



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 June 15, 2012**

---

The University Design Review Board met on Friday, June 15, 2012, at 1800 Grant Street, Denver – 1st floor conference room.

DRB members present were: Victor Olgyay, John Prosser, Candy Roberts, Jerry Seracuse, and Teresa Osborne (ex officio).

**University of Colorado Hospital – Renovation & Expansion of the Rocky Mountain Lions Eye Institute.**

Architect(s): Davis Partnership

Presenter(s): Hugh Brown, Principal.

UCH staff members present: Tony Ruiz, Project Executive (UCH); Sean Menogan, Senior Project Director (UCH); and Dr. Naresh Mandava (UCH).

Hugh Brown: introduced the project and gave a review of the existing building(s) and described details about the site analysis completed, proposed plan(s) and perspective(s), and their vision of the building(s).

- Discussed past projects, funding, and problems that could have stemmed from those decisions.
- Indicated they would go back, make appropriate adjustments to the plan, and be present at the next 2-3 meetings.

Dr. Mandava: spoke on behalf of the hospital about their clinical operation needs and their desire to expand 30,000 - 40,000 sq. ft. to accommodate their current growth goal.

- Explained the needs of the physicians and staff.
- Stressed the impracticality of the existing structure for surgical needs.

John Prosser:

- Discussed the importance of expanding the outpatient building across 16<sup>th</sup> into the existing parking area to handle the current user capacity.
- Suggested instead of expanding south, consider expanding north reducing the effect on the Cancer Center and allowing for more options; leaving the south architecture untouched allowing users to experience the current design/reception center(s).
- Expressed the importance of the site connectivity and ease of user(s) to access the hospital for current and future use.
- Expanding to the north over the 17th ROW is found land use, doesn't effect to any extent existing facilities; provides the most options for simple enlargements, more potential

square footage (5-8 stories), allows better floor plates and layouts. This approach would then avoid the destruction of the very welcoming, open, airy, light and spacious south facade inside/outside entry/lobby relationships and have no impact on the adjacent cancer center elevations and functions. An additional structure over 17th could then continue the second level enclosed campus connection systems.

Candy Roberts:

- Discussed the master plan and the importance of the interconnectivity of the pods/buildings.
- Expressed the concern of “layering” additions vs. new construction.
- Stressed the importance of looking at the “big picture” and going back to the “small picture”. Does it make sense from a practical standpoint?

Victor Olqvay:

- Complimented the individuals on their hard work and dedication stressing the importance of keeping the eye center as an integral part of the campus.

Jerry Seracuse:

- Inquired if any data has been collected on the impact of the expansion and proposed parking structure.
- Agreed with Prosser on the importance of planning for the future use and capacity of the hospital.
- Stressed the importance of thinking holistically.

Teresa Osborne:

- Thanked the individuals for being here and noted that they would have to take the design ideas presented back to the hospital board for review.

Tony Ruiz:

- Described current growth patterns and the importance of this expansion to benefit the community, physicians, and staff.

Sean Menogan:

- Expressed concern that expanding north would be impeding in the mechanical closet/storage.

No formal action was taken.

### **University of Colorado Colorado Springs – Temporary Greenhouse (UCCS)**

UCCS staff present was: Gary Reynolds, Executive Director.

Gary Reynolds: introduced the project and talked about changes that have been made to the plan and noted that this will in fact be a temporary structure that will be replaced in an appropriate amount of time.

Candy Roberts:

- Expressed concern about the word and meaning behind “temporary” and asked for clarification of time intended.
- Suggested that the “temporary structure” be sold and utilized after its intended function for the University.

Victor Olgyay:

- Complimented the idea and progression of the project.
- Suggested materials (glazing) be used that would cut cost and improve overall efficiency.
- Noted that if this structure is going to be in use for more than 3-5 years, the Board should consider a more predominant and structurally sound green house.

John Prosser:

- Inquired about the fenestration and if it would match the design guidelines of the existing structure(s) approved.

Jerry Seracuse:

- Asked for clarification on the colors of the aluminum framing and the types of footings that would be used.

The motion to approve was unanimous. The Board thanked the design team for their progress on this project.

### **Lane Center for Academic Health Services**

UCCS staff present were: Carolyn Fox, University Architect; Gary Reynolds, Executive Director.

Architect(s): Anderson Mason Dale

Presenter(s): Paul Haack, Principal; John Graham, Design Architect.

Individuals present: Brian Zilis, Mathew Evans.

Gary Reynolds: introduced the project and talked about changes that have been made to the plan noting they were based on budget adjustment(s) and recent cost estimate(s).

Paul Haack: reviewed the comments that the Board had from the prior DRB meeting and noted the concerns that would be addressed for today's meeting.

- Noted the two dominant landscape features: the knoll, and the large open green common space directly north.
- Discussed the improvements made on circulation and emergency access points.

John Graham:

- Discussed the restrictions placed on them due to the easements set forth by the city.
- Expressed concerns about:
  1. Deeper entry drive.
  2. Public activity farther from entry
  3. Accessibility
- Talked in detail about the phases of design showing general building location and orientation.
- Discussed architectural elements and the expansion/adjustment of the interior layout for more practical use.
- Discussed programmatic elements: brick, column wraps, steel, and other materials intended for use.
- Walked the Board through exterior sections, perspectives, and interior section elevations.
- Explained the findings of the year-round sun study.
- Showed the Board physical examples of proposed brick, glass, stone, and exterior corrugated metal.
- Reviewed and summarized the energy results including yearly cost of operation.

Mathew Evans:

- Discussed palette, location of, and purpose of plant materials.
- Explained the intent of the vegetated bio-swale system located in the parking lot.
- Noted that dry-stacked stones will be used to create a wall to preserve the existing planting features located on the northeast portion of the building.
- Noted the detention pond will successfully hold 1-2 year storm water capacity.
- Showed graphic sections and described how the planting material will be utilized and incorporated into the site.
- Showed the Board physical examples of proposed planting bed material that would be used.

Candy Roberts:

- Complimented the design team on their “kit of parts” and the response to the land.
- Suggested taking this design style and mimicking it on other buildings to make a unified statement throughout.
- Commented on the quality and clarity of the Utility and Easement plan found on Page 17.
- Commended them on the overall project and suggested they try to find a creative way to incorporate the ADA ramp to “finalize” the project.
- Asked for clarification on the trellis design and recommended considering a denser material to promote shade.

Victor Olgvay:

- Commented on the successful design and implementation of the engineered swale.
- Complimented the design team for attempting to understand and incorporate different phases of design.
- Expressed concern about the ADA ramp study that was completed and suggested taking time to find a “better” solution.
- Asked for clarification of materials proposed on the south/west façade.
- Recommended using the atrium as a passive solar element to reduce the heating load.
- Suggested doing studies on the type of glass being implemented.
- Complimented them on their energy goals.
- Recommended trying to reduce the amount of mechanical equipment found in the metal penthouse and re-arrange the structure to reduce overall surface area on roof.

John Prosser:

- Inquired about the landscaping plan and the orientation of the benches and the lack of shade for user(s).
- Recommended mimicking the diagonal architecture of the building in the landscape.
- Noted the planters on the upper terrace are not placed for optimal user circulation/movement.
- Noted on the site plan (C-20) that the sidewalk bordering Nevada Avenue does not have a connection to the building entrée or terrace.
- Recommended the planting beds in the terrace relate to the angles of the retaining wall.
- Inquired about the 20'0” emergency vehicle right of way space(s) around the building.
- Add second bioswale at west parking bar edge and more berming between there and the Nevada Avenue sidewalk. Will need railing at top of south retaining wall. Open inside dark corridor to an outside west opening on closed-in floor.

Jerry Seracuse:

- Recommended implementing different elevation heights to the pour-in-place concrete retaining wall to create visual interest and an appropriate scale.
- Noted the large staircase could be hazardous for elderly or people with slight disabilities.
- Suggested trying to find a way to incorporate a ramp up and through the staircase.
- Recommended adding another landing to the staircase.

Gary Reynolds:

- Suggested flaring the staircase on the main level to create a natural funnel and increase visual dominance.

Carolyn Fox:

- Asked for clarification and reasoning for relocating the exterior doors.
- Expressed that the orientation now is visually and physically inviting.

The motion for schematic design was unanimous. The Board thanked the design team for their progress on this project.

### **Geosciences Phase II Concept Design**

Architect(s): Klipp Architecture

Presenter(s): Wayne Northcutt

Individuals present: Marie Cole, Project Manager; Brian Klipp, Principal; Craig Vickers; Landscape Architect/Planner Civitas , Alec Lacono, Senior Project Architect; Jim White, Director of N-Star, Chris Ewing, Project Manager; and Sean Convery, Principal Mechanical Engineer.

CU-Boulder staff present were: Tom Goodhew, Facilities Planning; Paul Leef, Campus Architect; Richelle Reilly, Campus Landscape Architect; Philip Simpson, Director of Facilities Planning; and Nicole Gordon, Communication Specialist.

Brian Klipp: gave a brief introduction to the project following Simpson's review of the Board's comments and answered any remaining questions.

- Discussed how Klipp was able to be more accurate in the programming of the buildings.
- Described how the Nolli map was used to help establish building locations and orientation.
- With help from the physical model, Klipp described the architecture and function of the proposed building(s).
- Elaborated on their grounding of functional needs through different bay studies.
- Noted after bid adjustment(s), the four-level building is actually \$500,000 lower than the three levels.
- Expressed the importance of the building to fit within the existing campus style but retain a vernacular feeling.

Craig Vickers:

- Discussed the framework plan and some key characteristics found on page 17/18.
- Noted ground studies were done to understand the density and functionality of the site.
- Described the proposed landscape study, including natural boundaries and successful ways to integrate them into the built environment.
- Elaborated on the landscape typologies found on the site and in the proposed landscape plan.

Paul Leef: introduced the project during study session and talked about the potential design elements.

John Prosser:

- Discussed the concern of water scarcity in Colorado and the multiple layers of landscape. Noted that the majority of plantings should be native, not domesticated.
- Suggested looking at “Meridian” as a phenomenal example of successful native planting design.
- Noted on pages 22/23, the fire lane has to go all the way around the project to meet code standards.
- Suggested adding a labyrinth under the building for heating/cooling purposes.
- Recommended moving the building(s) east to create better gathering space(s).
- Suggested changing the orientation of the west building.
- Explore HVAC plenum crawl or full height spaces without baffles if structural floors are necessary or not. Using the smaller footprint and moving phase one to the east gives much more flexibility for future expansion; makes better solar access to the existing development and open spaces. The reorientation was based on Paul Leef’s idea from the study session. To enhance the skyline profile, harmonize with existing MacAllister; reduce HVAC demands and other building construction costs – introduce hip and/or Dutch hip roofs, where feasible. Provide permeable paving and bioswales where surface reconstruction occurs; consider more creative intake and exhaust designs.

Candy Roberts:

- Inquired about the different phases of design, if any.
- Suggested talking in detail about the idea of contextual architecture.
- Noted the roof massing needs simplification.
- Seconded Olgvay’s decision to go with four levels to accommodate future developmental needs.
- Suggested personalizing the building for its intended use.

Victor Olgvay:

- Recommended considering the formal way that air will be ventilated through the proposed space(s).
- Inquired about the difference in the floor plate between the three and four-story building.
- Agreed with the idea of verticality and horizontality but suggested expressing contemporary ideas of ecological design integrity (solar, ventilation, water) within the proposed design.
- Explained the reasoning for choosing the four-level building to accommodate future expansion(s).
- Suggested doing studies to see if architecturally you could reduce the amount of fan energy used for the labs.
- Recommended considering the location of air intake(s) on the buildings.

Jerry Seracuse:

- Inquired about the feasibility of parking on site.
- Inquired about the main entrance moving north of the building in the courtyard.
- Discussed the elevation plans on page 40 and expressed concern for the lack of horizontality.

Richelle Reilly:

- Noted all the permeable paving area(s) on campus are working well; this feature is proposed for this specific project.

Paul Leef:

- Clarified the layout and details of the three and four-level building plans.
- Noted that the building should receive a LEED platinum rating.

Philip Simpson:

- Explained in detail how the MacAllister Building was acquired and how it fits into the program plan.
- Described the existing renovation budget for the MacAllister Building.
- Explained that the site has a surplus of parking and would be more than adequate to accommodate additional usage.
- Asked for clarification between horizontality vs. verticality.

Marie Cole:

- Discussed the importance of reaching a LEED Point-Plus status by incorporating appropriate plant material.

Sean Convery:

- Discussed sustainability concept goals.
- Explained techniques to chill water (recycled) and use a heat recovery system to reduce the amount of energy and costs by an average of \$30,000-\$40,000 a year.

No formal decisions were made. The Board thanked the design team for their progress on this project.