



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

**University of Colorado Design Review Board
And Research Park Design Review Board
Meeting Notes**

Date: Thursday, April 12, 2018
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Location: RTA Architects, 19 South Tejon Street, Suite 300, Colorado Springs, CO; and Public Safety Training Room, Room 107, Gateway Hall, CU Colorado Springs Campus

DRB members present: Sarah Brown; Rick Epstein; Victor Olgyay; Michael Winters, Cheri Gerou (ex officio); Carolyn Fox, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs campus (“CU Colorado Springs”), and Bill Haverly, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus (“CU Boulder”). Due to a scheduling conflict, Don Brandes was unable to participate in the meeting for this date.

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker.

Ms. Brown, Acting Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 9:10 a.m.

9:00 – 9:30 a.m. Work Session – Board Only

The Board met to briefly discuss the items on this day’s agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

9:30 – 11:45 a.m. William J. Hybl Sports Medicine & Performance Center – CU Colorado Springs; Pre-Design (Information Only, held at the offices of RTA Architects)

Architects/Designers/Project Team:

RTA Architects, Colorado Springs, Colorado
HOK, Designers, St. Louis, Missouri
JE Dunn Construction, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

Stuart Coppedge, Principal, RTA Architects
Eli Hoisington, Design Principal, HOK
Peter Tronnier, Design/Build Manager, JE Dunn Construction

CU Colorado Springs Campus Presenter:
Carolyn Fox, Executive Director, Planning, Design &
Construction, and University Architect, Facilities
Management

Description:
Pre-Design Submittal regarding a new building to be
located on North Nevada Avenue for clinics, academics,
and research to create an interprofessional approach to
develop future healthcare providers

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

After introductions of the individuals present for this agenda item were made, Mr. Coppedge and Mr. Hoisington reviewed a summary of the William J. Hybl Sports Medicine & Performance Center project (“Hybl Center” or “Project”) including: goals which have been added to the project summary; existing master plans for the campus and for the Health and Wellness Village in the West Campus; site description, conditions, and analyses; various views and site context analyses related to the site; site features, scope, access, and parking concerns; existing and proposed utilities; existing easements, setbacks, and maximum buildable area; vehicle and pedestrian flow and accessibility; various topography analyses; existing hydrology; and landscape, vegetation and tree analyses.

It was noted that a planning charrette regarding sustainability and energy matters related to the Hybl Center was held prior to this meeting.

Ms. Fox discussed neighborhood traffic conditions and congestion, a new proposed route for campus shuttle buses only, and a contribution of \$300,000 from the City of Colorado Springs toward the construction of this route on Pioneer Road (formerly known as Mountain Lion Way and Spine Road) bypassing the intersection of North Nevada Avenue and Austin Bluffs Parkway.

Ms. Fox also discussed the relationship with Penrose St. Francis Centura Health, the long-term tenant in the Hybl Center.

The Board discussed the knoll and tree grove on top of the knoll; views and landscaping; potential opportunities for placemaking; road orientation and potential master planning implications; various LEED, WELL, and FITWELL assessment criteria related to the Project goals; Project timing; potential programs intended for the Health and Wellness Village (“the Village”), and fire lane requirements. The knoll is small relative to the buildings proposed, and it was noted that its stature may be overwhelmed by the proposed construction. This should be considered in micromasterplanning this site. Also, because of the program use of the facility, the WELL assessment criteria was noted as an especially appropriate metric to consider. As daylighting is a key element in this assessment, narrow floorplates (60-70 ft deep) could be an important massing criteria.

The Board reviewed the massing options under consideration, and recognized the importance of the building having a “presence” on Nevada Avenue. However, since this orientation is due west, it must be carefully fenestrated to avoid solar penalties and bioclimatically balanced with an overall massing solution that incorporates the north/south opportunities of the site.

Additionally, Mr. Tronnier discussed the proposed budget for the Hybl Center.

Using 3D models, preliminary program stacking plans; parking, access, flow and connections, and wayfinding; and various building studies were reviewed.

B. DRB Comments:

Following is a summary of the comments made by the Board during the presentation:

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Study what the meaning of the knoll is and how it will inform the buildings,
 - consider preservation and optimization of the grove of trees and the views from and to the knoll and daylighting at the knoll
 - determine what outdoor spaces will be needed in order to support the scope of overall development in the Village
 - define placemaking as it relates to these outdoor spaces and the public realm and how it can tie all of these buildings together
 - study connection with rooftop striving for a visual relationship
- Consider adding goals and landscape diagrams related to the outdoor spaces, public placemaking, and built landscaping so the grove/knoll isn't engulfed by the buildings surrounding it
- Investigate possible options where development in the future might include a different alignment of Pioneer Road and different placements of future buildings in the Village and consider incorporating these options into the planning for the Hybl Center, including what opportunities may exist once the temporary buildings currently in the area no longer exist
- Review placement of parking and landscaping areas adjacent to the Hybl Center:
 - define these elements
 - consider placing a berm between Nevada Avenue and the Hybl Center as an option to eliminate the feel of a line of solid cars parked along the western edges of the Hybl Center and the Lane Center and to extend the feel of the grove of trees from the knoll outward
 - also consider utilizing the partial road to the north of the Hybl Center for additional parking, creating a street scape and entryway, and activating the northern edge of the project, etc.
- Study the connections between the Hybl Center, the existing Lane Center for Academic Sciences, the shared public spaces, and the fire lane; investigate the possibility of making the fire lane more pedestrian in nature while maintaining the required access of a fire lane

- Also study options regarding the entry and access, including ingress and egress, to the Hybl Center, keeping in mind challenges related to traffic flows and existing or planned roads, pedestrian flows, wayfinding, and the connections noted above
- Continue reviewing utility easements in order to maximize the allowable building footprint and provide more flexibility concerning the overall site and building designs

Architecture:

- Review placement of programming in order to optimize the height of the building without impeding the desired collaboration within the building

Sustainability and Energy:

- Determine and express the energy assessment criteria most important to the project which you intend to optimize, include reasons why these criteria were selected

The Board discussed the Pre-Design submittal with the design team and expressed its appreciation of the format for the submittal and the subsequent review. No action was required for this item, although the Board acknowledged that the design team fulfilled the requirements of pre-design.

11:45 a.m. – 12:45 p.m. Travel and Lunch Break

The Board took a break to travel between meeting locations and for lunch prior to convening as the Research Park Design Review Board for the following agenda item.

**12:45 – 2:15 p.m. Aerospace – North Wing Addition, College of Engineering –
CU Boulder; Design Development (Action Required)**

Architects/Landscape Architects:

Hord Coplan Macht, Inc., Denver, Colorado
RATIO Architects, Indianapolis, Indiana
PLOT Project, LLC, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

Chris Boardman, AIA, LEED AP, Principal/STEM, RATIO
Architects
Kent Freed, Principal, PLOT Project, LLC
Anthony Mazzeo, Principal, PLOT Project, LLC

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities
Management

Others Present:

Heather Bemis, Associate/Project Manager, Hord Coplan Macht

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,
Design and Construction
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning

Description:

Design Development submittal for expansion of recently approved building for the Aerospace Engineering Sciences ("AES") Program currently under construction

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Mr. Northcutt provided a brief project update and noted the primary items for which the Board provided direction the last time this item was heard by the Board.

Mr. Freed reviewed various updates to the landscaping plans and illustrations including the project limit line in the northeast corner, the orientation to one of the seating platforms in the east courtyard due to the addition of a canopy over an entrance on the east side of the building, the depths of the PLD drainage channels as directed by the civil engineers, and currently proposed planting palettes and planting plans. The lighting plan was also reviewed. To the extent applicable, lighting elements will match what the elements used for the original AES Building.

Ms. Gerou noted that while Mr. Brandes has received the submittal packet, the Board did not have his response regarding the updated landscaping and planting plans and that if he has any comments regarding these items, those would be shared with staff at a later date.

Samples of the wood decking which will be used to build the seating platforms and the paving materials were presented to the Board. Mr. Freed noted that these materials are the same as what will be used with the landscaping for the original AES Building currently under construction.

Mr. Boardman presented a SketchUp model of updated plans for the North Wing Addition and the covered bike shelter. Regarding the architecture and building design, the removal of a former entryway on the northwest corner and the existing exterior colonnade related to that former entryway, the building massing, various updates and options regarding the roof overhangs, and the bike shelter were all reviewed and discussed.

Ms. Reilly indicated that two trash receptacles would be placed in the east courtyard but that the specific locations were yet to be determined and that details regarding the signage were still being discussed.

B. DRB Comments/Action:

The Board provided the following direction and/or comments:

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Regarding the landscaping furnishings noted by Ms. Reilly, the Board requested that staff follow up with Mr. Brandes regarding these items in order to get his final approval

Architecture:

- In lieu of the exterior colonnade shown on the northwest corner, consider bringing the walls down to the ground and filling in the space by extending the electrical and autoclave rooms
- Consider modifying the design of the east and west rooflines so the:
 - Dimensions and angles are symmetrical rather than asymmetrical
 - Depth is shorter by 5', bringing the total down to 8'
 - Soffits are filled in as modeled
- Regarding the bicycle shelter, consider:
 - Adding a screen edge between the south side corners back to the brick wall
 - Making the top of the roof match the banding at the top of the nearby windows, as modeled – smaller, simpler, aligning with brick bands
 - Reversing the widths of the banding on the roof

Mr. Epstein moved to approve the Design Development submittal for the Aerospace North Addition including the comments noted above related to the bicycle shelter, the east and west rooflines, and the colonnade. Mr. Olgay seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

The Board adjourned as the Research Park Design Review Board and reconvened as the Design Review Board in order to hear the following agenda item.

2:30 – 4:00 p.m.

**Ramaley Biology Building Addition – CU Boulder;
Design Development (Action Required)**

Architects:

Hord Coplan Macht, Inc., Denver, Colorado
RATIO Architects, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

Chris Boardman, AIA, LEED AP, Principal/STEM, RATIO
Architects
Chris McBride, ASLA, Landscape Architect, Hord Coplan Macht

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities
Management

Others Present:

Heather Bemis, Associate/Project Manager, Hord Coplan Macht
David Shaffer, Architect, RATIO Architects
Tim Wellner, AIA, LEED AP, Project Manager, Hord Coplan Macht

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,
Design and Construction
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning

Description:

Design Development (“DD”) submittal for addition to existing building for the relocation of the Integrative Physiology Program (“IPHY Project”)

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Mr. Northcutt introduced the design team members present for this meeting. He noted that the CMGC for the IPHY Project, Fransen Pittman General Contractors, has been selected. As soon as classes and commencement have been completed in May 2018, the construction team anticipates breaking ground to begin working on the utilities so the horizontal ground work can be completed before the students return to the campus in the fall. He also noted that the preliminary budget numbers from Fransen Pittman are higher than the proposed budget and that staff would be reviewing these numbers with Fransen Pittman. He briefly described the areas the Board requested the design team review prior to the DD submittal.

Mr. McBride and Mr. Boardman reviewed the current site and design for the IPHY Project including but not limited to the front entrance area and front façade; the Norlin Library service/loading dock area on the west side; the addition of porous paving for electric cart parking; and the south courtyard area and access entryways.

The design team met with civil engineers and campus maintenance staff to address various challenges including grade changes and drainage issues.

Regarding the south courtyard, samples of the concrete paving and powder coat on the frames for the benches were brought to share with the Board. After reviewing the samples provided, the Board agreed that neutral, buff-tone colors for the concrete paving materials are preferable.

B. DRB Comments/Action:

After the presentation, the consultants left the room, and the Board discussed the submittal with staff. Once the consultants returned to the room, the Board, by consensus, tabled action on this matter until the items noted below are addressed:

Architecture:

- Review the north entrance façade and elevation to determine if it can be simplified by reducing the proposed limestone arcade at the entry to a single portal surrounding only the entry door and investigate bringing the height of this limestone portal even with the top of the engaged colonnade
- Explore other locations for a decorative cartouche on the northwest wall
- Consider removing the decorative limestone above the two tall windows on the northwest wall and review the locations of the windows on this wall
- Explore removing the limestone lintels from the lower edges of the recesses or removing the blank recesses in their entirety on the upper portion of the western elevation
- Look at the bay in the south elevation and determine the best strategies to balance the design and performance goals

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Simplify the front entryway, seat walls, and steps between the north side of the building and Pleasant Street
- Simplify and refine the design of the south courtyard including the concrete paving design, the furnishings, lighting, the plantings, and if applicable, a water feature

Sustainability and Energy:

- Review the daylight analysis and the need and use of the sunscreens on the south wall to the north of the courtyard which are inconsistently represented in the presentation
- While the sunscreens are not critical on the south façade because a hallway is on the immediate interior, the west windows which fenestrate the laboratories must incorporate some method to control the solar glare. Mr. Olgay offered to assist with the assessment of the best application of sunscreens or other solar control devices, if needed.

A conference call with the full Board, staff, and the design team will be scheduled for early the following week in order to review the modifications requested and, if acceptable, take action regarding the DD submittal.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

MEMORANDUM

TO Sarah Brown
FROM Don Brandes
RE DRB Projects
DATE April 9, 2018

William J. Hybl Sports Medicine & Performance Center Pre-Design

- Define ideal program relationships within the Building – How do they stack (vertically) and what is their ideal horizontal relationship?
- How do you provide ideal student learning opportunities with patient care and privacy. The balance of students learning and treatment of patients.
- Relationships that need to be explored;
 - Urban Design context of the Building from Nevada – What is it? Is the building architecturally distinctive as a Medical Center or Academic Building?
 - Is there a relationship between the Hybl Building and Lane Center in terms of their set-back, building heights and materials?
 - Will the front (Nevada) access be dedicated to patients and the back (Mountain Lion Way) be dedicated to student access?
 - The dedication/allocation/weighting of parking from front to rear needs to be studied.
 - Is there an emergency, pedestrian or vehicular connection between the adjacent ENT parking lot and Hybl?
- When will the future student parking lot be laid out? Will it be terraced?
- Access from the round-about into the Hybl facility is too short – not enough distance. See Carolyn for alternative routing plan. Gate Mountain Lion Way and provide safe crossing for students.
- Explore alternative building placements on the site.....
- Potential for future expansion of building
- Is there a way to encourage/provide patient views to the mountains....similar to what was done at ENT for the dance studio?
- Will the architectural character be a break from both Lane and ENT? What should a Sports Medicine and Performance Center reflect? Innovation, team building, high technologies, an Olympic edge?

Aerospace Engineering Sciences Addition

Design Development

- Is the irrigated native grass area north of the addition included in the budget?
- Re-define the extent of project limits and budget.....landscape, lighting, walkways and outdoor furnishings.....
- Section A – Is it a PLD with Native Plantings? Compare page 8 with 12 and 13?
- Is there a potential “trip” hazard with the PLD – See page 13. Is the PLD lighted? What if you eliminated the walls and graded the slope back?
- Page 18 – Let’s assume AF= Maples, PA = Cottonwoods, AL = Alders and AC= Service Berry.....Let’s assume they are all 4” caliber, balled and bur-lapped.
- Signage, trash, quick couplers for pavement washouts, etc.
- The entry roof options need work.....they seem too pronounced and out of scale.

Ramaley Biology Addition

Design Development

- I am not sure we need the front entry seat walls..... They seem to break-up the sense of arrival and entryway. I would try to provide a more uniform entry with the steps. Students can sit to either side of the steps along the seater wall by the planters. See page 11 for layout.
- The Courtyard is dependent on the placement and sound of the water features, seating, lighting and power pedestals. Otherwise the courtyard is mostly in shade/shadow. Add seating. Eliminate the seater-walls in front and get the water features in the courtyard.
- The plantings for birds is a great idea.

City Center

Design Development

- The proposed office area/space seems far out of proportion to the Meeting and Conference space. The office should be incidental to the meeting and conference space. It seems to occupy 50% of the area.

Business and Engineering

Pre-Schematic Workshop

- Did they resolve the relationship of the two building masses?
- Create an obvious point of entry into the complex – in addition to the underpass access.
- Simplify the west facing student gathering spaces into a common open space.
- Other



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Friday, April 13, 2018
Time: 8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Location: Conference Rooms 502 & 503, Fifth Floor, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, CO

DRB members present: Sarah Brown; Rick Epstein; Victor Olgyay; Michael Winters, Cheri Gerou (ex officio); and Bill Haverly, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus ("CU Boulder"). Due to a scheduling conflict, Don Brandes was unable to participate in the meeting for this date.

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker.

Ms. Brown, Acting Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 8:07 a.m.

8:00 – 10:30 a.m.

**Business and Engineering Schools Expansion – CU Boulder
Pre-Schematic Design Workshop (Information/Direction Only)**

Architects:

Gensler Architectural Design/Consultants, Denver, Colorado
Civitas Landscape Architecture, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

Brian Vitale, Design Principal, Gensler
Craig Vickers, RLA, Civitas

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

Jan Becker, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning

Others Present:

Jonas Philipsen, Design Director, Gensler
Kyle Hopkins, Landscape Architect, Civitas
Troy Bovard, Preconstruction Manager, Haselden Construction

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Stephanie Gillin, Assistant Dean, Leeds School of Business
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager,
Facilities Planning
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,
Design and Construction
Keane Ray, Project Manager, Facilities Planning

Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning
Doug Smith, Assistant Dean, College of Engineering and
Applied Science

Description: Pre-Schematic Design Workshop for an addition and renovation to the Koelbel Building and the Engineering Center for the Leeds School of Business and the College of Engineering and Applied Science (the "Project")

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Introductions of the individuals present for this meeting were made after which Mr. Haverly noted that staff is pleased with the progress made on the Koelbel Building/Engineering Center project by the design team. He also indicated that there may be budget issues related to this Project and if any changes occur which may significantly impact the architecture, staff will inform the Board.

Ms. Becker briefly commented on the Project schedule which includes returning to the Board in May 2018 for the Schematic Design submittal and potentially in November or December 2018 for the Design Development submittal. Ms. Gerou also discussed the timing of the submission to the Board of Regents.

Mr. Vitale began the presentation for the workshop by indicating that landscape options have been added in the 3D model to the currently preferred version of the Project building and that the first half of the workshop would be focused on site and landscaping with the second half being focused on the building itself.

Mr. Vickers reviewed with the Board and staff the currently proposed rooftop garden and deck areas along the west side of the Koelbel Building covering the basement rooms, proposed areas for bicycle parking, grading and landscaping options for the quad area to the west, landscaping surrounding the southwest corner of the new Engineering auditorium, pedestrian pathways and seating areas on the west wide of the Project building, and the pedestrian pathway east of the Project building along the south side of the Engineering Center.

Mr. Vitale then reviewed various illustrations, elevations, and floor plans related to the Project including options concerning the width of the space between the north end of the existing Koelbel Building and the tower portion of the Project building; a building parti and massing hierarchy; and connector, façade, and roof form studies. A current SketchUp model was also reviewed.

B. DRB Comments:

The Board expressed its appreciation to the design team and staff for the positive progress made on the Project and indicated that the design has come a long way. The design team has done a good job of tying the buildings together and simplifying the new structure so it is less complicated and disjointed and has done a good job with massing and materials.

No action was required for this item, although throughout the workshop, the Board provided direction to the design team regarding the site, landscaping, the building design, and sustainability and energy matters.

Following is a summary of the comments from the Board:

Site and Landscape Architecture:

Bike parking on the west side:

- Study options regarding shaping the geometry of the bike parking in the quad to make the entry more fluid and easier to access and so the form is more organic and aligns with and is more friendly with the existing quad shape
- Continue to study the locations of the bike parking to ensure that the areas have been sized and placed appropriately and are not overly intruding into the landscape
- Consider adding trees and zone landscaping to the bike parking so they feel like they are in the landscaping, not separate from the landscaping, and agree more with the organic form proposed

Bike parking on the east side:

- Investigate ways to buffer bike parking so length of the bike parking area isn't so obvious and experience of the walk itself is enhanced, such as:
 - shifting the wall a little further south to increase the planting areas adjacent to the sidewalk in order to make the planted edge more substantial and softer
 - adding trees on the south side of the sidewalk if possible given existing utilities
 - making the bike parking part of the landscape similar to suggested treatment on west side
 - breaking up the length of bike parking area into more sections
 - recognizing that as wall is shifted further south to make room for more planting area, it will become taller and needs to be studied
 - wall could be non-linear and could have some definition to it
- Ensure the designs for retaining walls surrounding the bike parking are consistent from the west side to the east side

Landscaping on the west side:

- Review the program uses for outdoor spaces in this area to ensure that the spaces are of sufficient size to be used for the desired purposes
- Consider adding usable patio spaces to both ends of the green planting space adjacent to the west wall on the Koelbel Building, eliminating the existing pinch point, and reducing some of the choppiness of the connections between the existing spaces:
 - on the south end, the new patio space could look down onto the BBQ patio
 - on the north end, the new patio space could be combined with the larger space currently proposed, creating two levels, the larger patio space on the lower level

- and a smaller patio space on the upper level, with the upper patio space replacing some of the existing green space
- the skylights may need to be reconfigured in order to accommodate the change to the patio space on the north end of the green space
- study the connections between the two spaces

Overall landscaping:

- Reconsider landscaping designs in general:
 - there is a lot of geometry and it's very busy
 - not all elements are tying together
 - need to "marry" landscaping from the east side and to the west side
- Investigate ways to make the landscaping more consistent:
 - study the materiality of the elements, paving options, etc.
 - make them consistent from the west side to the east side
- Consider options of carrying elements through the vestibule such as and materiality, paving patterns, etc.

Architecture:

Vertical tower element:

- Preference for the 8'6" distance between the south side of the vertical tower and the north side of the Koelbel Building was expressed by the Board
- Preference for fully flat roof connecting the east and west sides of the tower covering the mechanical penthouse also expressed by the Board:
 - completely flat roof eliminates too many angles
 - calming, especially compared to the roof activity in the Engineering Center
 - makes discussion regarding size of "forehead" of vertical element less important
 - clearly identifies the vertical element as an addition
- Consider the design and fenestration on both sides of the vertical tower:
 - since there aren't the views on the east side, perhaps giving fenestration on the west side a hierarchy over the east side would be preferable
 - study the configuration, height, and design of the tall windows and whether or not there should be stronger windows over the entries vs. the windows to the side of the entries so the windows don't read as one element
 - both sides of the tower don't need to match
 - consider defining the entries as a more unique space and that less glazing may be beneficial
 - create enough detail in the fenestration so that the windows don't become flat and undifferentiated
 - consider adding spandrel on both sides since two-story spandrel is a very common detail on the Boulder campus

- study the reveal and the banding on the east side to provide a break in the form beyond the stone, perhaps making the banding continuous, adding or changing the cladding, etc.
- continue to study the entrances including determining the right proportions, how to make the entries look special, etc.

Vestibule/pass through:

- Current plan and circulation flow from east to west or from west to east through the vestibule feels somewhat disjointed, chopped up, and disconnected as you walk through the space
- The idea of two sides of the vestibule being different is preferred, both sides don't need to be identical
- In furtherance of reinforcing the idea of mixing functions/programs between the two schools, consider studying what makes a good entry sequence and consider possible options for putting doors into vestibule to help eliminate awkward relationship between two buildings:
 - keep in mind the idea of connecting the two schools should be manifest in this space
 - the two schools should be thought of in a unified way
- Study the rhythm of the experience of the vestibule, i.e., alternating back and forth between windows and walls:
 - consider thinking of the vestibule more like an exhibition where views (windows) are framed or like a fence along the path
 - continue studying options related to the interior and exterior sides of the windows on both sides of the vestibule, for example, including chamfering, adding interior window seats, creating nooks, etc.
- Because it adds to the awkward movement through the vestibule space, investigate the possibility of removing the lunch room extension and replacing it with a window:
 - if not possible, investigate adding a planter or something adjacent to the lunch room
 - study the walls on the east side of the vestibule, can they be angled so the north wall connects to the corner of the lunch room at end of corridor on the first floor of the Engineering Center and the south wall on the northeast corner of the vertical tower angles to the south instead of making a 90 degree angle at the corner, making both walls parallel, allowing them to speak to each other
- Consider using lighting to break up the cleft walls
- Investigate using clear glazing for the windows inside the vestibule
- Regarding the Engineering Center door in the north side of the vestibule, keep it clean, simple, and direct

- Consider adding glass on the south side of the vestibule, perpendicular to the Engineering Center door, so it would feel more permeable and may help eliminate confusion about the entry
- If the exit door on the northwest corner of the existing Engineering Center building can be removed, consider bringing the curb/seat wall surrounding coffee tree to a different point of connection, perhaps touching the corner edge of the vestibule or moving into the vestibule and connecting with the existing seat wall, bringing moving to the doorway into the Engineering Center

Engineering auditorium:

- In addition to the proposed windows in the Engineering auditorium, consider adding windows on first floor of the south façade to continue language of bridge through the corner and down the south wall to south façade, perhaps in first bay next to the bridge or even all along the length of this wall
- If it wasn't necessary to have a fully-dark room, having a view to the outside from the entire length of that wall would be a nice feature to add to the auditorium
- Although the language of the auditorium could be somewhat different than that of the Engineering Center, the vocabulary of the shading on the Engineering Building may be helpful for these windows

Sustainability and Energy:

- Allow energy studies, including heat loss and energy models, to inform the design and the fenestration of the architecture of the building and the energy performance:
 - reconfiguring the windows/fenestration and creating a hierarchy on the sides of the vertical tower may help with energy issues
 - ensure that the amount of daylight and heat coming into spaces within the vertical tower element on a daily basis is controlled so the spaces on all levels are usable
 - think about how building will be using and controlling lights as they will likely be a big part of the energy load:
 - take into consideration shading, light shelves, interior glare control devices, etc.
 - keep in mind that all program areas may want to use light differently, and some orientations will be easy, but others will be more challenging, especially those with an east/west orientation
 - sun studies to the west will be very important
- Other interior energy loads and solar heat gain may be minimized through design and careful fenestration
- Flat roof over the mechanical penthouse may provide space for potentially integrating renewable energy

10:45 – 11:45 a.m.

**CU City Center – CU Denver
Combined Schematic Design/Design Development
Submittal (Action Required)**

Architects: Architectural Workshop

Presenters: Mark Bowers, Architectural Workshop

CU Denver Campus Presenter:

André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional
Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz

Others Present:

Erik Balsley, AICP LEED AP, Senior Planner, Institutional
Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz

Kimberly Griffin, Project Manager, Civil Engineering, Facilities
Projects, CU Denver/CU Anschutz

Holly Hall, Architectural Workshop, Denver

Description:

Schematic Design/Design Development presentation for a
project which will create space for the new City Center
program at CU Denver in the existing CU Denver (Dravo)
Building at 14th and Lawrence Streets, modifying interior and
exterior spaces of the building (the “City Center”)

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Mr. Bowers began the Schematic Design/Design Development (“SD/DD”) by reviewing the items related to the Board direction from the last time this City Center project was heard by the Board in March 2018. Included within this review was regarding the windows, glazing materials, and specifications; the status of the ceiling and above-ceiling space; changes to the interior and exterior lighting; and related to the entry, the removal of the exterior planter and relocation of a full-height entry door.

Mr. Vite noted that the changes to the CU signage had been approved by university Communications.

B. DRB Comments:

Beyond discussing various elements of the presentation with the design team, the Board shared the following direction and comments:

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Due to the variance in elevations between the existing sidewalk and the new sidewalk inset pad at the entry, study additional elevation points to ensure the water flow will be positive in the correct direction and won't seep into the interior spaces.

Architecture:

- Since the interior can be seen from the outside, consider using a minimal amount of faux wood panel ceiling system as an accent on the interior ceiling in order to improve the continuity between the exterior and the interior spaces and help create definition to the ceiling and the interior spaces. Continue studying of the interior ceiling to create a more high quality expression visible from the street that better represents the aspirations for this program.

Sustainability and Energy:

- Mr. Olgay indicated that the proposed glass and glazing for the windows was acceptable, noting that it has a low (approximately 11%) reflectivity from the outside, an acceptable visible light transmission level, and will be a relatively affordable glass.

Mr. Olgay moved to approve the Schematic Design/Design Development submittal for the CU Denver City Center project, with the inclusion of the comments noted above. Mr. Winters seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

MEMORANDUM

TO Sarah Brown
FROM Don Brandes
RE DRB Projects
DATE April 9, 2018

William J. Hybl Sports Medicine & Performance Center Pre-Design

- Define ideal program relationships within the Building – How do they stack (vertically) and what is their ideal horizontal relationship?
- How do you provide ideal student learning opportunities with patient care and privacy. The balance of students learning and treatment of patients.
- Relationships that need to be explored;
 - Urban Design context of the Building from Nevada – What is it? Is the building architecturally distinctive as a Medical Center or Academic Building?
 - Is there a relationship between the Hybl Building and Lane Center in terms of their set-back, building heights and materials?
 - Will the front (Nevada) access be dedicated to patients and the back (Mountain Lion Way) be dedicated to student access?
 - The dedication/allocation/weighting of parking from front to rear needs to be studied.
 - Is there an emergency, pedestrian or vehicular connection between the adjacent ENT parking lot and Hybl?
- When will the future student parking lot be laid out? Will it be terraced?
- Access from the round-about into the Hybl facility is too short – not enough distance. See Carolyn for alternative routing plan. Gate Mountain Lion Way and provide safe crossing for students.
- Explore alternative building placements on the site.....
- Potential for future expansion of building
- Is there a way to encourage/provide patient views to the mountains....similar to what was done at ENT for the dance studio?
- Will the architectural character be a break from both Lane and ENT? What should a Sports Medicine and Performance Center reflect? Innovation, team building, high technologies, an Olympic edge?

Aerospace Engineering Sciences Addition

Design Development

- Is the irrigated native grass area north of the addition included in the budget?
- Re-define the extent of project limits and budget.....landscape, lighting, walkways and outdoor furnishings.....
- Section A – Is it a PLD with Native Plantings? Compare page 8 with 12 and 13?
- Is there a potential “trip” hazard with the PLD – See page 13. Is the PLD lighted? What if you eliminated the walls and graded the slope back?
- Page 18 – Let’s assume AF= Maples, PA = Cottonwoods, AL = Alders and AC= Service Berry.....Let’s assume they are all 4” caliber, balled and bur-lapped.
- Signage, trash, quick couplers for pavement washouts, etc.
- The entry roof options need work.....they seem too pronounced and out of scale.

Ramaley Biology Addition

Design Development

- I am not sure we need the front entry seat walls..... They seem to break-up the sense of arrival and entryway. I would try to provide a more uniform entry with the steps. Students can sit to either side of the steps along the seater wall by the planters. See page 11 for layout.
- The Courtyard is dependent on the placement and sound of the water features, seating, lighting and power pedestals. Otherwise the courtyard is mostly in shade/shadow. Add seating. Eliminate the seater-walls in front and get the water features in the courtyard.
- The plantings for birds is a great idea.

City Center

Design Development

- The proposed office area/space seems far out of proportion to the Meeting and Conference space. The office should be incidental to the meeting and conference space. It seems to occupy 50% of the area.

Business and Engineering

Pre-Schematic Workshop

- Did they resolve the relationship of the two building masses?
- Create an obvious point of entry into the complex – in addition to the underpass access.
- Simplify the west facing student gathering spaces into a common open space.
- Other



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Tuesday, April 17, 2018
Time: 10:00 – 11:00 a.m.
Location: By Conference Call or in person at Regents Conference Room, 1800 Grant Street, Denver

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown; Rick Epstein; Victor Olgyay; Michael Winters, Cheri Gerou (ex officio); and Bill Haverly, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus (“CU Boulder”).

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker.

Mr. Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 10:00 a.m.

10:00 – 11:00 a.m.

**Ramaley Biology Building Addition – CU Boulder;
Continuation of Design Development Submittal from
April 12, 2018 (Action Required)**

Architects:

Hord Coplan Macht, Inc., Denver, Colorado
RATIO Architects, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

Jennifer Cordes, AIA, LEED AP, Principal, CPSO, Hord Coplan Macht
Chris Boardman, AIA, LEED AP, Principal/STEM, RATIO Architects
Chris McBride, ASLA, Landscape Architect, Hord Coplan Macht

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities Management

Others Present:

David Shaffer, Architect, RATIO Architects
Tim Wellner, AIA, LEED AP, Project Manager, Hord Coplan Macht

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,
Design and Construction
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning

Description:

Design Development (“DD”) submittal for addition to existing building for the relocation of the Integrative Physiology Program (“IPHY Building”), continued from meeting held 4/12/18

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

After a brief introduction by Ms. Cordes, Mr. McBride described the updates that have been made to the front entrance, stairs, railings, and seat walls since the April 12 Board meeting.

Mr. McBride noted that during an overflow scenario, water will sheet flow over the sidewalk north and east of the front entry plaza along the side Pleasant Street and over the north sidewalk entrance into Ramaley. Staff indicated that as long as this sheet flow was an occurrence only during an overflow situation, it would be acceptable.

Mr. McBride and Mr. Boardman reviewed a series of options regarding the north elevation specifically concerning the front entrance, the design of the colonnade, the windows on both sections of the north wall, and the alignment of the cartouche.

The current design of the south courtyard was discussed. While the design was simplified, the Board suggested a number of options for the consultants and staff to consider.

The west elevation and the use of sunshades on the south elevation and related daylighting studies were also discussed. Ms. Cordes noted that the sunshades had been removed because they were blocking sunshine from going into the courtyard and into the hallway inside the building. After an analysis, it was determined that a sun shelf/light louvres could improve issues with glare, could bounce light further into the interior spaces, and would not interfere with the courtyard. She also confirmed that glazed clerestory windows had been added to the wall between the south hallway and the interior offices and lavatories, thus improving daylighting in those spaces. Mr. Olgay concurred that an interior light shelf should adequately solve these issues.

B. DRB Comments/Action:

During the presentation, the Board made the following suggestions for additional follow up by the consultants and/or staff after which Mr. Brandes moved for conditional approval of the Design Development submittal for the Ramaley Biology Building/IPHY Addition. The conditions are noted below. Mr. Epstein seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Regarding front entry plaza, continue to explore following recommendations:
 - Remove stub wall/pilaster at the stairs, use small cheek wall to separate sections of risers similar to the detail at the central railing
 - Open up front entry, thereby reducing by one number of risers along stair sections
 - Position center railing so it is centered with the front doorway
 - Step western retaining wall down, create seat wall next to the building
 - Investigate terminating western end of the western seat wall along Pleasant Street at beginning edge of tall vertical windows, ensuring that grade in this area will allow seat wall to be proper height
 - Connect south end of retaining wall along side of east planting bed to north wall of IPHY Building, allowing for water overflow underneath wall when needed

- Concerning south courtyard landscaping, explore following concepts, work with staff to consider possible options while redefining sense of place:
 - Determine if design of courtyard and placement of benches could allow size of benches to be more consistent, perhaps 5' to 6' in length
 - Investigate how benches can be integrated into courtyard environment so they feel like they are flowing from the ground rather than being an object or a piece of furniture:
 - Cast-in-place concrete
 - A blend of concrete and wood if concrete band in ground plane could also be replaced with wood
 - Continue study of possible geometric forms for design of courtyard:
 - Analyze how the landscape and hardscape may tie together better
 - Should the center planting area continue to be organic?
 - Determine if benches could relate more to a geometric shape
 - Explore ways that the small size of courtyard could be enhanced by design, by placing benches in areas not only benefitting from sun and/or shade but also providing access to other visual opportunities (other areas adjacent to courtyard, specimen plantings, art, views, etc.) beyond edges of courtyard; in effect, enlarging the space through placement rather than shrinking or containing it by focusing entire courtyard on center planting area. Also consider proportion/ placement of landscaped and hardscaped areas given the small size of the space and the interface of the courtyard with the surrounding buildings.
 - Consider extending southern edges of ground plane banding to engage southern retaining wall north of Norlin Library, also enlarging courtyard space and discouraging sense of a pass-through walkway south of courtyard
 - If budget allows, determine if water feature could still be included in garden area

Architecture:

- Regarding the north elevation, design of front entrance and portico, continue analyzing the following:
 - Option 6 where depth of entire portico has been reduced by 18" and lower windows and entry door are inset by 18" and the piers are proud of the door and window plane

- Bring soffit out relative to others at top of entrance area to align with horizontal banding at building
 - Make width and alignment of windows and pier columns consistent with windows and columns above portico
 - Reduce limestone portal surrounding entrance and adjacent columns to front door only
 - Investigate increasing width of limestone on sides of front door so it wraps around sides of pier columns adjacent to front door and engages with the wall flush with the door and window plane to eliminate the narrow edge of ashler sandstone
 - Consider making limestone surround for all lower windows at front entrance so they are consistent with taller windows above portico
 - Study all windows at front entrance to determine if inset plane around black frames of glass should be made of limestone like the upper windows, not including the return which should remain ashler sandstone
 - Show texture on metal panels in windows on north elevation
 - Continue similar texture in design for limestone header above front entry, not overly decorative, perhaps including IPHY building identification
- Remove limestone header from tall vertical windows on west end of north wall
 - Retain new placement of cartouche on upper section of west end of north wall and remove cartouche from limestone header above front entry

Regarding the west elevation, the Board agreed to remove the proposed insets and leave the upper portion of the west wall as a blank, solid wall which is more consistent with other elevations on campus and architecture of proposed IPHY Building.

Sustainability and Energy:

- Concerning the daylighting and sunshades on south elevation:
 - Determine if proposed sun shelves/light louvres are within budget
 - Regarding daylighting, the Board encouraged the use of interior glazing to better distribute daylight within the space, and asked the design team to review the glare control on the west-facing laboratory windows

Ms. Cordes indicated that the design team will return to the Board at its May 2018 meeting, and will include an update regarding status of the budget and any potential impacts to the Design Development submittal.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.