utilizing natural ventilation can also affect the design of the building; for example, by using the clerestory windows to help provide ventilation by evacuating interior heat gain.
- Regarding the mechanical system, consider using other alternatives such as an indirect evaporative cooling unit, DECs, etc., which may help achieve the established energy and LEED goals, instead of a "packaged design."
- Consider designing a roof plan that will try to accommodate multiple concerns including a realistic plan for the future installation of photovoltaics, the clerestory windows as discussed, and mechanical systems, and review the way the light comes in through the clerestory windows so that it reinforces the design of the floor plan and which takes into consideration that the roof is, in essence, a façade of what needs to happen inside the building.
- If daylighting, energy conservation, ventilation and photovoltaics can be incorporated into the design of the building, it will help make the project a success.

(NOTE: The meeting notes from the July 14, 2016, DRB Pre-Design meeting provide additional details regarding the site, architecture and sustainability, and how incorporating these comments into the planning of the building from an early stage may "inform" and lead the building's design.

Overall Project Consideration:

The architectural team was encouraged to regard the project as a campus building in terms of the design and the quality and style of the building rather than thinking of it as a pad site building built for commercial purposes.

Scheduling Considerations:

- While no approval is granted or needed at the concept design level, the next steps of schematic design and design development will include Board action, so it will be important to take into consideration the comments from the pre-design submittal meeting and this concept design meeting while moving forward and to work with Ms. Fox to ensure that the submittal package for the schematic design meeting demonstrates everything the Board is looking for in the project design as articulated in this meeting and the previous meeting held on July 14, 2016.
- In order to schedule a schematic design submission for the Board's next meeting on September 8, 2016, the Board requested that the architectural team meet with Ms. Fox for a mid-point check-in on or by August 22. This meeting should present a review of the site plan, elevations, and a site and building cross section. Ms. Fox will forward these plans and drawings, if she deems they are acceptable, with her comments, to the Board prior to the September 8 meeting and indicate if the plans are moving forward in a positive direction.
- Regarding the "ceremonial groundbreaking" which might be desired by Ent in September, the Board indicated that it would prefer to schedule such a ceremony for a date after the schematic design submission and suggested that it be held in late September or early October and requested that Mr. Lauer check with Ent regarding scheduling the event.

- Since the timing of the project as discussed during the meeting appears to be sufficient, the Board indicated that it would prefer to complete the schematic design submittal and the design development submittal separately rather than consolidate them into one meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.