



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University Design Review Board

Thursday, July 17, 2014

University of Colorado Boulder
Folsom Field
East Stadium Club Level (5th floor) North Side Room

Design Review Board Members Present: Don Brandes, Candy Roberts, Rick Epstein, Victor Olgyay

Boulder Staff Present: Tom McGann– Athletics Facilities Management; Richelle Reilly- Planning; Tom Goodhew – Planning; William Haverly – Planning; Rob Dean – Project Manager Euclid AutoPark Addition; William Arndt – CU-Boulder, note taker

Euclid Autopark Addition Introduction Presentation

Presenter(s): Wayne Northcutt & Richelle Reilly

Architects: OZ Architecture + Planning / BOORA Architects / GH Phipps

Description: An introduction to the project with the design build team seeking input and feedback from the DRB for pre-design for CU-Boulder's new student services building. The project is approximately 115,000 GSF and situated on top of the Euclid Autopark.

- Front door to campus gateway for visitors, touchstone for alumni, advising center for all students of campus.
- The building will not just be a point of arrival, but also a showcase for campus diversity.
- Reaching out to a broader set of populations.
- Building has the ability to be transformational in showing what is happening on campus now and in the future.
- Showcase that highlights the academic strength of CU-Boulder, an environment of nurturing and encouraging. Building should reveal the depth of this activity.
- Telling a richer story about the diversity of populations served on campus.
- Still in the process of developing building user groups.
- Building is to take disparate programs, put in the heart of the campus, and create synergies to connect to the life of every student on campus.
- Budget is established at \$43 million.
- Targeting completion of design development for January 2015.
- Construction should begin in May 2015. Garage will be closed from May to October.
- Construction will continue on structure's roof over the next 16 to 18 months.
- This is the second largest transit center in the entire state, second only to downtown Denver.
- Thinking about project in context of arrival point. Some strong physical boundaries (Broadway, for example). Some porous boundaries to the north.
- Discussing the idea of the building as a gateway separating outside world from the academic world, or the idea of a porous gateway where the two worlds meet.

Landscape

- The Front Range and Flatirons create the idea of a natural edge that comes down and flows / transitions into campus.
- The texture of open space gets finer and more urban (courtyards, Shakespeare gardens); give the building site an interesting character compared to other green space on campus.
- Elements of projects that extend just outside the building, but on this part of campus there is not a landscape experience that stitches the campus arrival to the overall landscape.
- If we build up, we also have to grow out with the landscape.
- We are asking how we can tie together the beautiful components of landscape that now feel cut off.
- The idea is to build off of the complexity of plant material (sweet spot microclimate) of Boulder.
- Negotiate grade, define safe-zones.
- How do we transform Euclid as less of a barrier?

Site Issues

- Redirect existing pedestrian and bike circulation away from UMC service yard.
- Improve safety and experience while maintaining transit capacity.
- Expand functionality of appearance of bike parking.
- Maintain function and circulation while enhancing character of Visual Arts Green.
- Provide / maintain views to the Flatirons.

Future Site Development

- Music building expansion.
- Science building expansion.
- Telecom building could go away to define a grand quad area.
- Looking for advice and input for a strategy that impacts / responds to future development.
- Vision for redevelopment of the massive parking lot is a little unclear to the team.
- Ability to reshape Euclid and capture more green space.
- Negotiating grade change across a fairly limited buildable footprint.
- First occupiable level of the building is 14' - 22' above grade.
- Pulling curb line out one lane and reconsidering intersection can triple the amount of horizontal area. This can allow us to negotiate a desirable grade change.
- Parking garage is designed for three levels.

First Concept - Pinwheel

- Hoping to create a transit hub along 18th. Make the path of entry for students on campus run along 18th, as a result, the primary entrance is on 18th.
- Relocating transit-oriented services to the south of Euclid.
- Thinking about the transition to the building as the transition from the Front Range to the mountains.
- An earth berm will provide a 5% ramp seamlessly incorporated into entry. Not just a way to get up, but also as a place.
- The team is exploring the opportunity to integrate the landscape and bike parking.
- First-time visitors to park at surface lot (orient themselves to the landscape) to the south as opposed to getting "buried in the beast" by parking in a structure.

Second Concept – Porch

- Idea is to pull the landscape through the building. In this concept Euclid stays as existing.
- On the north side there is a berm that transitions into green space, per master plan.
- Trying to define area with a sense of portal and entry not just for visitors but everyone.

Third Concept – Land Bridge

- Traditional campus idea drives this concept. It is more symmetrical; does not alter existing Euclid.
- Provides a porch on the north side looking back to the fine arts green.
- Landscape treated as a park. Maximized bus drop off, parking to Broadway edge. Visitors arrive, then move through park to Euclid.

Fourth Concept - Procession

- Responds to traffic flow and idea of students moving along 18th.
- The form needs more development. To achieve this concept, need to negotiate curb line.

DRB Comments

Victor Olgyay – Happy to see the team is looking at issues DRB and staff have already discussed; rather than pick a scheme, would like to discuss the principles that we liked over all concepts. Idea of resolving traffic conflicts will really make the project successful. Referring to connections across Euclid to UMC, connections through to the Visual Arts Green, opportunity to repair quads and connections through the outdoor terraced “displaced” landscape; there are some principles the DRB and staff were not excited about. Not as excited about the east entrance and it seemed to them that the building should face south more.

Rick Epstein - The sheer wall bookending the service yard needs attention. There could be a secondary east-west circulation system. This would add richness and complexity to the circulation system.

Candy Roberts – Liked the massing concept that shows a visible cut through the building; has a dynamic relationship.

Rick Epstein – Architecturally, this building is a great opportunity to respect the campus’s traditional architecture but also look into the future. Interesting building to explore “diversity” on campus.

Don Brandes –

- Given the importance of the intent and desired outcome of the project, please consider an appropriate name for the project.
- Explore the origin and destination (a.m. and p.m.) of users for the facility and the adjoining campus facilities in terms of visitors (parents/students), on-campus students passing through, transit, bicycle, car (drop off, short term park, longer term park, emergency, maintenance). How do we seamlessly accommodate the various users given the variety of nodes and modes of transportation?
- Explore how the proposed site improvements and architecture can meld and unify the adjacent campus quads, courtyards, pathways and buildings into a welcome gateway that seems less than a transit/parking hub and more of an integrated “Welcome and Discovery Center.”
- Your “affected project area and budget” is larger than the existing parking structure. Encourage your team to continue to portray the larger context of the project site – to better evaluate visual, pedestrian and site/landscape improvements.
- Early in the planning and design process, please temper your proposed site and building improvements according to your approved program and budget, but clearly noting future phased improvements that you consider important/critical to the overall plan.
- Congratulations on a very thoughtful introduction and initial exploration of ideas, connections and important relationships. Please keep your project architect and landscape architect’ joined at the hip’ throughout the planning and design process.

Candy Roberts – the terrace at UMC isn't really used as much. Would like to see concepts that encourage a building that people move through. Would be nice to see a concept that flows out of Klauder, not symmetry, but balance.

Rick Epstein stated that we are in danger of fossilizing the campus, losing dynamism and becoming static. This building will represent something different. We do not want a radical break from traditional campus architecture. Want something "of the campus" that is also "of today and tomorrow." In reply, it was noted that they want to improve the indoor-outdoor relationship of the traditional Klauder buildings. Epstein encouraged a research assignment for net presentation from the Boulder campus and elsewhere that respects and extends the campus language. Massive new buildings have lost the scale of traditional feel and permeability. Smaller older buildings feel internalized.

Athletics Complex Site Design & Design Development

Presenter(s): Populous; Michael Ray, Brian Smith, Jeremy Krug

Description: Approval for design development of the site. Design development approval for the Indoor Practice Facility.

Review design development conditions of the northeast corner building (aka Football Ops) that the DRB placed on the approval for the building.

Site Plan (DD)

Entry road and entry sequence has changed.

- Moved entry drive farther south to avoid floodplain.
- Entry experience now takes on much different character.
- Tree bosque becomes entry point of project as a pedestrian court.
- Parking configuration: Leaving lot #390 as-is, building additional 55 parking spaces for total of 75 spaces.
- Master planned a planter bench landscape plan for future additions.
- Developed a scoring plan for landscape surface.
- Buff Walk piece is anticipated 20' sidewalk (shared auto and pedestrian).
- Develop campus node to start circulation piece to North Boulder Creek.
- Developed circulation diagrams to accommodate all users / visitors.
- Developed entry diagrams to delineate secure areas, ticketing areas, etc.
- Enlargement of the pedestrian court. Tree spaces widened to 32' spacing; drive lanes are 15' wide, allows for busses and semi deliveries.
- The transit stop is moving, but the shelter will stay at current location.
- The drive aisle is both parking and driveway; 17' parking space; 15 drive space is the recommended width for 45 degree parking.
- Pedestrian corridor, south of weight room will have planters, priced as an add alternate.
- Colorado Avenue ticketing plaza becomes 50' wide.
- Site accessories and furnishings are typical of campus.
- Permeable pavers will be the same as Norlin Plaza, but in herringbone pattern.
- Retaining wall to rise about 8'.
- Wall at edge of floodplain to rise to about 17'.
- Cut the parapet wall back and Boulder Creek elevation.

Landscaping

- Maple trees in 6x6 tree grates north of the building.
- Northernmost wall is the tallest wall.
- Cottonwood, pinon and evergreen will be planted to screen the wall.
- Trying to plant the saddle to hide the wall.
- Prairie seed mix, deciduous and evergreen trees along northern slope.
- Water quality area – pond will be excavated in existing glade to north, near Boulder Creek.

- Saving existing cottonwoods; ADA path “wiggles” around trees.
- Gleditsia triacanthos (honey locust) ‘Shademaster’ to be planted in pedestrian court.
- Buff Walk- left side to be planted with dense Linden trees with evergreens planted underneath. Hybrid Japanese Elm planted to the right side.
- Saving seven existing trees in this area (inside fence).

Civil

- Pulling away from developing within riparian area.
- Other concepts remain same as before.

DRB Comments

Don Brandes noted that the most extensive wall is 17’ on the north side and inquired whether they were looking into stepping it at all. They responded that they were looking at planting zones that wouldn’t work with stepping the wall. Brandes asked if there was an integrated curb for the retaining wall because, from a structural standpoint, they could reduce the cost with integration. It was pointed out that this is the current design and that Mortensen is pricing it out now. It was confirmed that they are basically piping and draining the practice field through roof drains.

Brandes requested a walkthrough of ADA accessibility over the entire site plan. Campus wall signs have been approved already. Everything shown has been priced for construction by Mortensen, except for weight room roof planters and landscaping. These have been master-planned as ‘add-alternate.’ The field lighting does not meet the Boulder city ordinance for light pollution spillover, but should not be an issue. It doesn’t spill over into the neighborhood; only spills over onto sidewalk. Still, this is a reduction from existing light pollution spillover.

Parking entry turn radius is tight for semis and buses. Facilities has agreed to allow deliveries to drive against traffic flow. The inside curb is reinforced with paving band. There are three ‘add-alternates’ right now. The total cost for all the ‘add-alternates’ for the entire site development has not been estimated yet.

Candy Roberts inquired if there is a stacked stonewall in the water quality area and who is detailing it. (They are recycling stone from the current construction, but they have not begun to detail or to discuss it.)

Rick Epstein suggested an additional median at the drive entrance on Folsom St. In reply, there are actually three lanes that will change direction according to game day traffic flow.

Candy Roberts inquired about the existing statue of Frank Shorter and where it will be located. Commented that it is a nice monument, especially for the Boulder Boulder race. The statue is the property of the President’s office and it will likely be relocated.

Indoor Practice Facility Architecture

- From egress standpoint parking level required to have three exits.
- From field level required two exits.
- Opportunity to explore PV solutions to celebrate a degree of sustainability.
- Looking at mechanical systems that will heat, cool and ventilate the building.
- Broken up scale of the building by increasing rhythm / sequence of sandstone pieces.
- On east side all windows at Kalwall.
- On west side combination of Kalwall and clear glazing for views relationship to exterior.
- Sandstone glazing to mirror that which is typical of campus.

Victor Olgyay

- Concern that Kalwall will create bright spots on the walls and less light on playing surface.
- Clear glazed windows will provide views for pedestrians into practice field with option to cover under coaches’ discretion.
- There are 2.5 acres of roof. Exploring options to introduce photovoltaic solar panels to roof.

- There is a minimum of 500 Kw that makes solar a viable option.
- West side of roofline is less efficient.
- For a net zero efficiency, required 16,560 on west side and 27,600 sf on the left side.
- Once the contractor is on board with solar, there is a lot more to explore.

Bill Haverly

- Would like to see endorsement from DRB to seek approval from University to add solar panels to IPF roof.
- A third party would be charged with the installation.
- Need panel-to-panel connectivity for efficiency reasons.
- Interior day lighting strategies are being explored. Continuous skylighting and diffuser panels. Will the diffuser panels be able to retain footballs? We do not want things collecting in the roof.

Northeast Operations Building

- Dal Ward connection bridge to be a gateway to the corner of the stadium. Went back to a masonry solution, removed the red clay roof.
- Redesigned the base of the Northeast Entry Tower.
- Stepped the tower out using precast to achieve broader base.
- Grand staircase remains mostly the same. Made some value engineering modifications in Northeast corner of open court.
- Moved ticket windows into open space.
- Stair and elevator for circulation of general public.
- Stair wall remains level with back wall elevation.

DRB Comments

Northeast Building

Candy Roberts stated that one month ago granted DD approval was granted for the Northeast Building under specific conditions. Thanked Michael Ray for his work in such a fast project. The board would feel more comfortable if the team extracts out of CD packages a real DD package that meets requirements for DD approval. It is our understanding that there are elements that have been unresolved that need to be reviewed. Need to figure out a schedule to meet with Don and Candy on Tuesdays. Need to see what is going to be built, not constantly changing as has been happening. Board is uncomfortable with degree of change to design. There are questions about the lights on the windows.

Victor Olqvay – DD set is to clarify for the board what exactly is going to be built as it relates to the budget rather than ‘add-alternates.’ We are particularly concerned that we approve something but it changes and gets built that way. We are afraid of seeing a beautiful rendering but what gets built does not look like the rendering. As a team need to ensure quality and designs will not get diluted further.

Candy Roberts – Talked to Doug about someone from Populous being the ‘accountant’ to keep track of what has been approved.

Rick Epstein – (pg. 71-74) The building tower base still feels pinched. As an important entry, would like to see the arch at base widened. Also the crenellation needs to be resolved. There is a chimney that feels a little out of place. Need to be mindful of where louvers are going. As a DD package, we need to see these things finally resolved. (pg. 75) On the stair elevation, the first wall created too much enclosure on stairs. Entire area (landings) needs site furnishings (benches, lights, flags, plants) to make this feel like a place.

Don Brandes – Commended team on their work but board feels like the area is developing into a ramp. Suggested there is an opportunity to add pedestrian-scaled elements to make this a significant meeting place. Perhaps it needs an icon, seasonal plantings, and annual planters. In reply, Bill Haverly noted that they are driving to keep the area open and trying to decorate the entire facility as a whole later for means of identity and branding.

Rick Epstein – there are things like adding architectural, stone benches so that even if additions don't come for years down the road, would transform the space to a real pedestrian experience.

Don Brandes – would like to see the trees in this area included as an important element to the staircase.

Candy Roberts – if there is anything that can be included into the architecture it needs to be designed now, not later. The board needs more detail (which was not included in the package) and must be able to see the grand staircase and review.

Site

Candy Roberts – Need to figure out a reasonable timeframe to extract a thoughtful DD package; need to fold grand staircase design into DD package for Northeast Building; do we really want to invest in Linden trees?

Don Brandes – would like to see a detailed lighting plan with legend and scale.

DRB Moves to Approve DD for Northeast Corner Building Under Following Conditions

Don Brandes – Moved to approve (seconded by Olgay) DD for site plan under following conditions:

- Complete DD packet (per DRB submittal requirements)
- Consideration for vehicle entries, crossings into structured parking area/pedestrian crossings
- Better delineation – base budget vs. 'add-alternates'
- Lighting

The motion carried.

IPF Building

Victor Olgay – Would say the building is going in the right direction. Continues to encourage team to explore a net zero energy efficient building. Encourages sustainable design. Encourage using day lighting studies to inform the design as opposed to design informing day lighting studies. Still concerned with Kalwall. At 20% transparency not sure it is the right option. Visual comfort and ability to see flying footballs is important and the rendering right now do not support that. Ventilation in the building and in the parking structure. There is an opportunity to show how ventilation will work.

Rick Epstein – To make a net zero electricity building it is not just about PV. Improved ventilation will have a huge impact on energy demand. Also suggested additional lighting control to take advantage to day lighting inside building.

Reply- there is daylighting and climate control in the design already. About to exceed 100% on daylighting.

Bill Haverly stated that it is unusual for a practice facility to have so much light – would not normally have windows, etc. It will not be air conditioned.

Rick Epstein – there is an opportunity to add more clear glass in the building. On the north elevation, there is an opportunity to break up the large glass wall with architecture; at the sidewalk at the north elevation base, would like to see a pedestrian scale study. The sidewalk will get a lot of use. Maybe integrate lighting, variation in detailing, rhythm to create a more pedestrian oriented experience; as amount and location of PV develops this will inform daylighting and roof design.

Candy Roberts – the small addition, rooftop terrace at northeast corner seems odd; parking entrance details need to be refined for DD; encouraged vision glass on east side just like on the west side; beginning to look way more authentic to its building type. It has been simplified and has a real authenticity. With that said we are going to leave the roof out of approval.

Don Brandes inquired if the location of the utilities is affecting the football field. In reply, the location of the utilities is above the track and not affecting the football field.

Candy Roberts stated that there needs to be more detail for the parking entrance. Would encourage using vision glass on the east side. The arch is different from previous illustration (has authenticity now).

Motion by Brandes, seconded by Olgyay, for Schematic Design of Grand Stair. Motion carried.

DRB Moves to Approve SD for Indoor Practice Facility with Conditions

- Achieve goal of net zero electricity building
- Refine daylighting with additional clear glass
- Parking and pedestrian entrance details need to be refined

Rick Epstein moved to approve SD for IPF Building; Don Brandes seconded. Motion carried.