



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

Office of the Vice President for Budget and Finance

1800 Grant Street, Suite 800
Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 860-5600
Fax: (303) 860-5640

University of Colorado Design Review Board Minutes

Minutes of the Meeting of December 12, 2013

The University Design Review Board met on Thursday, December 12, 2013
University of Colorado Colorado Springs
Campus Services Building, #204.

DRB members present were: Victor Olqvay, Don Brandes, Rick Epstein, and Teresa Osborne (ex officio).

Visual and Performing Arts Complex (21 minutes first recording) - UCCS

Architect(s): H3/Hardy Collaboration Architecture (Design Architect); Semple Brown Design (Architect of Record)

Presenter(s): Chris Wineman – SBD; Brian Schmidt – SBD

Individuals Present: Carolyn Fox, University Architect – UCCS; Gary Reynolds – UCCS

Description: Initial presentation and pre-design discussion for the Visual and Performing Arts facility.

Chris Wineman

- Noted that the building needs to be created that ties together the external with the internal.
- Mentioned site as an opportunity and challenge.
- Discussed the issues that needed to be resolved that involve access.
- Noted that Phase One will plan to bring in music program, theater, gallery of contemporary art.
- Questioned how to set up and establish future phases to bring visual arts to the site.
- Discussed three phases in terms of programming, square footage, budget.
- Discussed the relationship between SBD and H3 on this project.

Bryan Schmidt

- Mentioned detailed plans that included parking, accessibility, pedestrian paths, site access, and entrance layouts.
- Noted that Phase One addressed the soccer field, pedestrian paths, and water quality issues.
- Discussed topography of the site through live model to display proposed site plan.
- Addressed environmental issues that include orientation, wind direction, acoustics.
- Mentioned that there will be an eco-charrette in January to start preliminary design.

Rick Epstein

- Asked about parking - if it would be surface or garage.
- Suggested to create a micro-master plan for what is around the area.
- Asked what the character of Spine Road is in relation to the campus and the “entryway” it represents.
- Mentioned the emphasis on sense of place and the degree to which there is a bold, dynamic expression.
- Noted the importance to integrate the natural sensitivity to natural arroyos, distinct to Colorado Springs.
- Suggested to create an idea of phasing that is clear and recognizable and for next reviews and concept level to develop the sense of place, the whole integration, and ties it to UCCS.
- Suggested to take more time instead of rushing to get things ready so that the overall comprehensive plan is developed further.
- Noted that the DRB would like to see the process of the concept design and options.

Gary Reynolds

- Noted that the Master Plan suggests significant surface parking; have discussed one-level parking garage.
- Mentioned that there are accommodations for those who want to utilize space on an event basis.
- Mentioned that the three phases are three separate requests for funding.
- Noted that the size of theater was chosen to fit the need of the community/area.
- Suggested to pick the big themes (site, environmental, views) to then integrate into a final design.
- Noted that the Chancellor wants a rendering to be used for fundraising efforts in project.

Don Brandes

- Noted three main issues that need to be dealt with involve accessibility, phasing and sequencing of project, and creating a sense of place.
- Mentioned that creating a sense of place is key between the native landscape, ball fields, and the performing arts.
- Asked about the programming and the relationship with city/community issues.
- Suggested to show conceptual design to engage DRB so that they can see the process.

Victor Olgay

- Noted that the building needs to react to the traffic issues, environment issues, views.
- Suggested that the design needs to be driven by the sense of place and community.
- Suggested that the hydrology needs to be further developed to influence site plan.
- Mentioned that the sustainability design of the building needs to be emphasized and enhanced to fit the vibe of the performing arts and programming uses.
- Asked how the environmental process is implemented in concluded design; how is it relevant and suggested to show improvements.

Teresa Osborne

- Expressed concern on the funding on phases due to the competition on other higher education centers.
- Mentioned that the building's programming has to demonstrate to the State of Colorado, that each Phase stands alone in terms of funding

Village at Alpine Valley (First Year Experience Housing Village) - UCCS

Architect(s): PageSoutherlandPage

Presenter(s): Chris Carvell, PageSoutherlandPage

Individuals Present: Christopher Kleingartner, Architect – PSP; Chris Carvell, Architect – PSP; Harvey Whitcomb, Principle Manager – PSP; Ed Chargualaf, Design Manager – Kiewit; Brent Given, PM – Kiewit; Chris Kelnek, – Kiewit; Sam Hosfelt, PM – Kiewit; Greg Dorolek, Landscape architect – Wenk; Carolyn Fox, University Architect – UCCS; Jeff Davis, Executive Director – UCCS.

Description: Roaring Fork Dining Hall - Schematic Design.

Victor Olgay

- Noted Candy's remarks and concerns that include roof slope, floor layout, furniture, open spaces, stair placements.
- Mentioned that DRB reviewed schematic design needs to move on phases of design.
- Noted that the schedule can move forward to design development.
- Mentioned the DRB is concerned with access to deck, the perimeter heat around glass, I-Beam columns feel cold.
- Suggested that the roof needs to be something else if it isn't accessible.

- Noted what needs to be done:
 - Suggested to meet in January to discuss progress, timely feedback before DD meeting in February, midpoint check-in.
- Expressed operational concern that the west side porch should be able to be used for dining.
- Noted that there is some concern on what KSQ has been doing; want them to be present or information be relayed to them on layout, site.
- Suggested to eliminate some expenses to create efficiency of building and eliminate mechanical systems (daylight).
- Asked how daylight is being addressed in the middle part of the floor plan on level one.
- Suggested to create operable windows in dining hall.
- Noted to look further into shading studies.
- Suggested to bring the west side elevation design into the east elevation.

Don Brandes

- Suggested that there should be a pre-DD workshop (2-3 hours) to allow time to address issues; midpoint check to see where they are headed.
- Noted that the site relationship needs to be further developed.
- Suggested extended walkways concerning the integration in edging, native stone, and to create some spaces to 'hang out.'
- Asked how are they bringing students to the arroyo.
- Mentioned that there needs to be further detail integrated in the walkway across Stanton Road.
- Suggested to further develop site fixtures and finishings.
- Asked if the site drainage widening affected the grading to the site drainage.

Carolyn Fox

- Noted that there is a DD in February.
- Addressed that as of Tuesday, December 10 - \$800,000 over budget.
- Noted that the shared entrance was rejected.

Rick Epstein

- Noted that the orientation of the main entryway feels hidden.
- Mentioned that there is confusion on multipurpose room.
- Noted that there needs to be further design investigation on east elevation.
- Noted that there needs to be a more robust discussion on the second floor deck.

- Suggested that shading is at conceptual level, needs to be further developed.
- Mentioned the second floor “fin walls” performance of windows need to be looked at, maybe make solid.
- Noted that the key views are to the west and north; suggested to study further to integrate less glass and glazing.
- Stated that the entrances on the south elevation are confusing and to develop hierarchy and make secondary entrances.

Chris Carvell

- Mentioned the issues that they resolved from the previous DRB meeting.
- Addressed design implications:
 - Simplify hardscape, more uniform
 - Extend plaza in front of building
 - Widen portal between La Plata and Roaring Fork
 - Shifted foot print and minimized it
 - Connecting Alpine Village
 - Widen aperture to commons
- Addressed architecture issues:
 - Simplified level two
 - Unified elevation between front and back of house
 - Simplify main entry (less confusion, addressed proportion)
 - Roof form was lowered
 - Volume is lowered (second floor, parapet)
 - Consistent post and beam spacing
 - Sandstone walls anchor building
 - Connecting interior with exterior
 - Retaining walls in courtyard are gone
 - Set daylighting goals and strategies with glazing on south and west
- Noted that there is now equal seating and dining arrangement between level one and level two.
- Noted that the front porch area is a ‘grab and go’ space, not for dining.
- Stated that the shading detailing is ongoing and that a SunShade Diagram is being developed.

- Mentioned that the main entrance's issue could be rotated and "floating" (similar to University of Houston Project).

Gary Reynolds

- Asked about budget.

Teresa Osborne

- Mentioned that there will be a day worked out for Pre-DD.

Jeff Davis

- Discussed maintenance and safety issues. (24, recording 3)

Building 500 Window Replacement – Anschutz Medical Campus (via GoToMeeting)

Architect(s): SlaterPaull

Presenter(s): Andre Vite

Description: An update will be provided on the design process to date.

Victor Olgyay

- Suggested looking at fiberglass windows.
- Noted that the profile could look like original.
- Suggested certain facades that have the most heat gain and lower shading coefficient on south and west windows.
 - North and east: higher visible light transmission and higher shading coefficient
- Mentioned that the windows and mechanical system should be analyzed together.
- Suggested to imagine different types of glass for different orientations.
- Suggested to look at life cycle costs replacing windows along with mechanical systems.

Don Brandes

- Asked if the revisions are façade based.

Andre Vite

- Addressed window issues on existing building.
 - Keep wood windows, on first floor
 - Change steel windows to aluminum
- Mentioned to replace metal windows with aluminum windows with insulated glazing.
- Noted that he will look into fiberglass windows.
- Noted that IGU Glass, low E coating could be placed on third surface.
- Mentioned that the mechanical systems will be upgraded.

- Updated DRB with what moved forward.

(Update - Mentioned the significant changes to the design on the Rocky Mountain Lions Eye Institute expansion.)

North of Boulder Creek (via conference call) – CU-Boulder

Architect(s): OZ Architecture

Presenter(s): Tom Goodhew, Phil, Rochelle

Description: Introduction

Victor Olgyay

- Suggested that DRB would like to see exploration of the opportunities.
- Mentioned concern with the large proposed buildings against the small existing buildings in the neighborhood.
- Asked what is the plan that moves forward; what information should DRB expect.
- Asked to clarify what the pieces and research that are being done for the Master Plan.
- Referenced page 27: Texas Wrap Residential and Structured Parking is noted
 - B3: defined in terms of site acreage, number of units, development per acre
 - Specific to development based on parcel
 - Questioning the process of deciding the parcel size and uses
- Mentioned concern with the course detail that exists.
- Asked if there will be testing in regards to the relationship between the streets and creeks.
- Suggested to look at different density uses in terms of page 289.

Rick Epstein

- Expressed that there needs to be more definition before creating Design Guidelines.
- Noted that it is a critical notion to create a connectivity diagram.
- Questioned what will be in those pods.
- Mentioned that in between transportation and land use, there needs to be a relationship established.
- Asked why the density is higher in one place than another.
- Expressed that DRB is looking for further information that determines the decision making and defining the land use connections will help further determine those decisions.
- Expressed that the road lay out on page 26 and that DRB is unsure how they got to this layout and curious on what was the intention.

- Suggested that the proposed layout on pg. 22 and 26 changed the street layouts.
 - Ran street into Folsom
 - Secondary street all the way through
 - Third street all the way through
 - Ran 4-6 streets to reinstate grid
 - Series of streets will distribute density of traffic
- Suggested to push density away from neighborhood and that DRB wanted to see the main strategies and design process to achieve the goals.
- Mentioned that the goal is to provide simple framework, promote sense of place, sustainability.
- Stressed that, at some point, things need to be solidified.
- Asked to see more planning and processes.
- Asked about flood mitigation.

Don Brandes

- Mentioned that the firm is missing an analysis of the neighborhood.
- Asked what they are trying to design around the 1300 units.
- Noted that there is an issue with density and traffic.
- Asked where is the demographic of who they are designing this for.
- Noted that the demolition of current buildings displaces and causes all sorts of havoc.
- Mentioned that there is concern with the level that Oz is at and wants a better understanding on what is developing.
- Noted that the DRB is looking for who has studied the site to see if it will accommodate the program.
- Mentioned that existing conditions with accessibility and size will need to accommodate proposed development program.
- Noted that the expectation from the DRB was that the Plan was going to be more of a Master Plan and design.
- Suggested that the extension of grid of neighborhood needs to be honored.
- Noted that the land use alternatives need to be tested so they don't have as many implications.
- Asked what the level of review is that is appropriate and inappropriate.

Phil Simpson

- Mentioned that the Master Site Development Plan would be used to secure approval from the board and would negotiate an intergovernmental agreement with the City of Boulder,

FEMA, and Boulder County, and other organizations that have an impact on the development.

- Noted that a program plan would come from this Master Site Development Plan.
- Addressed the uses and parking requirements for the Williams Village Master Site Plan.
- Mentioned that the Design Guidelines would run parallel with the Master Plan.
- Public document
 - Looks at financial, types of housing, mix of housing, legal aspects
 - Being planned in the background to be studied to help influence further (EPS, Andrew)
- EPS is doing the background research.
- This is second of three steps
 - Outlines what is going on
 - Next one would be April: documents combined
- Noted that the design team needs to regroup to better communicate.
- EPS, DRB, and Oz could meet together to discuss the next steps.
- Suggested the design elements and issues that are involved in the road layout
 - Didn't require student population to cross major road
 - Crosswalk issues
 - Aggregating housing parcels into 2 big lots (A lot, B lot) would maximize flexibility to deal with density, minimize crossings
- Mentioned that the firm is trying to work with the City of Boulder to mitigate traffic impacts.
- Stated that Oz is responding to user issues, recreation, land use and that the plan is trying to respond to lots of issues.
- Expressed that the connectivity to grid, flow of people, create larger blocks, more flexible housing have all been debated.
- Discussed that the land use diagram will shift into Design Guidelines
 - Introduction to design guidelines that will wrap up plan
 - Close out with refined Design Guidelines with further detail
- Mentioned that there will be further discussion with the team in terms of the direction that it is headed.
- Addressed that the firm is working with density issues, parking issues, infrastructure of existing capacity.

- Noted that the plan will provide a better transportation network, better connection among the area, mitigation of flood, and opening up and maximizing athletic space.
- Noted that the City doesn't consider this area to be a risky part of town in terms of flooding.

Tom Goodhew

- Noted that certain properties (2 parcels in northeast corner) need to be acquired but can't be shown at this time.
- Mentioned the map of proposed layout has changed.
- Noted that the Athletics Master Plan will consolidate athletic facilities.
- Mentioned that there could be a fourth step that emphasizes further on the design guidelines.
- Addressed mitigation of flood issues in the pods to raise floors up; can it be used as residential flood space.