



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 March 14, 2013**

---

**Donor Memorial Garden**

Jim Leggit of studioINSITE presented construction documents for the Donor Memorial Garden to the Board along with a brief presentation concerning the history of the Project.

The Board commented upon the truncated nature of the scheme and requested clarification regarding why the existing walkway remained to disrupt the pure geometry of the circle. It was pointed out by Jim Leggitt of inSITE that he had been instructed by the Office of Institutional Planning to provide a phased scheme that would accommodate the existing pathway while allowing for the geometry to be completed once the path was relocated in the future. The following additional comments were provided by Board member Don Brandes, Jr:

- A. Documentation of the intended final build-out (Phase II) plan should be on record with the University. It was suggested that University staff confirm the future pedestrian walkways in this area to make certain that the proposed Phase One improvements will align in line and grade with future improvements.
- B. The quantity of wood mulched area was questioned; particularly areas immediately adjacent to the existing building. The extent of wood mulch seems excessive and is placed far beyond the base of the building for drainage considerations. Jim Leggit noted drainage concerns and a hesitation to provide sod at these locations.
- C. Don suggested the need for a weed barrier fabric at all mulch locations.
- D. It was suggested that an irrigation performance specification be written to address vagrant irrigation concerns as well as potential efflorescence at retaining walls.
- E. It was suggested that a mow band be added at the base of existing Building 500 to address irrigation/moisture concerns as well as to assist in future maintenance.
- F. Detail 4/L301 – It was suggested that the CIP mow band detail include finish elevation information to remain slightly elevated in relation to adjacent conditions.
- G. Detail 8/L301 – It was suggested that reveals be added to the detailing to help prevent staining through the introduction of drip edge conditions.
- H. Detail 6/L301 – It was suggested that a 4 to 6” perforated drain tile be added to relieve potential hydrostatic pressure issues at the foot of all retaining walls.

- I. It was suggested that an addendum to the specification be issued to bidders concerning tree protection during construction. Don expressed considerable concern that the area within the drip line of the existing tree be protected from compaction; noting that should compaction occur, the resulting damage caused by the event (or events) could take a number of years to become evident. The “during construction” measures should ensure protection of the specimen/memorial tree around its drip line to prevent compaction of the root zone.

### **Monumental Signage**

Don Brandes shared some additional comments regarding the landscape areas of the current Monumental Signage scheme. It was clarified by the Board that their approval of the Monumental Signage proposal, presented to the Board in February, was limited to the construction of the walls only and did not include approval of plantings/landscape design. The following additional comments were provided by Board member Don Brandes, Jr.:

- A. It was suggested that the termini of the sodded areas at corner radii along Colfax be coordinated on both sides of Aurora Court (see sketch).
- B. It was suggested that some additional color be added to the scheme through the placement of perennial/annual beds south of the sidewalk along Colfax with similar beds to the north along Aurora Court.
- C. It was suggested that the median in Aurora Court be raised to protect trees from winter salt and potential splash damage by vehicles.
- D. Teresa Osborne requested additional information on when the mock-up was being constructed, how long it would remain, as well as whether the landscape portion of the scheme was intended to be bid in April as part of the overall signage package.

### **Building 500 Window Replacement**

The Board expressed concern over not having been represented during the architect selection process for this project. Apologies were expressed and assurances were given that the Board would be kept informed on the progress of the project. Their consultation will be solicited on all matters pertaining to future window replacement.



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 March 15, 2013

The University Design Review Board met on Friday, March 15, 2013  
1800 Grant Street, 1st Floor Conference Room  
(Denver)

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

---

#### **POD J Development Schematic Design**

Architect(s): Davis Partnership

Presenter(s): Brian Erickson, Davis Partnership

Individuals present: Paul Leef, Campus Architect - University of Colorado; William Arndt, CU Facilities Management (Retired) - University of Colorado; Tom Goodhew, Campus Planner – University of Colorado Boulder; Lynn Moore, Principal Architect – Davis Partnership; Brent Murphy, Architect – Davis Partnership; Joe Lear, Associate Principal – Davis Partnership; Kurt Basford, Intern, Davis Partnership; Richelle Reilly, Campus Landscape Architect, University of Colorado Boulder; Brian Erickson, Principal – Davis Partnership; Jeffrey Lipton, Director of Real Estate Services – University of Colorado; Tony Ruiz, Project Executive – University of Colorado Hospital; David Chadwick, Managing Director – CU Foundation; Jim Faber, Project Manager – University of Colorado; Kim Prentice, Managing Director Development & Operations – NexCore Group; and Tim McDonough, Asset Manager – CUREF.

Kim Prentice:

- Briefly discussed the individual team members present.

Brian Erickson:

- Gave a detailed summary of the project's progress since the last meeting.
- Noted that the design is still in the conceptual phase.
- Reviewed context maps of the proposed site.

- Mentioned the design team's success in making the building look like a medical office plaza.
- Expressed concern for the direction in which the project has taken – lack of understanding from the Design Review Board's comments.
- Asked for clarification on the outcome of the proposed collaborative work session.

Lynn Moore:

- Discussed the context of the project – location, connectivity, and the building components.
- Talked in detail about the concept diagrams – massing and site layout.
- Noted the addition of the planting bed at the base of the retaining wall to allow for planting material to grow vertically.
- Noted the implementation of storm water management techniques.
- Discussed the progress that's been made in the entrée courtyard – paving patterns and EVA access.
- Discussed the preliminary grading/drainage plan.

Joe Lear:

- Discussed building concept diagrams and how they decided on the building shape and orientation.
- Noted the grade change from west to east.
- Discussed material palette (primary and secondary options).
- Noted the intent for the design to be functional and simplistic.
- Discussed elevation drawings.
- Showed Sketch-Up model perspectives from several different angles.

Victor Olgay:

- Noted the concern for the language used in expression and its fit within the campus standards.
- Expressed concern for the lack of landscape plan(s) – 1:20 scale instead of a 1:60 – at a schematic level.
- Encouraged the team to design at an appropriate scale to thoroughly understand the details of the site.
- Noted the lack of detail in the building details.
- Encouraged the design team to conduct - or consider - the building from an energy model standpoint.

Candy Roberts:

- Expressed concern for the flat roof - lack of integration into the campus.
- Suggested setting up a time to conduct a collaborative work session.
- Noted that specific elements of the design would require variances – roof, rooftop mechanical, site plan and landscape pallet, signage, and the building to landscape relationship.
- Noted the Design Review Board would like to see some of these concerns addressed before they grant approval.
- Noted the entrée lacks development and a strong relationship to the building.

Don Brandes:

- Noted the need of a more detailed planting plan.
- Noted the signage needs to adhere to existing campus standards.
- Expressed concern for the proposed detention ponds – location and size.
- Expressed concern for the entrée courtyard – lacking detail and thorough understanding of its intended use.

Rick Epstein:

- Noted the lack of understanding of the entrée and the plaza sequence.
- Noted the comments from the last meeting were in no way permission for free rein but an allowance to creatively fit within the campus.

Epstein made a motion that the design team conducts adequate studies based on thoughts, input, and consideration and re-present the material to The Research Park Board in two weeks for schematic design approval. The Research Park Board unanimously voted and thanked the design team for their hard work and progress on the design.

---

**Stanton Parking Garage and Recreational Field - UCCS**

Architect(s): Mortensen and Davis Partnership Design/Build

Presenter(s): Brit Probst, and Carolyn Fox.

Individuals present: Carolyn Fox, University Architect - University of Colorado Colorado Springs; Gary Reynolds, Executive Director - University of Colorado Colorado Springs; Curtis Cox, Project Manager - Davis Partnership; Brit Probst, Principal – Davis Partnership; Joe Lear, Associate Principal – Davis Partnership; and Lynn Moore, Principal Architect – Davis Partnership.

Carolyn Fox:

- Provided an updated progress plan for the parking garage and recreational field.

Brit Probst:

- Discussed the progress that has been made since the last meeting.
- Noted that the project came in over budget – the team has been working on making the necessary cuts without compromising the key features.
- Noted the cost saving came from retaining structures, grading, wall types, and allowing the ground level to rise.
- Summarized the micro-master and site plan studies – highlighting the opportunities and constraints.
- Discussed architectural alternatives to the southeast parking structure-netting support.
- Noted alternative designs (six) for the west elevation.
- Discussed cost reduction studies conducted for the south elevation.
- Discussed amenity upgrades – spectator bleacher seating, northeast landscape, and plaza.
- Conducted window studies looking at different exterior finishes, light penetration, etc.
- Discussed material selections – aluminum, glass, concrete, etc.

Lynn Moore:

- Discussed elements of the site plan – feasibility and location of the roundabout, egress routes, landscape palate and zones, north courtyard plaza.
- Noted that all landscape materials are selected out of the UCCS design guidelines.

- Justified the proposed storm water management plan based on the volume needs of the campus.

Don Brandes:

- Expressed concern for the percentages of plant material proposed in the narrative versus what is shown in the proposed landscape plan.
- Suggested showing a limit of construction line for clarification.
- Inquired about improving the area north of the plaza and having to redesign when the Alpine Village is completed.
- Suggested using the swale as a visual and physical barrier to separate planting material.
- Suggested implementing option two - metal netting and framework.
- Noted that the three different paving patterns and width are all conflicting – suggest the design team look at vertical and horizontal controls to reduce this and create a stronger entrée.
- Expressed concern for several of the plants selected – suggest looking at alternate options.
- Inquired about ordering a pre-stripped field – field patterns and the ability to use different netting devices (portable).
- Complimented the design team on their hard work and progression.

Candy Roberts:

- Suggested using a horseshoe shape for the grass area on the north plaza instead of the harsh angles of the circle.
- Suggested rotating the benches near the bus shelter - face toward one another.
- Recommended including larger plans of the parking levels and the pavilion.
- Suggested when the pavilion is presented to the Design Review Board, please include detailed plan drawings illustrating accessibility, connectivity to the field surfacing, etc.
- Suggested placing a small-cantilevered structure over the door - field level.

Rick Epstein:

- Seconded Brandes's motion to use option two - metal netting and framework.
- Complimented the design team on the quality of the packet and for including the different design approaches.
- Noted the preference to have the architectural shade structure on the northeast corner of the field.
- South elevation – noted the importance of denoting the habitable space from the grating covering the parking structure.

Victor Olgyay:

- Thanked the team for the progress.
- Suggested using alternate materials to achieve the light color concrete instead of using white paint - increase reflectivity.

Roberts made a motion for design development approval with the condition of seeing detailed pavilion drawings (if the architectural addition is applicable). The board unanimously agreed. The Board thanked the design team for their hard work and progression on the design.

---