



Office of the Vice President for Finance

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

University of Colorado DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting of Thursday - February 9, 2012

Table with 2 columns: Label (Location, Time, DRB members present) and Value (CU-Boulder Student Recreation Center, 1:45-3:45, Y/N, and list of members).

Agenda Items



Student Recreation Facilities Improvements Review

- a. Architect(s): Davis Partnership with Cannon Design and CIVITAS Landscape
b. Presenter(s): Brian Ericson, Davis Partnership; Ken Wiseman, Cannon Design; Todd Mead, CIVITAS Landscape; Tom Goodhew, CU-Boulder Planning
c. Campus Staff Present:



Summary of presentation:

The meeting began with a discussion of project finances and the need to evaluate the design in light of updated budget numbers. It was noted that student input would be critical to the evaluation of the design as it changed over time.

The DRB prefaced the designer's presentation by saying that they had concerns with the current proposals and would not be approving the schematic design at this meeting. It was decided to break the presentation into segments, with DRB feedback following each segment.

Todd Mead from CIVITAS began with a review of the overall site plan and the proposed changes to areas adjacent to the recreation center, including:

- Extension of the recreation facility southward toward Pleasant Street;
• Opportunity to enhance Pleasant Street as a pedestrian-focused corridor with new surface materials and an allee of trees focused on the Carlson Gym;
• Relocation of Parking Lot 380 to the west – flipping the relationship with Sewall Field;
• Increased ADA access, and an improved pedestrian approach on center's east end;

- Parking and service access on the north side, with anticipation of a future service link to Sewall Hall;
- Plaza with seating to connect with Clare Small Arts and Sciences building;
- Proposed outdoor pool elevation is changing (potentially to same elevation as existing indoor pool). Pool will be surrounded by 8' black steel fence; and
- Entry plaza on south end with access from east, west, and Ramaley Biology.

Following Todd's presentation, the DRB offered the following input related to the site plan:

- Focus on enhancing the plaza at the south entry of the building and improving its connection to Sewall Field. The DRB sees this area as a great opportunity to make a cohesive social space, and wants to see a design that offers a lot of 'bang for the buck' so that it is not value engineered out at a later date.
- The proposed changes to Pleasant Street are good. Moving towards a pedestrian-oriented environment is the right choice.
- Review the design of Parking Lot 380 to accommodate more cars on the west side, allowing all parking on Pleasant Street to be removed.
- Review the design of the fence surrounding the proposed pool for a softer, less utilitarian look.
- Ken Wiseman of Cannon Design presented on the building design. He reviewed the overall floor planning, which he says is still evolving, but functionally starting to work well. He noted:
  - primary focus is on the middle, main entry level
  - big goal of linking the southern entry to the large glass wall north side of building
  - outdoor pool is open to southern exposure
  - climbing wall area shifted; offers windows oriented to open views to north
  - greatly simplified ice rink
  - planning of the south addition is good

Ken discussed the challenges of designing the building in elevation; given that users experience the building in fragments. Regarding building elevations, he highlighted:

- attempt to respect proportions of existing campus architecture
- north facade has large picture window with nice rhythm of columns
- proposed social space on the south pushed entry around corner to east
- proposed entrance in a recessed arch is challenging, as it isn't the typical entry protrusion

The DRB offered the following input regarding the architectural design:

- review massing and elevation as they relate to site experience
- simplify the architecture, allowing the mass to speak for itself
- ensure that the building's interior use is expressed on the outside
- review elevations to increase cohesiveness and continuity between various facades
- look to the existing building architecture, that of nearby buildings, and principles and systems of Klauder to inform design
- review the character of the three entrances to increase cohesiveness
- the proposed north elevation is the most preferred so far
- explore the push/pull of the massing to reinforce southern entry
- site becomes more important on south and west sides
- review west facade to provide more of a backdrop instead of primary statement
- maximize opportunity for an inviting social space along Pleasant Street to create an outdoor space for facility users and non-users alike

Regarding the environmental sustainability and energy considerations, Ken offered:

- all major interior spaces are daylit;
- adding skylights to allow daylight from top, supplemented from the sides;
- strategy of using displacement ventilation to take advantage of rising heat (push at bottom, suck out at top);
- desire to use photovoltaic panels on the roof;
- two big energy challenges are the pool and ice rink ;
- the biggest challenge is rejecting heat in summer ;
- opportunity to try and use outdoor pool as cooling tower at night;
- desire to use translucent panels, not glass, to reduce direct sunlight to lessen heat gain;
- will have to balance value of day lighting with related heat gain; and
- Brian Erickson expects updated energy modeling results next week.

The DRB offered the following input regarding environmental sustainability/energy:

- pleased that sustainability is being addressed;
- desire to see updated energy modeling to better evaluate where the design stands;
- continue to explore the interior lighting and day lighting issues;
- review the roof plan (number and size of apertures and integration with PV panels); and
- further explore how energy analysis actually affects design issues and how bioclimatic issues might influence architectural design, including fenestration.

Prior to conclusion, the DRB solicited input from Recreation Center staff who expressed satisfaction with the internal features and function of the building. In light of budget constraints, staff reiterated the importance of maintaining (not shrinking) the capacity of interior space given the high program demands. They expressed a desire and commitment to work hard on reducing costs while meeting student needs and meeting the needs of the campus architectural design.

The meeting closed with a summary of feedback provided by the DRB:

- recommend flip of parking and Sewall Field and pedestrian emphasis along Pleasant Street;
- recognize opportunity to improve south entry, pool, pedestrian relationship as social space;
- consider how the architecture cooperates with sustainability; and
- simplify the architecture – increase cohesion, build off existing styles, let the use be expressive and move towards the character of the proposed north elevation.



Board Action:

Conceptual Design:

*Approve/Disapprove*

Schematic Design:

*Approve/**Disapprove***

Design Development:

*Approve/Disapprove*



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

Office of the Vice President for Finance

---

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

## University of Colorado Design Review Board Minutes

---

Friday, February 10, 2012  
1800 Grant Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor conference room

DRB Board members in attendance: Teresa Osborne (ex officio), John Prosser, Jerry Syracuse, Victor Olgay, Candy Roberts, Lois Brink, Gary Reynolds

Meeting minutes submitted by: Garrick Swanson (CCCD)

**8:00- 9:00 am**

***UCCS Master Plan Update***

***Architect(s): Ayers Saint Gross***

***Presenter(s): Kevin King and Sally Foster (Ayers Saint Gross; Gary Reynolds (UCCS))***

### Summary of Presentation:

The consultant presented the plan as updated since the last DRB presentation. There are currently 9,300 students on the UCCS campus; the number does not include those enrolled in a virtual learning program. 11,500 students are projected to be physically present on campus in 2020. The master plan theme includes transportation and a pedestrian spine connecting the new development on the Nevada Avenue corridor with the existing campus. The corridor will include activity nodes, and be designed with a landscape that respects the existing topography. The corridor will include a bus lane to transport students between classes. Pedestrian and bus traffic will converge at certain locations along the spine.

### Summary of DRB Members Comments:

Excellent type of concept and plan to look at the long-term range up to 2020 and beyond. The proposed layout solves most of the difficulties on the site as well as connection and circulation patterns. Campus vision and design needs to reflect the future ownership of the Eagle Rock property. Additional comments included:

- It is impossible to make class schedules work with the proposed campus shuttle. There is not enough time for students to make the connection between classes. If they miss the bus they will need to wait an additional 12 – 15 minutes. Think about the placement of professional schools. They do not need to be integrated into the core issue. These are populations that primarily operate out of one building or confined space. Could professional programs be connected to reduce the volume on the transportation system?
- Existing and proposed trail system – One must look at the whole system not just the major trail system and major nodes on the master plan. The plan needs to be a comprehensive system including the existing network of recreation trails.

- North end of spine: The proposed track fits best with existing topography when it is not orientated north / south.
- Plaza south of the track is disconnected from the site – explore the options to integrate with road / trail system on proposed spine.
- Preserve access perpendicular to Nevada Avenue – a better connection to the existing and proposed development – create a slight angle into the Eagle Rock Properties to focus on the green space (soccer field).
- Austin Bluffs Parkway – needs better access to the property south of Austin Bluffs Parkway – have been working on this in the past to improve access. We do not want to lose what we have been working on to improve access.
- Create a campus amphitheater- a flexible space / valuable asset to academics and the university. Stadium and track area is a strong location for a theater. Second, it serves as a public and university gathering space to reinforce the arts and academics.
- Create a cost estimate for the spine with a phasing plan.
- Double check the amount of parking area to make sure it is adequate.
- To promote traffic calming consider a roundabout, with a branding logo or signature piece in the core.
- Slides #20 -25 (concern about pedestrian and vehicle conflict) Would like to see a diagram to see how they interact and relate.
  - The current master plan is vehicle dominant. Continue to explore the pedestrian element. How will the pedestrian and vehicle programs relate?
  - Parking garages are not related to the residential structures to the north (needs to be refined to develop a connection) south end of spine.
- Master plan needs more than a LEED Gold Standard
  - Detail how you are going to achieve the LEED Gold Standard.
  - Does the massing allow for access and passive solar gain or Access to winds for ventilation?
  - Master Plan document needs to include massing models and diagrams to help shape the future of the campus. A set of performance guides needs to be included to direct the future of the campus.
- Need to address the arroyos – in particular, the connection of the buildings and arroyos environmentally and programmatically. This will be a challenge for the transportation spine as it passes through multiple arroyos.

**9:00- 10:00 am**

***Lane Center for Academic Health Sciences – Introduction of the Project***

***Architect(s): Anderson Mason Dale***

***Presenter(s): Paul Haack (Anderson Mason Dale); Gary Reynolds (UCCS)***

### ***Summary of Presentation:***

This session will be the introduction of the design team to receive input from DRB on issues they wish to see addressed. This is the first major new building along Nevada Avenue. A traffic study has been commissioned for the current three-way intersection to address student parking and traffic needs. Nevada Avenue is no longer designated as a state highway.

### ***Summary of DRB member comments:***

- Pre-design Phase is to outline key components and outcomes that guide the design phase
- The alignment with Eagle Rock Road needs to be studied. The alignment needs to respect the quad and pedestrian / vehicle relationship.

- It is more interesting to not align the buildings to Nevada Avenue. Loosen up the buildings and space them around the knoll. Respect and utilize the existing contours. Work off of the organic conditions that are currently on site. The design needs to integrate the pedestrian access and landscape elements such as sculpture and water reflecting the process of healing. Reinforce the most unique aspect to the campus - the topography.
- Relocate the parking and free up space for future expansion to the south. We need to remember that we are building one structure at a time. Remove the parking lot that is currently in the center of the proposed quad.
- Option C seems to be the preferred option. There is a phase 1 and phase 2 for option C.
- Allow the main transportation spine of the master plan to visually and physically terminate into the knoll and building. Again, offset the building from Nevada Avenue (not parallel). This will showcase the building to the street as well as physically and visually connect the knoll with the spine.
- Consider the City of Colorado Springs' vision to reinforce the Palmer's Plan. Informal native plant species inspired the landscape on the campus side and the commercial side is more formal. There is no connection between the two types of landscape plantings.
- We need to develop a palate and theme for landscaping that is comprehensive. Our concept about native vs. the cultural campus landscape are two opposing views with a conflicting interest. The Convention Center is an example of using indigenous species to make a formal space. Establish a precedent to combine native and cultural landscape planting schemes.

#### **Summary the DRB key issues:**

Develop a Concept and Schematic design with a holistic relationship of building, landscape, campus and surrounding context. The sighting of the building needs to be a holistic view of parking, building and landscape. Specifically:

- Parking needs to be removed from the courtyard.
- Recognize the diagonal of the spine and its relationship to the knoll and architecture
- Consider the edge of Nevada Avenue and existing contours.
  - building and landscape should reflect these features
- Expand design option C – four-story building because campus is land poor.
- Address parking and Nevada Avenue.
- Pay attention to respecting view corridors with the future development.

**11:45 – 12:45 am**

#### ***Summit Village Expansion – Schematic Design***

***Architect(s): H & L Architecture***

***Presenter(s): Kent Freed, Lou Galletta (H&L Architecture); Carolyn Fox (UCCS)***

#### **Summary of DRB Review Comments:**

The schematic design review and discussion focused on architecture, sustainability, site and landscaping. The architecture has an opportunity to enhance entrances, material, colors, and focus on pedestrian level spaces (specifically underneath the building and patio overhang). Additionally, the project can improve the design of arroyos and look beyond the pedestrian focus to an environmental aspect to reduce erosion.

#### **Sustainability**

- The project is missing an energy analysis that defines the energy goals of the project.
- Double-hung windows and sliders are not energy efficient. Document how the design uses a variety of windows to meet different climatic conditions (east vs. west side). Higher

performance windows help offset other mechanical needs. The glassed walls of the stairwell have a high potential to prevent high performance of the building.

- Shade on the facades of the building can bring down summer loads (example: the west facade to limit building heating during summer months).
- Natural ventilation is an opportunity to cool the buildings without using air conditioning. Maximize the comfort of the building while limiting the energy loads. If policy limits cost – the goal is to reduce the energy loads.
- In a high-water consuming environment we can capitalize from the heat recovery of domestic hot water and continue to make this part of the design conversation.
- Roof-scape is a design opportunity for a solar hot water system. We can design for this opportunity and implement as funding is available. Don't forget the opportunity for design and future implementation.
- An energy analysis would compare and contrast the use of energy from the grid and solar power. Think about the arrangement of mechanical equipment as not to prevent the use of solar potential. Think about how the mechanical equipment can be part of the architecture. Challenge the design team to incorporate the roof mechanical equipment into future living system programs.
- The size of windows has a dominate effect on all aspects of a building's performance. Consider the environment by reducing window size to reduce costs by capturing and limiting solar impact.

### **Architecture**

- Use caution with the color yellow; it jumps off the building. Suggestion: return to a more natural color by looking at the existing landscape.
- Would like to see the roof pitch at 6 – firm will explore.
- Make sure that the entry vestibule and overhang areas do not limit the use of the space below. Would like to see a program or a range of program possibilities. The covered space should activate the architecture and landscape into a cohesive relationship.
- In the next phase: consider window layout and size, bike storage, trash and recycling locations.

### **Site Issues**

- When the arroyos have check dams, it no longer represents an arroyo. Do we have space to detain and control storm water before the spine? Expand project further upstream to slow down and use a natural check dam system that is more representative of an arroyo. Use the natural curves of the topography for the arroyos and rely less on the check dams.
- Integrate the green spines.
- Rain harvesting is a more preferred term than a rain garden.
- The space under the building has a high potential to be an unwelcoming space. Need to integrate into the bigger idea or an indoor outdoor space.

### **DRB ACTION - Schematic design approved**

#### **Summary**

- Architecture has opportunity for enhanced entrances (warehouse architecture), material, colors, with an additional focus on pedestrian level spaces and underneath building.
- Sustainability – increase sustainability of buildings backed up with an energy analysis.
- Improve design of arroyos and look beyond the pedestrian focus to environmental aspect to reduce erosion.