



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board

Date: Thursday, January 11, 2018
Time: 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Location: Conference Room 230, Macky Auditorium, CU Boulder Campus

DRB members present: Don Brandes; Sarah Brown; Rick Epstein; Victor Olgyay; 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.
Aubrey Prestwich, Student, College of Environmental Design, CU Boulder

Mr. Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 8:05 a.m.

8:00 – 9:30 a.m. Work Session – Board Only

The Board met to briefly review administrative and legislative items with Ms. Gerou after which the Board briefly discussed the items on the agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

Discussion was held re: Building Recognition Signage Plaques as requested by the Board of Regents. Ms. Gerou will be working with ArtHouse Design and the Chair on the request. A report back to the DRB will be made at the February DRB meeting.

9:45 – 10:15 a.m. Muenzinger Air Intake Exterior Structure Improvements – CU Boulder Schematic Design and Design Development

Architects:

CU Boulder Planning Staff

Engineers:

Martin and Martin, Lakewood, Colorado, structural engineers

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

Jennie Freeman, Campus Landscape Specialist, Facilities Planning

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager,
Facilities Planning
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,
Design and Construction
Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities
Management
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning

Description:

Schematic Design (“SD”) and Design Development (“DD”) submittals for a permanent air intake exterior structure of the Muenzinger air intake near the intersection of 18th & Colorado

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Ms. Freeman presented new materials relevant to the SD and DD submittals for the permanent air intake structure at the Muenzinger Psychology Building on the CU Boulder campus. She reviewed the site area and plans for demolition, detailed site and layout plans, a planting plan and palette, site sections and elevations, and structural details.

B. DRB Comments/Action:

The Board expressed appreciation to Ms. Freeman for her good work on this project after which Mr. Brandes moved to approve as submitted the Schematic Design and Design Development submittal for the Muenzinger Air Intake Exterior Structure Improvements. Mr. Olgyay seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

10:15 – 11:45 a.m.

**Ramaley Biology Building Addition – CU Boulder
Schematic Design**

Architects:

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

Presenters:

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

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities Management
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning

Others Present:

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

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design & Construction
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager, Facilities Planning
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning, Design and Construction
Amy Kirtland, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning
Peter Nelson, Civil Engineering Project Manager-Construction, Facilities Management

Description:

Schematic Design submittal for addition to existing building for the relocation of the Integrative Physiology Program

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Ms. Cordes, Mr. McBride, and Mr. Boardman reviewed the project schedule and budget; project boundaries; existing conditions; site design, master plan, and diagrams; a grading plan; architectural concepts; and sustainability and energy goals.

B. DRB Comments/Action:

After the presentation, the consultants left the room, and the Board discussed the submittal with staff. Upon the return to the room by the consultants, the Board, by consensus, tabled approval of the SD submittal, requesting the following:

- A conference call will be convened on Wednesday, January 17, at 10:30 a.m. to review and discuss revised drawings to be forward to the DRB by 5:00 p.m., Tuesday, January 16

Architecture:

- Review arcade entry concerning massing and site improvements (courtyard, entryway, materials, paving, courtyard, etc.); determine how the front of building should present itself; share pros and cons of possible options

Site and Landscape:

- Regarding south garden, work with staff to further explore concepts and resolve privacy, accessibility, articulation; review programming to determine movement through area (Norlin, service area, etc.) and which areas should be encouraged, discouraged, or precluded in the future (seating areas, spaces that aren't comprised by circulation, etc.)

Sustainability and Energy:

- Concerning sustainability and energy, review wind and daylighting, determine if changes in design, interior and exterior fenestration patterning and composition, articulation, etc., can be made in order to further reduce EUI and enhance energy performance

General:

- Overall, SD submittal package should be clear and consistent, all pieces working together, understandable by Board so DD submittal can be achieved without significant modifications

12:15 – 1:45 p.m.

**Aerospace – North Wing Addition, College of Engineering –
CU Boulder
Schematic Design**

Architects:

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

Presenters:

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

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities
Management
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning

Others Present:

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

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design & Construction

James Faber, Project Manager, Construction Management, Facilities Management

Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager, Facilities Planning

Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning, Design and Construction

Amy Kirtland, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning

Doug Smith, Assistant Dean, College of Engineering and Applied Science

Description:

Schematic Design submittal for expansion of recently approved building for the Aerospace Engineering Program currently under construction

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Ms. Cordes, Mr. Freed, and Mr. Boardman reviewed the project budget, scope, and site boundaries; site and landscape master plan, detailed plans, design details, and planting plans and palette; building floor plans; and various sections, elevations, and renderings.

B. DRB Comments/Action:

After the presentation, the consultants left the room, and the Board discussed the submittal with staff. The following action occurred upon the return to the room by the consultants.

In order to allow staff an opportunity to move forward with foundation, permitting and Design Development processes, Mr. Brandes moved to approve the architectural improvements portion of the Schematic Design submittal for the Aerospace North Wing Addition for the CU Boulder College of Engineering with the direction to further study and resolve the design of the entryway to bring back to the Board. Mr. Olgay seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

Additionally, Mr. Brandes moved to conditionally approve the site and landscape improvements of the Schematic Design submittal for the Aerospace North Wing Addition for the CU Boulder College of Engineering. Mr. Epstein seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

Conditions of site and landscape SD approval include:

- Return to the Board in February 2018 with a detailed site and landscape SD set for review and final approval

Site and Landscape:

- Work with staff to further resolve and detail:

- Bike garage, location, materiality, architectural relationship to the buildings, plaza
- Interior/exterior relationship of plaza to the classroom, entryways, etc.
- Plans for site, layout, grading, planting, lighting, furnishings, pavement, other standard, required elements and kit-of-parts for the east plaza, amended as discussed

Architecture:

- Resolution of architectural design for entryway will be included with amended site and landscape submittal

1:45 – 3:00 p.m.

23rd Street Bridge, North of Boulder Creek – CU Boulder Schematic Design

Architects/Engineers:

Loris and Associates, Inc., Engineering Consultant,
Superior, Colorado
BHA Design, Inc., Landscape Architects, Fort Collins,
Colorado
Icon Engineering, Inc., Civil Engineering, Centennial,
Colorado

Presenters:

Dan Beltzer, P.E., Associate, Loris and Associates, Inc.
Roger Sherman, Landscape Architect, Principal, BHA Design, Inc.

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Amy Kirtland, Campus Planner for this Project, Facilities
Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning
Brian Moffitt, Project Manager, Planning, Design &
Construction, Facilities Management

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design &
Construction
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager,
Facilities Planning
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,
Design and Construction
Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities
Management
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning

Description:

Schematic Design submittal regarding bridge crossing over
Boulder Creek

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Mr. Moffitt provided updates regarding FEMA and SHPO and project funding and construction schedule. Mr. Sherman and Mr. Beltzer reviewed updated area and site plans including the north landing, asymmetrical and geographical options for the south landing; various views of the landings, the crossing, and potential lighting options; site cross sections; various renderings of options regarding the bridge construction; a grading plan; plant materials; wayfinding signage; various samples of materials; and sustainability goals.

B. DRB Comments/Action:

After the presentation, the consultants left the room, and the Board discussed the submittal with staff. The following action occurred upon the return to the room by the consultants.

In order to accommodate existing FEMA and construction deadlines, Mr. Brandes moved to conditionally approve the Schematic Design submittal for the 23rd Street Bridge, North of Boulder Creek, with the conditions noted below. Ms. Brown seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

Conditions of SD approval include:

- Return an updated SD submittal package to the Board within two to three weeks

Site and Landscape, Architecture:

- Work with staff to further resolve and detail:
 - Overlot grading plan - include overall site improvements and layout, articulated details for walls, piers, floorplates; grading; drainage; irrigation; nuisance flows; planting plan; include horizontal and vertical perspectives; fit into landscape
 - Lighting plan - basic concept acceptable, preliminary illumination to be determined by staff, detailed plan to be completed by consultant
 - Structural details for option 1 – include connectivity and design of rails, beams, column caps, and piers (slender design, sympathetic to landscape, no net hydrologic rise in floodway, without exceptional costs); articulate radiuses, expansion joints, etc.; make structural integrity seamless, silent, integrated; review concrete mixes to determine best options for structural workability and environmental characteristics
 - North and south landings and crossing – include medallions, pavements, materiality, textures, expansion and score joints, connectivity and transitions, cross sections, bollards, lighting, seat walls (include cross sections), placemaking elements, wayfinding, signage, use callouts and notations as needed

Preferences expressed include:

- Asymmetrical alignment for south landing with modifications as discussed by Board
- Constructed stone walls, pillars/columns/piers, etc., where appropriate for each landing
- Patina-dipped steel railing
- Staff to determine the appropriate details in relationship to available funding

3:15 – 5:00 p.m.

**Business and Engineering Schools Expansion – CU Boulder
Conceptual Design**

Architects:

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

Presenters:

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

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

Jan Becker, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning

Others Present:

Jon Gambrill, Managing Director, Principal, Gensler
Jonas Philipsen, Design Director, Gensler
Scott Wightman, Project Manager/Primary Contact, Gensler

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Brenda Engle, Building Manager, Leeds School of Business
Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design &
Construction

Jennifer Gerke, Associate Professor, Library Administration
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: Conceptual Design submittal for an addition and renovation to the Koebel Building and the Engineering Center for the Leeds School of Business and the College of Engineering and Applied Science and a continuation of a project last heard by the Board in June 2017

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Ms. Becker began the presentation by providing a brief overview of the project including noting that the Leeds School of Business has requested that two additional classrooms be added to the scope of the project.

The representatives from Gensler and Civitas then reviewed the goals, programming, schedule and budget for the project; existing conditions; site constraints and analyses; building design, massing, floor plans, and sections; examples of campus architectural vernacular; massing studies; and a recommended site and building design concept.

B. DRB Comments/Action:

Recognizing that this project is a difficult one and that additional exploration concerning conceptual design options needs to be accomplished, the following action was taken.

Mr. Epstein moved to deny approval of the Conceptual Design submittal, noting the comments below would be applicable to the resubmittal of Conceptual Design:

General:

- Work closely with campus staff, facilitate communication about concepts developed and work through, resolve them with staff, study nature of the connection, connectivity of faculty and students, project goals, and the gateway between the buildings

Site and Landscape, Architecture:

- For both landscape and architecture, work on concept designs, determine what ideas are driving the concepts, identify the issues and how to solve them:
 - Explore bringing architecture vernacular of the Engineering Center to the Koelbel Building
 - Explore other options for bringing two buildings and required parts together
 - Integrate auditorium into overall project, recognize it as a central component, not just Engineering element
 - Review exploration and reorientation of quad and other site and landscape ideas, look at bigger picture concepts first before narrowing down into details

Sustainability and Energy:

- Consider how sustainability concepts can be quantified and made into integral part of design process, determine how design is influenced and informed by these concepts, especially how they can relate to and inform building with no North/South orientation

Mr. Olgay seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board

Date: Friday, January 12, 2018
Time: 8:30 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.
Location: Conference Rooms 502, 503, 1800 Grant Street, Denver

DRB members present: Don Brandes; Sarah Brown; Rick Epstein; Victor Olgyay; Cheri Gerou (ex officio); and André Vite, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Denver campus (“CU Denver”) and the CU Anschutz Medical Campus (“CU Anschutz”).

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 8:30 a.m.

8:30 – 9:30 a.m. Work Session – Board Only

The Board met to briefly review agenda items heard during the prior day’s meetings and to briefly review the items on this day’s agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

9:30 - 11:00 a.m. Colorado Center for Personalized Medicine & Behavioral Health - CU Anschutz Medical Campus (“CU Anschutz”) Conceptual Design (“CD”)

Architects:

AndersonMasonDale Architects, Denver, Colorado
ZGF Architects, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

David Pfeifer, Principal-in-Charge, AndersonMasonDale
Braulio Baptista, Lead Design, ZGF Architects

CU Denver Campus Presenter:

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

Others Present:

Joey Carrasquillo, Associate Designer, AndersonMasonDale
Bob Packard, Associate Pincipal-in-Charge, ZGF Architects
James Taylor, Project Manager, AndersonMasonDale
Rob Stephens, PE, CAA ICON, Denver, Colorado, Project
Manager representing CU Anschutz

Description:

Pre-Design information item to introduce the Board to the new 391K SF interdisciplinary facility

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

The Board briefly explained the review process for the Design Review Board after which Mr. Pfeiffer introduced the consultant team for the project. He, Mr. Baptista, and Mr. Vite then elaborated on personalized medicine and behavioral health and reviewed project goals and objectives, project scope, campus sustainability goals, programming, schedule, budget, and site analyses and context.

B. DRB Comments:

No formal action was required regarding this matter. The Board shared the following comments:

General:

- At the Conceptual Design (CD) level of submittal please bring a display of distinct conceptual studies that test the project goals and objectives, project programming assumptions and other site and architectural opportunities and constraints.
- Because of the size and complexity of the proposed project please consider working with the Campus Architect and Director of Capital Assets to schedule both a site orientation session and related session with the AE firm to review and discuss conceptual design alternatives.

Site and Landscape Architecture:

- Explore and study the space and connections between RC2, the proposed parking garage, and the proposed CCPM&BH building for development opportunities and constraints.
- With a future dedication of money for public art - please explore how this project integrates art with students, faculty and visitors.
- Consider the boundary for a Micromaster plan to consider how future development not part of this project could impact the project. Please bring this preliminary micro master plan as part of the Concept Design Submittal

Sustainability and Energy:

- Use sustainability goals to drive design

- Consider program adjacencies from an energetic perspective, for example waste heat from a data center should not be near a freezer farm. Similarly it may be useful to group program elements with similar interior environmental criteria, i.e. the data center will have a significantly broader temperature tolerance than the vivarium.

Architecture

- Consider the architectural vocabulary of Anschutz and how this building will both fit into or perhaps forge a new direction for the campus.
- How will the building signify gateway and entry given the important location on campus.
- Given the size and public interface of this project, consider the pedestrian and user experience when developing edges and connections.

11:15 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

CU Denver Business School - CU Denver Conceptual Design

Architects:

RNL Design/Stantec, Inc., Architects, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

Dominick Weilminster, AIA, Principal/Board Member,
RNL Design/Stantec

Angelia Cowgill, LEED AP BD+C, Senior Associate,
Architect, RNL Design/Stantec

CU Denver Campus Presenter:

Cary Weatherford, Office of Institutional Planning,
CU Denver Campus

Other Campus Representatives Present:

Sharon Anthony, Engineering/Architecture Project Manager,
CU Denver

Description:

Conceptual Design presentation for renovation project for the CU Denver Business School building infilling the interior courtyard in order to accommodate an events center, several classrooms, and office space.

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Mr. Weatherford briefly discussed the project, the 2017 Facilities Master Plan, project budget and funding, and the anticipated project schedule. Mr. Weilminster presented an overview of the project, site constraints, conceptual section, project floorplans, and various exterior and interior renderings.

B. DRB Comments:

Upon completion of the presentation, Mr. Brandes moved to deny the Conceptual Design submittal for the CU Denver Business School Infill Renovation project. Mr. Epstein seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

The following site/landscape architecture, architectural and energy/sustainability comments and recommendations were offered by the members of the DRB with regard to the submittal:

- In CU Denver Master Plan, it appears that the alley separating Lawrence and Larimer is a strong connection back to the Dravo Building and CU Denver campus. The design presented did not achieve a strong connection to the alley.
- If possible, representative(s) from CU Denver may meet with representatives from Larimer Square regarding future plans and uses for the alley in order to explore how the alley may be better integrated to both development areas.
- Explore at a conceptual level how a public gathering event space could be created within the building which may or may not use a portion of the open space patio infill area; determine how to meet the desires of the donor and the needs of the school while developing an exceptional event space that can host multiple events for the school and for public/private uses. Consider how this space will be expressed on the exterior.
- Without the constraint of the existing plaza explore the best conceptual options for the event space recognizing that the CU Denver Business School is in the heart of Downtown Denver, and provides the opportunity to be a beacon for the Downtown Area, the Business School and a leading host for a number of public events.
- The channel glass used in the alley façade is distinctly different from the existing building skin treatments, creating an awkward contrast. The overall exterior infill façade is creating a barrier to any interaction with the alley connection. The building corner at Lawrence and 15th is a good example of an addition/renovation that is compatible, open and engaging. In addition, the diffuse light admitted through the channel glass behind the presentation podium will backlight the speaker, providing a difficult visual experience for the audience. The tall uninterrupted blank brick wall is an unfriendly and harsh building edge.
- Consider how the entry on the alley can be expressed to significantly activate the alley and signify the presence of the event space as well as reinforce the alley as a connection back to CU on 14th St.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 12:33 p.m.



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board

Date: Wednesday, January 17, 2018
Time: 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Location: Charles V. Sweet Conference Room, #700, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, or
By GoToMeeting/Conference Call

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

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 10:30 a.m.

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Ramaley Biology Building Addition – CU Boulder Schematic Design

Architects:

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

Presenters (by phone):

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

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present (by phone):

Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning, Design and Construction
Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities Management

Others Present:

David Shaffer, Architect, RATIO Architects
Tim Wellner, AIA, LEED AP, Project Manager, HCM (TBD)

Description:

Continuation of Schematic Design ("SD") submittal for addition to existing building for the relocation of the Integrative Physiology Program, tabled from 1/11/2018

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Ms. Cordes and Mr. Boardman reviewed updates to the SD submittal package including a schematic site design and site plan; grading and utility plans; landscaping and planting zones; sensory courtyard and south site details (paving, materials, planting plan and palettes, site furnishings, and renderings); floor plans; north side diagrams for circulation, storm water, programming, and the front entrance; north and south elevations; wall sections; preliminary environmental studies completed to date, and an updated SketchUp model.

B. DRB Comments/Action:

The Board shared the following comments:

Architecture:

- Explore other Klauder details that could potentially be added to the building edges and fenestration

Site and Landscape:

- Integrate furnishings, lighting, and potential water element into design of the sensory courtyard so these elements don't appear to be an "add on" to the courtyard design
- Regarding the facades surrounding the courtyard, consider the views from all windows looking into the courtyard, including from Norlin, should they be part of the design in terms of planting and materiality

Mr. Epstein moved to approve the Schematic Design as submitted for the IPHY addition to the Ramaley Building including the following direction:

- Option B for the sensory courtyard, modified to make framing and spandrel the same or similar language established in other façades on the building
- Colonnade option on the north side, to be further explored regarding the depth of the arcade or engaging it, either acceptable to the board which can be explored in more detail
- Explore making the window on the west end of the north side similar to other windows on the north side; windows don't have to be identical

- Determine whether there should be additional elements/cartouches on the north elevation
- Determine if the chimneys can be integrated with the mechanical systems or if they function only as a design element and if there should be any additional design elements applied to them

Ms. Brown seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

Upon completion of the agenda item, the Board reviewed the actions taken at the previous week's meetings. There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.