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

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Amended Meeting Notes

Date:	Wednesday, February 15, 2023
Time:	8:30 – 11:30 a.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, Cheri Gerou, Tom Hootman, Mike Winters, and d'Andre Willis, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder ("CU Boulder")

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:
Kori Donaldson, AVP for Budget, Planning, and Capital and ex officio member of the DRB
Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker (via Zoom)
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 8:45 a.m.

8:30 – 9:15 a.m. **Study Session – Board Only**

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

9:30 – 11:30 a.m. **Residence One – *CU Boulder***
Schematic Design Workshop (Information/Direction)

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:
- Anderson Mason Dale Architects ("AMD")
- Bohlin Cywinski Jackson Architects ("BCJ")
- James Corner Field Operations

Presenters:
- Daniel Lee, Principal, BCJ
- Thomas Kirk, Principal, BCJ
- Karli Molter, Senior Associate, Field Operations
- James Zarske, Director of Sustainability Services, Noresco

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

Others Present:
- Luc Bamberger, Andrew Nielsen, AMD

CU Boulder Campus or Other CU Representatives Present:
Daniel Gette, Student Affairs
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning
Patricia McNally-Leef, Housing Facilities Services
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planning
Edward von Bleichert, Facilities Management

Description:
Schematic Design ("SD") Workshop submittal for Residence One project and site located within the North Boulder Creek neighborhood, including site analysis, context, concept design alternatives, and preferred design direction.

A/E Presentation

The design team gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, a copy of which is available upon request through the contact information noted at the bottom of this document.

DRB Comments

A. General Comments

- The DRB recognized and welcomed the evolution of the design, specifically the massing articulation, site plan, parti, the variance of rooftop heights, and the addition of rooftop decks and outdoor terraces.

- The videos allowed the DRB to get a much better feel of the project.

B. Site & Landscape Architecture

Site

- The parti is a good blend of public, social, and private spaces. This "pedestrian corridor and walkway" should be an organizing principle and hallmark for the project in terms of its potential pavement patterns/materials, fixtures/furnishings and lighting. Work closely with the architects for visual/physical connections and relationships to the ground floor.

- Consider ways to intermix the urban and the organic into the site.
    - Organic plantings could be done in a meandering style along with urban, hardscape seating.
    - The seating along the landscaped edge of the Rustandy Building is a good example of blended spaces. It is an architectural, city-type edge with ample seating and has been popular with students.

- Study the recommended plants and trees to ensure a pedestrian scale has been applied where appropriate.

- Is there a way to rebuild or acknowledge the community garden that will be displaced by the project?

- Explore ways to use landscaping to break down the scale of the large wall along 19th St.
    - Planters would provide an opportunity for a small seating edge.

Pedestrian Connection to Site

- What is the hierarchy of pedestrian connections to Residence One and throughout the site? How will the integration between indoor and outdoor spaces work?
    - There is a strong pedestrian connection from the northeast edge of the project site to Boulder Creek and the bridge to main campus.
        - Consider articulating the length of this pedestrian connection in some way to set it apart from the sidewalks along the street edge.
        - Consider ways to activate pedestrian connections to the building(s) and other destinations.

Central Lawn

- The planting and seating plan shown on the outside edge of the Central Lawn is preferable to hard, concrete edges.

- Study the amphitheater seating to determine if space for more seats can be added to the north end of the Central Lawn.
    - A more urban edge to the amphitheater may be preferable.
    - Limiting the number of boulders may allow more areas for seating.

- Is there a way to further define the corner of the Central Lawn through the addition of a gateway or other element?
    - Most pedestrians coming from campus will arrive at Residence One via this corner, the area could potentially be the genesis of the relationship to Boulder Creek.

- Consider using more deciduous trees in the planting areas surrounding the Central Lawn.
    - Decidous, ornamental, and fruit trees will provide dappled shade whereas evergreens may eventually cover nearby seating and obstruct travel through the site.
        - Illustrate how evergreen growth over time will affect the overall site flow.

- The pop-up box is a great addition and will help support student activities on the site. However, a permanent installation may conflict with other desired uses.

- Consider different formal and informal student activities that could be hosted/staged throughout the year – and offer suggestions on how they could be accommodated.

C. Architecture

- In comparing the two architectural/site plan schemes, Ridgeline and Canyon Pass, the DRB prefers the Canyon Pass option.
    - Eliminating the bridges between the southeast and main buildings provides more opportunity to:
        - work with the topography;
        - vary the datum lines;
        - more easily develop individual building personality; and
        - create a more flexible environment for current and future uses.

- Continue to study how to simplify the scale and massing of the overall project, particularly at the ground plane.
    - Determine whether the massing of the ground floor is too consistent across the three buildings. Is there a way to break up the hard datum lines similar to what was done with the rooflines? This would result in a more interesting urban space.
    - The more the ways the materials and datum lines are tied together at the base of the building, the more a one-building concept is amplified.
        - Investigate ways to carry the materiality from upper floors down to the ground to help break up the datum lines.

- Look at ways to further activate the building edges and engage the community.
    - Articulating the building access and related services at the pedestrian level is really important to the urban experience.
        - This pedestrian-level articulation will help create the new character of the neighborhood as the rest of the master plan area is developed.
    - Consider adding a terrace or outdoor seating along the 19th Street market side of the building.
    - Study the size and placement of windows. Do oversized windows feel commercial?
    - Consider whether adding a sculptural or gestural column below cantilevered areas makes a positive change to the pedestrian experience.
        - At the southeast building, lowering the cantilever is preferred.
    - Study the walls that will be blank at a pedestrian level. Can they be made more pedestrian friendly with the addition of murals, seating, landscaping, or fenestration?

- Research ways to replicate the subtle variance in stye and materiality of the buildings on the main campus in the buildings that comprise Residence One.
    - Additional study of and activation at the ground level will likely result in creating individual building identities.

- Think about ways to add a small front door entry or lobby at the south end of the north building where the UPS service center is located.

D. Energy and Sustainability

- The additional progress and updates regarding sustainability are appreciated.

- Continue to articulate the sustainability story and consider how the building can illustrate or demonstrate elements of this story.
    - For example, include strategies, design targets, the performance metric used to satisfy that target, and information about how the design fulfills the story.
    - Think about keeping a record of the raw data determining why certain building materials, systems, and design features were chosen over others. This information could be leveraged to help with student recruitment, inform future construction, and set new benchmarks and standards.
        - While tracking progress is great, it would be even better to say the building made an impact and that design decisions were made for this reason.
- Understanding that there may be initial limitations to achieve the following, continue to:
    - Work on the approach to demonstrate a climate-responsive design and reduce the EUI as much as possible. The project should set a new bar.
    - Strive to be the most sustainable building on campus.

        - Add more specificity regarding EUI and embodied carbon.
        - Study how to reduce embodied carbon in materials by comparing embodied carbon in material choices. Reducing embodied carbon is as important as reducing operational carbon. An embodied carbon target would be an important design metric.
        - Continue the great work on landscape design sustainability and user experience.
    - As noted in the presentation:
        - Continue to reduce envelope loads by refining your studies for window shading, optimal window-to-wall ratio, and assembly insulation levels. Improving the envelope can help you mitigate the reliance on a less-than-ideal current central plant. It's great you are thinking about the integration of a future, improved central plant.
        - Continue to pursue installing a low-carbon, all-electric kitchen in lieu of gas appliances.
        - Keep the integrated process in mind so that design decisions are made with performance data.

DRB Action

No action required. The DRB expressed its appreciation for the design team and for the opportunity to interact through a SD workshop. For the formal SD submittal, the DRB suggested:

- Further consideration of all site elements from an urban design standpoint;
- More definition in the level of connectivity between buildings;
- Call outs for materiality, including embodied carbon; and
- Some vignettes illustrating the pedestrian experience at various parts of the site,

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

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