

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

Minutes of the Meeting of November 7, 2012

The University Design Review Board met on Tuesday, November 7, 2012, in the University of Colorado Colorado Springs - Campus Services Building (CSB 204).

DRB members present were: John <u>Prosser</u>, Candy <u>Roberts</u>, Don <u>Brandes</u>, Victor <u>Olgyay</u>, and Teresa <u>Osborne</u> (ex officio).

Pre-design for Parking Garage and Recreational Field

Architect(s): Davis Partnership

Presenter(s): Architecture Team and Gary <u>Reynolds</u>, UCCS.

Individuals present: Gary <u>Reynolds</u>, Executive Director; Carolyn <u>Fox</u>, University

Architect; Susan <u>Szpyrka</u>, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance; Maja <u>Rosenquist</u>, Vice President and General Manager for Mortenson Construction; Chris <u>Knight</u>, Design Phase Manager for Mortenson Construction; Curtis <u>Cox</u>, Project Manager for Davis Partnership; Lynn <u>Moore</u>, Principal for Davis Partnership; Matt <u>Schlageter</u>, Principal for Martin/Martin; Joe <u>Plaskett</u>, Senior Project Manager for Mortenson Construction; Charles <u>Cummings</u>, Project Manager for UCCS.

Gary <u>Reynolds:</u>

- Described the pre-design plan for the parking garage and recreational field.
- Suggested sporadic meetings with voluntary board members to facilitate a quick, successful design process.
- Discussed the existing archeological site and the limitations that accompany it.

Lynn Moore:

- Gave a detailed description of the project including: existing conditions, current and future circulation patterns, transit, view sheds, and the existing architecture.
- Described the intended use of the proposed site and noted total number of fields and square footage(s).

• Noted whom this structure will service – students, faculty, and community members.

Susan <u>Szpyrka:</u>

- Described guidelines and regulations that need to be considered.
- Noted that the parking structure would serve the students living in the campus student housing building(s) across the street.

Don <u>Brandes:</u>

- Asked for clarification on the developmental process in getting to the proposed plan.
- Inquired about the potential users of the site.
- Inquired about soil surveys and geological assessments that have been conducted and the feasibility of the proposed use.
- Asked for clarification on materials and lighting that have been considered.
- Noted the overall level of site disturbance, the struggle of the two systems that need to be incorporated, the current and future circulation patterns and how these can be done successfully to seamlessly integrate this site as an extension of the land.

John <u>Prosser:</u>

- Asked for clarification on dimensions of the field(s) and parking structure.
- Inquired about the potential of existing mine structures under the proposed site.
- Discussed the feasibility of terracing the parking structure to maximizing storm water drainage and minimizing site impact with existing vegetation.
- Discussed the feasibility of implementing underground parking to reduce the vertical impact of the proposed structure.
- Suggested rotating the building to increase feasibility and implementing a roundabout for circulation.

Candy <u>Roberts:</u>

- Asked for clarification on the property boundaries and potential build location.
- Asked about the potential of the cut & fill that can remain on the site.
- Seconded Prosser about the potential problem of overwhelming verticality of the structure and recommended they consider making in-ground parking.
- Seconded <u>Brandes</u> on seamlessly integrating the site as an extension of the land and the potential for a strong gateway structure.

Matt Schlageter:

- Noted the grade change from the high point of the site, through the existing arroyo, to the low point 15'0" vertical grade change.
- Described in detail the existing topographic details, drainage patterns, existing utilities and calculations that have been done to understand the potential capacity for storm water.

Victor Olgyay:

- Asked for clarification on the grade change existing on the site.
- Recommended integrating the top level into the existing contours of the site making a more singular, fluid structure.

The board thanked the design team for their progress on this project and encouraged them to keep pushing the boundaries.

Pre-design for Academic Office Building

Architect(s): Civitas and Slaterpaull Architects.

Presenter(s): Architecture Team and Gary <u>Reynolds</u>, UCCS

Individuals present: Gary <u>Reynolds</u>, Executive Director; Carolyn <u>Fox</u>, University

Architect; Luanne <u>Ducett</u>, Terra Nova Engineering; Todd <u>Mead</u>, Civitas; Jennifer <u>Cordes</u>, Slaterpaull Architects; Tyson <u>Nunn</u>, Nunn Construction, Gwen <u>Gilley</u>, Slaterpaull Architects.

Gary <u>Reynolds:</u>

- Described the pre-design plan for the Academic Office Building and noted that a good portion of this project will be funded by bond allotment money.
- Discussed the current restraints on project site Austin Bluffs, detention basin, and existing structures.
- Noted the location of the proposed circulation trail around the detention pond.
- Stated that the bricks selected match the existing Columbine Building.

Jennifer <u>Cordes:</u>

- Described the existing conditions of the site and the opportunities and constraints.
- Noted the materiality that needs to be considered with the location of the building in relation to the existing architecture on campus.

Todd <u>Mead:</u>

- Discussed the circulation patterns, the opportunity to preserve the native vegetation on the site, and possibility to utilize the detention basin as a key gathering hub for students.
- Noted the current location of the transit stops in relation to the site.

Candy Roberts:

- Noted that the location and visual dominance creates a unique opportunity to create a signature building.
- Recommended that the design team visit and research the existing building types locate on campus to thoroughly understand use, materials, massing, etc.
- Activate and capitalize on the fifth elevation roof and respond to the natural environment.
- Noted the existing color of signage and expressed concern with the brick material selected.

Don <u>Brandes:</u>

- Noted the opportunity for bio filtration systems to be incorporated.
- Inquired about the potential users of the site.

- Showed concern for the potential storm water capacity flows and suggested more research and understanding on the issue.
- Discussed the opportunity for maximizing connection and linkage system(s) for students and faculty.
- Noted the 'kit of parts' aspect of the design and suggested researching a new material for the retaining bricks.

Victor Olgyay:

- Noted the opportune orientation of the building and how easy it will be to capitalize on it from an energy model standpoint.
- Suggested the design team look at the limits of construction as a "whole" system and understand the fluidity throughout.
- Noted a very special place can be created by utilizing building corners in strategic locations view framing.
- Expressed the importance of the materials selected for the building.

John <u>Prosser:</u>

- Discussed a prior project (Osborne Center) and its success and noted the great potential for this building to be the model for all University of Colorado campuses.
- Suggested the design team look at the building from the standpoint of energy and ventilation how can you capitalize on the 360-degree orientation?
- Inquired about the feasibility of relocating a portion of the trail taking it above the proposed building freeing up design constraints near the detention pond and intersection on Austin Bluffs.

Carolyn Fox:

• Discussed the need for three new retaining walls on campus and noted the material selection(s), approximate height and length of each.

Luanne <u>Ducett:</u>

• Inquired about the potential for signage and the materiality of the trail system, particularly at pedestrian/vehicular crossings.

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

_