



---

## University of Colorado Design Review Board Minutes

---

### Minutes of the Meeting of September 11, 2014

The University Design Review Board met on Thursday, September 11, 2014, at the University of Colorado Boulder, 1540 30<sup>th</sup> Street, RL2, #321.

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

#### **Meeting attendance:**

Anne Heinz, CU-Boulder; Bill Haverly, CU-Boulder; Rob Dean, CU-Boulder; Tom Bauer, Boora; Kate Feiertag, Boora; Michael Tingley, Boora; Josh Brandt, Boora; Rick Petersen, Oz; David Schafer, Oz; Tina Bishop, Mundus Bishop; James Lorde, Surface Design; Tim Kirby, Surface Design; Ted Laszlo, Phipps; JoAnn Zeldsko, Engineering; Matt Rhode, Engineering; John Iornsworth, Engineering; Christopher Herr, Christopher Herr Architects; Jim Faber, CU-Boulder Facilities Management.

#### **9:00 – 10:30 Euclid Autopark Addition**

Presenter(s): Wayne Northcutt

Architects: BOORA Architects / OZ Architecture + Surface Design  
Architecture

Description: Submittal package for Concept Design approval

#### **The consultant team outlined the work completed to date on the concept design.**

Since the last meeting, they have focused on the budget, the traffic study, and site analysis. The project will be back in November for DRB Review / with construction to start in May. To accomplish this they worked with a complex group of users and programs as this is a mixed-use academic building. The project goals include: showcasing and advancing CU's innovation in teaching and recruitment through advanced technology and innovative classrooms and integrating the site circulation into the campus.

The site design focused on showcasing a two-way connection with university and community with a pass-through walkway. They have developed a new scheme designed with attention to an existing utility tunnel which is becoming a large influence on the design. In addition, the existing site has complicated the circulation pattern. The goal is a long-term transformation of Euclid into a mixed-mode transit-oriented facility. To accomplish this they proposed introducing richer pavement and a slower pace. Euclid may be reduced to two lanes from four lanes. This creates a significant zone at the front of the building (20 feet from building to curb). They proposed an at-grade connection to the campus green on the north side of the building. A five-foot grade change at the front of building with curb with stair/seat treatment must be negotiated on the south side. They explored consolidating the three access points along Euclid into one, but Facilities Management is hesitant. They want at least two access points and room to maneuver their vehicles.

The design team is negotiating the possibility of:

- A shared trash/recycle facility with UMC Building
- Blurring the campus green with a meadow edge
- Accenting what is special about Boulder – the Flatiron experience
- With a greater budget, ideally would like to explore Euclid as entirely at-grade
- Looking into re-grading the northwest corner to manage storm water

- Recommend that campus does not replace the telecom building rather provide a signature landscape element.

### **Building Overview**

- Focused on mitigating interior/exterior and interior traffic flow.
- Movement up and through without entering the building.
- Providing amenities for all campus users (cafes, meeting areas, computer labs, etc.).
- Large footprint
  - Ground floor is heavily occupied by students
  - Going up changes the nature and density of use.
- Parking 1
  - Science discovery moved into the parking area.
  - Better for noisy kids, deliveries and drop-off.
  - Connected by a shared lobby
  - Open classrooms showcase campus activity.
- Level 1
  - Classrooms, computer labs, general use and a cafe.
  - Pre-college programs
  - Welcome hall provides an intuitive sense of direction.
  - Advising and IEC classrooms are flexible to temporarily move into the welcome hall and accommodate more students.
- Level 2
  - Discrete communities
  - Community rooms such as study areas and gathering spaces promote a rich diversity.
- Level 3
  - Auditorium and conference rooms
  - Serves a broader campus population and activities.
- Section
  - Smaller massing adds texture and a village character.
  - The roof form is a response to existing structural support (60' floor plate).
- Option 1: Pinwheels around central bay. Highlights major areas of transparency.
- Option 2: Shed roofs nestled against outer areas.
- Option 3: Centralized expression around rooftop volumes (hip form roof).
  - Avoids issues of snowmelt and precipitation.

### **Design Review Board Questions and Clarifications**

Don Brandes inquired about the parking capacity and if a 60' floor plate was being considered. Lot 204 is 250 spaces and, yes, the floor plate with a transfer deck is being considered. The width of the pass-through is 50'. The Flatirons can be seen from the pass-through, but the issue is the tree line. If you can see over the existing building, you can see the Flatirons. The floor-to-floor from science discovery to the top of the stair is 13'-14'.

Don Brandes asked if the base bid is over or under. It is over \$2.4 million. They are negotiating allocating a contingency into construction costs. They are also looking at \$3-4 million for landscape improvements; \$700,000 more for a full build-out.

Candy Roberts asked if the landscaping over the parking is ok. Yes, it is structurally feasible. The positive landform raises the grade.

Victor Olgay inquired if the goals of energy efficiency translate into massing studies. Energy efficiency has been a big part of the orientation. Of the three options, there is only 1% variation in energy efficiency. A big element will be the windows and chilled water delivery. Chilled water is only needed about 14 days a year.

Rick Epstein asked about architectural element studies, such as breaking up the scale with precast or limestone panels; breaking up the scale with asymmetrical windows and openings; contrasting smooth and textured; experimenting with intentionality of pattern (consistency and horizontality).

Victor Olgay commented that it looks like a contemporary take on the traditional Boulder campus. Massing and roofs should respect tradition; detailing and materials begin to talk about the future of the campus.

## Design Review Board Comments

Rick Epstein had the following comments:

- Negotiations with transportation departments have necessarily taken precedence over the goals of campus arrival and connectivity, but now that more information is known, these elements need to be strengthened.

Victor Olgay mentioned that the UMC and the building should relate more.

Candy Roberts challenged the University to pull out bigger site solutions. Would like to see something like the North Plaza at the UMC. Suggested that they study sun angles to inform the programming. Also suggested that they spend some time revisiting the older stair/pass-through concepts.

Bill Haverly noted that the most important program (Admissions) is the hardest to find.

### Design Review Board Motion:

DB: Granted Conceptual Design approval based on the comments provided in the approved DRB notes (noted above). It was also highly recommended that the consultant team try to schedule an “interim workshop” with University staff and the DRB prior to the preparation and presentation of the Schematic Design submittal.

RE: Seconded

CR: In favor

VO: In favor

Comment Summary:

- Please compare and contrast the project goals and objectives from the initial pre-design meeting and the goals and objectives listed on the September 11, 2014, Conceptual Design submittal. They are different. We need to have a comprehensive and common set of project goals and objectives that is measurable and that addresses both campus-wide, project site and building connections and relationships as we proceed to schematic design.
- Express the hierarchy of the building goals – need clarity of building concept to the site concept, while providing a strong identity and front door. Finding the Admissions office is at the top of the hierarchy for building identity and way finding.
- Please evaluate the variety of user groups to Euclid and diagram what their use pattern will be for arrival, parking, pedestrian, drop-off, pickup, service, emergency, students, first-time visitors, etc.
- Please clarify the building program use areas and SF allocations. We are using different names for programming spaces and for architectural features.
- If possible, please share with us the existing conditions, including base map with grades, existing vegetation, views, utilities, and other site conditions that are influencing your conceptual/schematic design.
- Student usage, pedestrian and bike pathways, transit, and student drop off for new visitors; current linkages are not yet well developed and need to be strengthened.
- The relation of Euclid Avenue to the proposed building needs to be reviewed and thought given to the massing of the building and sense of arrival. The relationship of the edge needs to help inform the architecture by creating more of a building entrance and sense of arrival. Please explore a greater sense of arrival for the first-time visitor. Visual, summer, winter, night.
- Please explore a more obvious and inviting point of entry/drop-off for a vehicular arrival, pedestrian/bicycle arrival, transit arrival and on-campus student arrival.
- Please study the possibility of designing an urban plaza/promontory that has an obvious and uninterrupted view to the Flatirons.
- Create a flow and connectivity to the main entrance into the university; there is an uneasy relationship between this building and the UMC – need to have this building complement the front door to the UMC and the building should contribute to and somehow be connected to UMC’s grand entry.
- Articulate all the elevations; this is a four-sided building and all sides are important.
- Please consider consolidating the various points of access to the surrounding existing land uses.
- The 18<sup>th</sup> and Euclid corner is as important and needs to be given architectural significance.

- Please evaluate the SW corner of the building as a potential icon/tower that alerts the visitor to the complex and relates to a pedestrian-scaled entry plaza into the building.
- The stair through the building should be articulated as more central and an obvious part of the building design – how you get there, how it is articulated on the outside, etc. The elevator should be seen as secondary to encourage the use of the stairs.
- The deck from the Admissions auditorium could be a more central feature of the building design.
- The clarity of the building concept should be developed so it is clearer. It should be used to organize the various elements such as roofs, towers, stairs, materials, etc.

### **10:30 – 11:30 East Campus Wind Tunnel**

Presenter(s): Wayne Northcutt

Architects: Christopher Herr Architecture

Description: Submittal package for Schematic Design and Design Development

#### **Landscape**

- Massing of switch grass also reflects the interior wind research.
- Conducted view shed study from the parkway.
  - 80% evergreen and 20% deciduous
  - The building will likely be screened from autos year round.

#### **Building**

- Building sits just east of MacAllister
- Exterior to reflect the type of wind research going on inside building
- Proposing some sidewalk modifications

Victor Olgyay asked if they could describe the mechanical decisions.

- Balance between temperature control, horsepower and consistency.
- Backed off the horsepower, widened research parameters, and expanded timing between tests.

#### **Elevations**

- Design is taking cues from SEC building.
- Chose bamboo color brick
- Shadow over the brick speaks to study of flow.
- Design pushes and pulls bricks to achieve wind shadow.
  - North elevation is a turbulent flow representation.
  - South elevation is a laminar flow representation.

#### **Design Review Board Questions and Comments**

Don Brandes appreciated the materiality and architectural vernacular in terms of integration of interior use.

Specific questions and comments included:

- The placement of the building might be located differently to avoid demolishing the existing ash trees, improving the visual relationship to the building and increasing the desired “affect” of the building being located within a “field” of swithgrass/sumacs.
- The design concept of “an object of art in the landscape” is very compelling – the orientation of the building should reflect this concept.
- The re-orientation of the building also may assist in the installation/maintenance/operation of the turbine and the access doors.
- It would be great to see the grading plan for the building....
- Please consider landscaping the entire site.

Victor Olgyay offered that if it was textured on both sides (north and south), the shadows would be different.

Rick Epstein suggested making the concrete base dark to highlight the “float” effect (no need for board form base).

The garage door is for delivery of test materials and works as an air intake. The louvers are for exhausting the building. The wind tunnel can run at ambient temperatures as long as they are stable. The tunnel itself works as the air exchanger. An exhaust fan on the roof helps with air circulation.

Candy Roberts suggested rotating so that the garage door is away from MacAllister.

Victor Olgay encouraged passive ventilation/lighting/insulating. The amount of solar energy this building can generate may outweigh its yearly consumption. Suggested moving the rooftop mechanical unit north to allow for future options of PV installation.

Consultants are weighing the option of raising roof, dropping parapet, and painting RTU. The scuppers are included to avoid clutter of downspouts. The roof can be tilted either way, this will likely change with rotated footprint.

**Design Review Board Motion:**

RE: Granted SD and DD approval based on the comments provided in the approved DRB Notes with request to review for compliance.

DB: Seconded

CR: In favor

VO: In favor

**Comment Summary:**

1. Review orientation with goal of saving existing trees. Project to be reoriented with entrance toward parking lot and garage doors toward MacAllister service area. The building is too close to the sidewalk and should be reconfigured so it reads more as a “building in the landscape.”
2. To maximize the building energy efficiency, passive ventilation and lighting is encouraged, along with moving the rooftop mechanical unit north to allow for future options of PV installation.
3. Review making the concrete base dark to highlight the “float” effect (no need for board form base).
4. With the building reconfiguration, it may make sense to have the pattern on only one wall, if needed, to control cost.

**12:00 – 1:45 Athletics Complex Indoor Practice Facility (IPF) Design Development**

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

Description: Design development approval for the Indoor Practice Facility.

**Design Review Board Approval Updates:**

**Grounds:** Partial DD approved (north of IPF)

**NE Corner Building:** DD approved with conditions / resolved some conditions

**IPF:** DD requested and SD approved with conditions

Team requests a meeting for formal IPF submission with NE Corner building updates.

DRB and team agreed on **Tuesday Sept. 30, 2014 at 9 a.m.**

**Comments prior to presentation.**

Don Brandes noted the following site development items:

- The CU staff and consultant team have been making great progress in assembling a comprehensive DD/site development package. It is premature to request final review of the site development package until the final grading, drainage, landscape, utility and building access/egress related issues have been resolved.
- To date, there is only a small section of the pedestrian walk that has been identified not-in-contract (NIC). It will be important to have a complete set of site improvements that reflect base-bid and funded site improvements.
- The DD site improvement package should clearly illustrate all project area improvements from the edge of Boulder Creek to the north, to Colorado Avenue to the south, and to Folsom St. to the east.

**IPF Design Summary by Michael Ray**

- Taking a step back, looking at the most appropriate building for the site.
  - Went back to the diagrammatic sweet spot in May
- Building was doing too much. The goal in terms of the DRB was to simplify.
- Elevation studies led to cleaned up punched window look.
  - Design is to be masculine

- Realized that existing entrances on campus are never really a sandstone arch.
- Since last meeting, have been inspired by ornamental precast concrete arches.
- North Elevation –
  - Committed to a clear, glazed system on upper portion of window.
- Since it is the north side, direct light may never hit the field.
  - Translucent, diffused glazed system on the lower portion of window.
  - Realizing now that the grade change to Boulder Creek combined with trees will screen the bottom portion of the building from nearly all perspectives.
- South Elevation -
  - All glazed translucent Kalwall.
- Trying to facilitate North/South ventilation.
- East – West Elevations -
  - Sandstone pushed to the corners and wrap around to N/S elevations.
  - Precast mass along center elevation.
  - Letting wall lines become big swaths.

### **Design Review Board Comments and Clarifications**

Rick Epstein commented that the east elevation needs more than four windows. Suggested additional empty bay or windows that gang-up. Suggested nine bays that are all the same. The north elevation arch option 2 seems integrated and simpler. Asked if the arch and the glass join and if the glass is segmented. The Kalwall team is working on this. Asked if the northeast stairwell was needed. Yes, it goes down to the garage.

Victor Olgay noted that a suggestion at the last review was a diffuser under the skylight. This lights the ceiling, distributes light more evenly, and would be better for the athletes. It is an opportunity for windows and façade to improve the function inside for football practice.

- Team is looking at cheaper, clear glass with savings going into a diffuser.
- Garage bays can accommodate portable bleachers, similar to the University of Washington – they can strategically scatter them. Trucks arrive and deliver at the northwest corner bay. The real issue isn't visitors but athletes waiting between events with nowhere to wait.

Don Brandes: Requested that Populous compose the final “story” for the IPF building, noting that the special nature of the building in terms of its location, size, use and architectural expression needs to be further articulated and explained – especially in terms of its energy, sustainability and its visual prominence within the campus.

Candy Roberts: Wants architecture to speak to an agreed idea of what a successful building is.

Victor Olgay asked about the parapet detail and if the skylight is translucent, will it light the wall. He noted that from a distance the scale will feel appropriate. The arch will be a nice prominent feature.

Candy Roberts: Commended team on a tremendous job.

### **Scheduled next Design Review Board (special meeting)**

**September 30, 2014 at 9 a.m.**

Three points to focus on

1. This is an incredible sports facility.
2. Energy and sustainability model.
3. Architectural detail.

### **2:45 – 4:00 CU Denver 2014 Facilities Master Plan – Working Session**

Presenter(s): CU Denver OIP (Michael Del Giudice, Andre Vite, Cary Weatherford)

Description: 2014 FMP process and outcome update; and working session with members to get input – recommendations, concerns and new ideas.

### **CU Denver Facilities Master Plan Update Presentation**

- CU South Denver is now included in the master plan.
- Master Plan done in-house with no external funding.
  - Never done because AHEC Master Plan covers CU Denver facilities.
  - This will be the first Full Utilization Analysis on Auraria Campus.
- Team has made progress on identifying opportunities and constraints on campus.
  - Process and Initiation phases are complete.

- Data collection is complete - the CU Denver total head count = 14,367
- Space planning is currently on hold.
- Study groups indicate students want more focus on student life.
  - Places to go and feel part of the CU Denver community.
  - Idea of club sports is gaining popularity.
- North Classroom Study
  - Largest inventory of CU Denver classrooms.
  - Investigating if classrooms are the right size.

### **Design Review Board Comments and Clarifications**

Don Brandes: Is AHEC reviewing the Master Plan?

- The Denver Chancellor is on AHEC Board and will review with Board.

Teresa Osborne: The Board of Regents must approve as well.

CU South Denver is part of the master plan. CU acquired The Wildlife Experience in the 'largest real estate donation in the University's history.' It is located off Peoria and Lincoln (one mile from the RTD station at Lincoln).

### **Urban Design Meeting #1 Update**

- Mapping the CU Denver Neighborhood
  - Identified 690 errors in coding of rooms are or are not actually CU Denver
- Recording and mapping use and scheduling
  - Use: when scheduled
  - Utilization: room capacity
- Planning for future facilities
  - Engineering wing addition to North Classroom
  - Lab wing to Science Building
  - Recreation / Athletic center
- Auraria Library
  - New Lawrence Street entrance
  - New paradigm for web-based learning in residual spaces

### **Urban Design Meeting #2 Update**

- Exploring Lawrence Street as a green corridor
- Exploring Larimer Street as it extends into Auraria
- Landscape Architecture Graduate study of North Classroom Plaza
- Student housing proposed to the south of Science Building
- Vehicular circulation studied
  - Bringing 11th Street back to make bus turnaround go away
- Wellness Center studies
  - Preliminary designs have excited people
  - Could be a student referendum / student fee initiated process

### **CU South Denver at The Wildlife Experience Update**

The site is currently maxed out but we can explore alterations and exemptions to the current code (PUD by Meridian). The site contains a two-story structure with a basement, including:

- 3D theater, café, gift shop, food service, large event space, gallery space, and the Globeology Program (where visitors explore global microclimates)
- Phase 1 began August of 2014 - This included introduction of nursing classrooms, instructional spaces and computer labs. A K-12 outreach component is planned with the School of Education & Human Development.

### **Design Review Board Comments and Clarifications**

Teresa Osborne: The Wildlife Experience is now known as the Liniger Building at CU South Denver.

Rick Epstein inquired about CU's plans for this acquisition. CU will:

- Expand certificate programs
- Expand nursing programs with simulation and skills labs, and establish new relationships with local hospitals.
- Work across all CU campuses to enhance their programs to meet student needs – particularly the gap between Denver and Colorado Springs

## **Design Review Board Final Comments and Clarifications**

Don Brandes noted that Speer Blvd. is the barrier on multiple scales and issues. It has been this way since the conception of campus. Strategies have explored at-grade and below grade connections but none above grade.

Rick Epstein: What about parking on Speer Blvd.? It sounds radical but would be absolutely transformative. CU has not looked at that yet. The city will certainly slow traffic for elementary, middle and high school but less likely for higher education. May make sense to activate the field next to Tivoli Green with a building and commuter lounge area, not another play field.

Don Brandes noted that the Master Plan nexus is evidently Speer Blvd. Need everyone on board to agree that this is the big issue. He suggested a conceptual exploration of Speer Blvd., including:

- Traffic calming
- Pedestrian connections to CU buildings north of Speer

Candy Roberts: In regards to housing on Speer Blvd., the trend is to live / work / study all in one place. If integrated into the Speer Blvd. edge, then this story will motivate change.

Reply: CU program needs are growing differently than that of Metro and CCD. There are only four development sites for classrooms and that edge is part of those sites.

Candy Roberts: What is the priority? Is it pedestrians?

Reply: Received grant funding for a study, likely at the Colfax crossing.

Candy Roberts: So then it may be good the study hasn't been implemented yet.

Reply: Yes, there is now more opportunity for study and change along Speer Blvd.

Candy Roberts: How can the Design Review board help? Currently the DRB doesn't have the ability to provide insight throughout the Auraria campus.

Victor Olgay: The opportunity is really the larger urban fabric of Denver. I think we can benefit from planning together with the rest of the campus and downtown.

Candy Roberts: The DRB offers to listen in detail to the urban design studies. Suggests DRB take some time with the in-house planning team to look at the issues discussed in today's meeting.

**Meeting was adjourned.**