University of Colorado
Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Amended Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, June 21, 2023
Time: 8:15 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Location: Bruce and Marcy Benson Conference Room, First Floor, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, Colorado

DRB and Campus Members present:
Don Brandes, Jody Beck, Sarah Brown, Tom Hootman, Mike Winters, and d'Andre Willis, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus ("CU Boulder"). Newly-appointed DRB members Laurel Raines and Chris Shears were also present. Cheri Gerou was unable to attend due to a scheduling conflict.

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:
Kori Donaldson, AVP of Budget, Finance, and Capital and ex officio member of the DRB
Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker
Emily Parker, Sr. Budget, Planning, and Policy Analyst, Office of the VP for Budget & Finance

Don Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 8:30 a.m.

8:15 – 9:10 a.m. **Study Session/Administrative Matters – Board Only**

The DRB reviewed administrative matters and items on the agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

9:15 – 11:00 a.m. **Chemistry and Applied Math Building – *CU Boulder***
Pre-Concept Design Workshop (Information/Direction)

Architects:
ZGF
James Corner Field Operations

Presenters:
Braulio Baptista, Design Partner, ZGF
Justin Brooks, Lead Designer, ZGF
Karli Molter, Senior Associate, Field Operations
Sarah Weidner Astheimer, Principal, Field Operations

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect, Facilities Planning, CU Boulder

Others Present:
Sadie Cline, ZGF
Heather Heiland, Whiting-Turner Contracting Company

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning
Wayne Northcutt, Facilities Planning
Zach Tupper, College of Arts and Sciences

Description:
Pre-Concept Design workshop for a new 147,000 GSF Chemistry and Applied Mathematics (CHAP) academic/ research building on the Business Field (a 4-acre recreational field on Main Campus), including 50,000 ASF for research labs and 15,000 ASF for offices for the Chemistry program; 15,000 ASF for offices for the Applied Math program; and 5,000 ASF for centrally-scheduled classrooms. The fixed limit of construction is $132.7M (CMGC delivery), with a planned occupancy of August 2026.

A/E Presentation

The DRB and the design team held a workshop to discuss a preliminary presentation of a Concept Design submittal package, a copy of which is available upon request through the contact information noted at the bottom of this document.

DRB Comments

While not all-inclusive of everything discussed during the workshop, the DRB provided the following comments/direction:

General Comments:

- Three general massing and location schemes were reviewed with the design team, all of which locate the new facility at the south end of the site and range in size from 28,000 SF to 30,000 SF, including:
    - The Bar;
    - The Heart; and
    - The Hinge.

- The scope of work for the project should include the building, some of the surrounding open space, and an overview of planned future developments on the remainder of the site.
    - References should be included to a Phase II and/or Phase III for future building and open space improvements, as well as improvements to Regent Drive and the urban streetscape.
    - References to work planned for future phases can be general, thus providing flexibility for different building footprints.

The group discussed various pros and cons of each scheme.

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- The south site location is appropriate.

- Keeping the north/east corner of the site 100% open isn't a priority.

- The views of the Flatirons shouldn't be the primary design driver of the building.

- The site needs to be successful as soon as the first new building opens and not depend on future developments.
    - Critical aspects of this success include access to the new building and the open space associated with it. Additionally, the associated open space should be fully landscaped, rather than delayed to a future phase. (Note that this comment does not refer to the full site, only the portion of the site that will be developed adjacent to the new building included in Phase I of the project.)

- Consider developing a micro master plan for the full site.

- The DRB expressed a preference for locating the loading dock along Regent Drive to the north of the new building. This location is aligned with the Events Center. Additionally, it allows for a gateway moment to occur to the south, and perhaps consolidates all loading with future building development.
    - The design team will study this option in detail to determine its viability.
    - Consider whether hard piping could be installed underground so tanks could be filled from the street edge into the building.
        - Would a striped loading zone along Regent Drive be appropriate for semi-truck loading?
    - Visually screen the loading area from traffic on Regent Street

- It was determined that the north side of the site includes too many constraints and that it is not adequate to fit the program or an adequate loading dock.

- The preferred site for a future building include the parking lot north of site (in partnership with a smaller building at the NE corner) or, alternatively, an east/west bar building at the northern edge of the site.
    - If a future building is planned at the parking lot location, the Bar and Heart schemes are preferred.

- Turf is one dimensional, and the inclusion of a meadow landscape should be explored beyond just being a metaphor or aesthetic element. Consider what a meadow can do to create a performance landscape (i.e. enhance the microclimate, manage stormwater/ rainwater, provide habitat, enhance views, and help connect to nature).

- Consider the extension of this nature integration concept in the design of the building. Are there ways to break open the space to provide light and air, making the building more passive? Are there ways to bring nature into the building to create a biophilic design?

- The group showed a preference for using open space at the south side of the site as a multi-functional landscape with a variety of student uses, and to preserve the north side of the site for informal recreation.

- Prioritize views for outdoor study and gathering spaces. Provide opportunities for continued use of open space for sports.
- Noting the comments above, the Bowl landscape scheme is preferred.
- The south site detaches the building from the adjacent buildings. How can the site design help to mitigate the potential feeling of the building being isolated?

B. Architecture

- The Heart and Bar schemes are 'siblings,' and there is an opportunity to hybridize them.
  - The Hinge does not need further study and can be eliminated.

- The architectural image of this stand alone, isolated building will be a challenge on this campus.
  - Blending the vernacular of Klauder and the Engineering Building may not be feasible, but think about what direction the form of this building should take. Be prepared to discuss potential options at the next submittal.

- The scale of the new building is quite large compared to existing buildings on this area of campus.
  - Consider massing options that are sensitive to the scale of buildings in this area.
  - Explore an option stepping the volume from north/east to south/west.

- For the Bar scheme, consider shifting the central plaza to align more closely with the building lobby and to take advantage of the views to the Flatirons.

- The location of the auditorium will end up being a big factor in future circulation routes on the site.
  - Can the floorplate of any of the schemes be flipped so the classroom is toward the southwest corner of the site?

C. Energy and Sustainability

See notes regarding the use of meadows and integrating nature in "Site & Landscape Architecture" section.

DRB Action

No formal action is required for a conceptual design workshop. The DRB provided the comments and direction noted above during the workshop.

11:00 – 11:30 a.m. **Residence One – CU Boulder**
Briefing on Concept Design Updates (Information/Direction)

Architects: Anderson Mason Dale Architects
Bohlin Cywinski Jackson
James Corner Field Operations

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Daniel Gette, Student Affairs (via Zoom)
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planning (via Zoom)

Description:
Update on previously approved Concept Design submittal for Residence One project and site located within the North Boulder Creek neighborhood, including design alternatives and preferred design direction.

d'Andre Willis provided an update. Comments and direction from the DRB include:

DRB Comments

- The design revisions made to address budgetary concerns are understood by the DRB.
  - The building feels less massive due to the removal of the 6th story on the northern edge and the removal of the east wing.
  - The simplification is a valid value engineering option.

- With the removal of the SE building, the integration of the Southeast open space into the overall site and landscape plan needs to be studied.

- Locating swing space in the southeast corner of the site could be beneficial for a future building phase.
  - Consider programming the space for gathering and "informal play" opportunities.

- When the SD submittal is prepared, ensure detail about the following is included:
  - fenestration;
  - how columns connect to the building and the ground;
  - materiality; and
  - updated grading studies.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

(For assistance with the attachments referenced within this document, please contact Linda Money at (303) 860-6110 or linda.money@cu.edu.)