



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 July 15, 2013

The University Design Review Board met on Monday, July 15, 2013, in the Haehn Community Room, Dwire Hall, UCCS Campus.

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

Recreation Center and Health/Wellness Addition

Architect(s): Barker Rinker Seacat

Presenter(s): Katie Barnes, Architect - BRS; Wayne Hughes, Architect - Hughes Group; Gary Reynolds, Executive Director of Facility Services - UCCS; Carolyn Fox, University Architect - UCCS; Jeff Davis, Executive Director of Auxiliary Operations – UCCS; Luanne Ducett, President - Terra Nova Engineering, Inc.; and Mathew Evans, Landscape Architect – Lime Green Design.

Wayne Hughes:

- Reviewed progress that had been made in the initial meetings.
- Noted the site and building design challenges.
- Reviewed the project goals and objectives.
- Noted that faculty and staff will be dealing with multiple health issues – creating a warm, welcoming space is essential.
- Noted the budget restraints - \$225/sq. ft.
- Noted that the size of the recreation center will double in the expansion.
- Noted its proximity to the proposed recreational field/parking structure located across the street.
- Noted the existing building will not be renovated due to budget constraints.
- Inquired if there were other attributes the design team should investigate to help facilitate a successful design.

Teresa Osborne:

- Noted that the Board of Regents has approved that the counseling facilities be moved into the new expansion of the recreation center.

Candy Roberts:

- Inquired if nutritional education would be included in the facility – the design team noted it is to be included.
- Noted the importance of having realistic views and goals that align with programmatic factors for the recreational center.
- Reiterated the importance of thoroughly understanding the land.
- Suggested utilizing the roof to maximize parking.

Don Brandes:

- Encouraged the design team to monitor and understand adjacent and on-going campus projects and studies that directly affect the Community Center project. This is one project of many that are underway.
- Suggested that the design team conduct feasibility studies to really understand how the building will function as the “Campus Community Center” while serving three related, yet different functions, namely; Recreation, Health and Counseling.
- Recommended greater written and graphic detail on the overall project programming (uses, activities, services and facilities) for existing and proposed improvements that clearly articulate project goals and objectives.
- Recommended setting specific goals and objectives regarding low impact development (LID), energy systems and sustainability. What are your initial thoughts regarding how the project can achieve more integrated and seamless energy and life cycle systems?
- Emphasized the importance that the design team thoroughly understand and graphically portray all physical and natural conditions affecting the proposed development program. Underscored the importance of understanding the physical and natural conditions of the site and how either the development program will be modified to accommodate site conditions OR how the site will be modified to accommodate the development program. The DRB members will be interested in this analysis, discussion and resolution prior to illustrating design alternatives. What is the synthesis of your programming and site analysis in terms of determining an ideal development program and developable area?
- With a thorough understanding of programming objectives and site analysis – the DRB “reacts well” to alternative plans and options that are “weighted” to emphasize the pro’s and con’s associated with each development concept.
- Noted the “pedestrian and service spine” running throughout the campus needs to be understood and successfully incorporated into the design – this acts as the single most feature linking the campus “pieces” together.

Rick Epstein:

- Noted the importance of clarity throughout the design process – keeping fundamental design ideas driving the project.
- Recommended the design team has a hierarchy of importance to facilitate the design directives.
- Noted that the recreation expansion needs to not only have its own identity, but also fit within the context of the campus – unique but not out of place.
- Noted the importance of understanding the needs and potential uses within the building.
- Suggested conducting a more detailed site analysis to understand the conditions and unique features offered by the site.
- Noted the continual conflicts with the western sun and how to effectively shade the building while making a grand expression of the building.

Victor Olgay:

- Noted the opportunity to utilize the sun (design driver) to understand the proposed extension and create some interesting diagrams and studies.
- Noted the importance of understanding what may/may not be working on the existing recreational facility – how these can be improved or implemented in the expansion.
- Suggested looking at making features multi-use to help reduce capital costs and increase performance.

Carolyn Fox:

- Noted the proposed recreational field users also will be utilizing the updated recreation center when it is complete.
- Noted there is no need to designate a bike lane within the 20'0" pedestrian spine running through campus.
- Shuttle bus stops – feasibility studies on optimum location.

Gary Reynolds:

- Noted the width of the spine can be altered if the buildings have adequate fire access.

No formal decisions were made. The Board thanked the design team for their hard work and progress on the design.

First Year Experience Housing Village

Architect(s): Kiewit/Page Southerland Page (Design/Build)

Presenter(s): Christopher Carvell, AIA, Design Principal – Page Southerland Page

Present: Charles Schmidt, AIA, LEED AP, Project Designer – Page Southerland Page; Harvey Whitcomb, RA, LEED AP, Project Manager – Page Southerland Page; Greg Dolorek, Project Landscape Architect – Wenk; Gary Reynolds, Executive Director of Facilities Services – UCCS; Carolyn Fox, Campus Architect – UCCS; Ed Chagnalaf, Project Manager – Kiewit Building Group; and David Short, Project Designer – KSQ.

Carolyn Fox:

- Gave a brief summary of the project.
- Noted this is a Design/Build project.
- Noted there is potential to implement appropriate landscaping on this project – this has not been the case on other campus projects.
- Noted the project needs to be completed, and ready to house students, in the fall of 2015. This project will include 510 rooms, common spaces, and a dining hall.

Teresa Osborne:

- Noted this will be funded in the form of bonds and financed by student fees for individuals living in the facility – implementation is essential.

Christopher Carvell:

- Discussed the project's site location and context with respect to the campus.
- Noted that developing FYEHV also will include consideration of Alpine Village, creating a unique, inviting space while improving Alpine Village.
- Noted common spaces will provide multiple functions (academics, retail, etc.)
- Noted the intent to have students – currently living in Alpine Village – utilize the new amenities offered in FYEHV.
- Noted the sensitivity to the existing historic landscape features (arroyos, drainage, and archeology).
- Showed perspective images – discussing grade changes – provided by the 3D model.
- Discussed environmental influences (sun, wind, water, etc.).
- Noted key circulation – both pedestrian and vehicular.
- Discussed each firm's qualifications and design drivers that will facilitate the process – beginning pre-design to final completion.
- Suggested having an intermediate meeting to work with the Board.
- Noted the potential to incorporate areas for community gardening – offering yet another physical fitness opportunity and the ability to access fresh fruit and vegetables.

Greg Dorolek:

- Discussed key landscape typologies (bluff, prairie, arroyos, local drainage, etc.).
- Noted existing conditions in/around Alpine Village.
- Discussed opportunities for development.
- Noted the opportunity to visually celebrate the drainage running through the site and incorporating it into the finished landscape.

Candy Roberts:

- Noted the importance of having realistic goals that fall in line with programmatic factors for the recreational center.
- Reiterated the importance of understanding the land.
- Inquired about key programmatic elements – what's driving the design?
- Suggested allowing the Board to help facilitate design – they have intimate knowledge of history, designs, and successful amenities.
- Inquired if future vehicle circulation has been considered. How much traffic will be utilizing the road and what size of vehicles?
- Inquired about implementing gardens or areas allowing for fresh produce.

Don Brandes:

- Noted the importance of encouraging students to reserve campus housing for their second and third year based on their “first year experience.” Financially, this is important to the university.
- Noted the importance of referencing, and continuing to follow the planning, design, and construction of campus-wide projects and studies that will directly affect the First Year Housing (FYH) project, namely;
 - ✓ Parking and Recreation plan
 - ✓ Health and Wellness Center's plan
 - ✓ Campus Trials plan
- Discussed the importance of providing a more rigorous and comprehensive written and graphic site analysis that includes the existing Alpine Village buildings. Elements to analyze include, but should not be limited to, the following:

- ✓ Geological – arroyo, bluff, prairie, etc.
 - ✓ Hydrology – historic and projected drainage patterns
 - ✓ Topographic – gradients
 - ✓ Vegetation – native and non-native
 - ✓ Visual Analysis – external and Internal
 - ✓ Wildlife and migratory usage
 - ✓ Cultural and Archeological
 - ✓ Access – pedestrian, vehicular, service and emergency circulation and parking
 - ✓ Climatological – on/off site, etc.
 - ✓ Infrastructure – surface and subsurface utilities (existing and proposed)
 - ✓ Regulatory and Compliance Issues
- Encouraged the design team to synthesize existing conditions – a composite of what they consider to be critical site constraints and/or opportunities for future development based on accommodating the development program.
 - Noted the importance – graphically and verbally – of developing a clear development program to accommodate the site analysis, including:
 - ✓ Campus and project site context – Key Connections and Linkages
 - ✓ Physical and Natural conditions – A Synthesis of Opportunities and Constraints
 - ✓ Objectives for LID, Energy and Sustainability
 - ✓ Building Programming Objectives
 - ✓ The Consultants Synthesis – What are your conclusions? Observations based on your analysis? What is the balance between the site and program?
 - Suggested developing alternative site development and building concepts that embrace and reflect the analysis.
 - Encouraged the design team to utilize the Board on planning and design issues that they would like to further review, discuss and seek counsel.
 - Encouraged the design team to create alternatives that clearly support a logical and thoughtful “process.”

Rick Epstein:

- Noted the importance of clarity throughout the design process. This will help direct the project and keep fundamental design ideas at the forefront.
- Suggested looking at a more detailed report on the climatological conditions of the site – helping to move forward the design, understanding all constraints.
- Recommended having a hierarchy of importance to facilitate the design directives.
- Suggested developing “big idea concepts” to help facilitate design and keep the design team on track with goals and objectives.
- Noted the importance of understanding the needs and potential uses within the building.
- Noted the importance of considering not only views out, but also views into the building. This will be a predominant building visible for miles.
- Suggested creating a palette of architectural influences; this building needs to have its own identity, but fit within the context of the campus – unique but not out of place.

Victor Olgvay:

- Noted that the Board is more helpful if they receive materials before presentations – reducing presentation time and allowing adequate time to make appropriate recommendations.

- Encouraged the design team to consider the “spine’s” role and placement within the design – is it a key factor in the design?
- Noted the importance of having very clear, concise goals to help drive design and help overcome obstacles.

No formal decisions were made. The Board thanked the design team for their hard work and progress on the design.

* Reconvened as the Research Park DRB *

POD J Design Development

Architect(s): Davis Partnership

Presenter(s): Phil Simpson, CU-Boulder Planning, and Brian Erickson, Davis Partnership.

Individuals present: Phil Simpson, Campus Planner and Assistant Director for Facilities Planning – CU-Boulder; William Arndt, CU-Boulder Facilities Management (Retired) – CU-Boulder Facilities Management; Joe Lear, Associate Principal – Davis Partnership; Brian Erickson, Principal – Davis Partnership; Jim Faber, Project Manager – CU-Boulder; Kim Prentice, Managing Director Development & Operations – Nexcore Group; Lynn Moore, Principal – Davis Partnership; and Tony Ruiz, Project Executive, Expansion Projects and Operations/Facilities – University of Colorado Hospital.

Phil Simpson:

- Noted the constraint of the building layout – practically no changes can occur.

Lynn Moore:

- Noted that the proposed seat walls create a visual and physical threshold.
- Noted the proposed brick palette complements the other buildings on campus.

Brian Erickson:

- Noted the windows are fixed – not operable.
- Noted the team used the solar study to determine several things, including appropriate glass for light penetration.
- Discussed building materials and their specific functions.

Victor Olgay:

- Commended the design team on paying attention to small details.
- Noted the importance of the design team to consider sustainability.
- Discussed heating/cooling variables and how they can affect capital costs and overall performance.
- Noted opportunity for increased performance in energy consumption.
- Inquired about an energy intensive design goal – is it prepared?
- Inquired about the solar test conducted and what the team took away from it. Did it influence the design? If so, how?
- Noted that adding shade trees to outdoor seating areas could effectively gain LEED points.
- Inquired about the proposed roof color and what bearing this may have on heat gain.

Candy Roberts:

- Noted disconnect between the repeated punched windows and the punched entry – lacks designation.
- Suggested looking for grander ways to celebrate the entry/exit – this may be accomplished by adding an architectural element or awning.
- Noted the proposed roof isn't adequate for the design.
- Noted the importance of conducting elevation studies to understand how the building will integrate within the site.
- Reiterated the fact that this building needs to fit within the CU family of buildings.

Don Brandes:

- Noted the entry plaza's architecture, architectural studies, and elevations need more consideration and articulation – the current packet doesn't reflect this.
- Noted the architectural detailing needs more consideration.
- Noted the proposed roof design is not adequate for its intended purpose – slope and orientation.
- Sustainability – The Board understands there is not a requirement in the present guidelines; they would like to see adequate consideration in reaching a specific level of LEED.
- Noted the several entrée alternatives presented – the Board would like clarification on which plan is preferred and how they are going to move forward.
- Suggested site design studies to thoroughly understand how elements would function within the site.
- Suggested eliminating the proposed seat wall and implement a series of seating areas broken up by shaded landscape plantings.
- Noted simplicity may be the key to success in terms of the architecture, lighting, planting, etc.
- Suggested considering a new ornamental specimen tree – Golden Rain trees, although showy, they are extremely messy.

Rick Epstein:

- Noted the importance of achieving a specific level of LEED certification.
- Suggested shifting parking to allow for a straight crossing from the canal to the main building entrance walkway.
- Noted the importance of seeing architectural details – notes key relationship between elements.
- Noted the entry feels fragmented – this may be due to the fragmented roof.
- Suggested looking at window details to help create visual interest and variation.
- Suggested trying to utilize the proposed seat-walls as an area that can be habitable and provide adequate amounts of shade.
- Noted the roofs feel fragmented and suggested trying to make a cohesive object.
- Noted wall sections are important in relaying design ideas and materials.

Design Development was not approved. The Research Park DRB thanked the design team for their hard work and progress on the design.

Anschutz Medical Campus Master Plan Study

Architect(s): AndersonMasonDale
Presenter(s): Michael Del Giudice (OIP)

Individuals present: Andre Vite, Campus Architect – University of Colorado Denver; Michael Del Giudice, Chief Planning Officer – University of Colorado Denver.

Michael Del Giudice:

- Noted the changes and progress that have been made since the last meeting.
- Discussed changes to updated owned and leased properties – updated boundaries on the Anschutz Medical Campus.
- Discussed the site-wide character zones found within the campus boundary.
- Noted the updates that have been made on the proposed roadway network – vehicular movement.
- Discussed the proposed bicycle/pedestrian networks and how they function within the site.
- Noted the importance of conducting site-wide landscape, storm water management, sustainability, way finding, and lighting plans.
- Noted the changes that have been made in the surface parking near the newly proposed transit stop.
- Noted some of the key challenges with developing a transit area [bioremediation, access, etc.] for the campus.
- Lightly touched on Phase I and II project diagram maps.
- Recommended conducting master planning [techniques] in ways that are suitable with flexibility and change.
- Noted the potential to include a bicycle share system on the campus – awaiting funding and site development.
-

Rick Epstein:

- Inquired about the surface parking that was included in the last packet.

Teresa Osborne:

- Noted the master plan will be presented to the Board of Regents this fall for approval.

Candy Roberts:

- Commented on how successful – and necessary - the diagrams are for understanding context.

Don Brandes:

- Noted the importance of governance in making decisions.
- Noted this is a structural framework packet – not a master plan document.
- Inquired about the carrying capacity of the site.
- Noted the importance of having a solid business plan [finance, funding, etc.]

No formal decisions were made. The Board thanked the design team for their hard work and progress on the design.

Tertiary Campus Boundary Markers for the Anschutz Medical Campus

Architect(s): Andre Vite (OIP)

Presenter(s): Andre Vite

Individual present: Andre Vite, Campus Architect – University of Colorado Denver; Michael Del Giudice, Chief Planning Officer – University of Colorado Denver.

Michael Del Giudice:

- Noted permission [from different land owners] must be received if signs are the preferred method of choice.

Andre Vite:

- Updated the Board on the progress that had been made since the last meeting.
- Noted that all options were presented to the President for review.
- Noted the mandatory 4'0" radius on all median standards.
- Noted that these obelisks are boundary-marking objects, not signs.

Candy Roberts:

- Noted that the obelisks need a strong base to ground the object.

Don Brandes:

- Discussed the importance of a safety base around the obelisks protecting them from water, salt, snow, etc.
- Noted the size of the obelisks make them a pole – not a designation marker.

Victor Olgyay:

- Noted that the idea of obelisks could be very well incorporated and create visual interest.

Rick Epstein:

- Noted that, ideally, these would be placed on each side of the street and increase in scale, providing light and entry for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

No formal decisions were made. The Board thanked the design team for their hard work and progress on the design.
