



University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2016
Time: 8:00 – 9:00 a.m.
Location: By Conference Call

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Rick Epstein, Victor Olgay, Michael Winters, and Teresa Osborne (ex officio)

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 (conference call) to order at 8:00 a.m.

9:00 - 10:00

CASA/ARL Clean Room – CU-Boulder

Architects: Architectural Workshop (did not participate)

Presenters: William "Bill" Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning, Design and Construction

Description: The project is to develop a large Clean Room for assembly of a space probe being sent to Mars by the United Arab Emirates. Originally presented to the Board as an interior renovation with site modification for access and mechanical equipment, the new proposal presented to the Board earlier is for a building addition near the East Courtyard of the facility. The change in project scope is proving to be more cost and time effective. Requesting SD approval from the Board; tabled from June 9, 2016.

Discussion Regarding the Proposed Schematic Design for the Clean Room Building

Mr. Brandes indicated that an updated schematic design proposal had been distributed to the Board for this meeting. Mr. Haverly reviewed the changes to the proposed schematic design building plan, which included:

- Lowering the elevation of the panels for tallest of the proposed additional elements;
- Eliminating the coping on the top of the pre-cast panels for all of the elements; and
- Eliminating the brick cladding proposed for the new retaining wall.

He noted that the coping and brick cladding were being eliminated due to the cost of these features and a limited budget and because matching the brick was appearing to be problematic.

Additionally, he noted that, in terms of reviewing the finish for the precast panels, Wayne Northcutt, an architect from Facilities Planning, would be visiting within a week or so the precast panel manufacturing plant in Colorado Springs in order to investigate what finishing options can be completed in the plant before the panels are finished and, if no options exist within budgetary constraints, what options to modify the finish are available after the panels are placed on site.

As the Board liaisons with staff for this schematic design proposal, Mr. Olgay and Mr. Epstein commented on:

- how the massing of the proposed buildings might provide an opportunity to make them distinguishable and understood as separate pieces and that this could be the essence of the composition of the building complex instead of trying to make it a unified composition within the existing structure;
- how horizontal reveals could tie the panels together; that the panels could be tied together with the retaining wall through a patterned reveal, and that this could unify all three elements;
- that there are two different massing issues, one from a vehicle standpoint driving along Colorado Avenue and one from a pedestrian standpoint;
- that staff should look for ways to ensure that the retaining wall doesn't become an element on its own but rather that it somehow ties into the other two elements.

The Board discussed the potential use of board form or other form liner for the manufacturing of the precast panels and keeping the brick finish on the retaining wall, but only if brick can be found that would exactly match the brick on the existing building. The Board understands that the industrial concrete pre-cast plant at StressCon may not have the same ability for Board Form panels that the architectural plant would have the ability to produce; however, the issue was to try to refine or upgrade the finish of the industrial panels.

The Board also provided some suggestions regarding the coping feature, how it would provide some architectural detail and become an architectural element itself, how the building would feel more institutional, how it would help tie all of the proposed elements into the existing building, and how it might be accomplished for less cost.

Mr. Haverly confirmed that his understanding of the construction budget is that it is now at \$6.75M.

Mr. Brandes indicated that he felt that the overall height of the proposed improvements has been improved with the reduction of the tallest element from 38' to 33' and that it is now more in line with the overall massing of the building.

Discussion Regarding the Site and Landscaping

Mr. Brandes indicated that he had recently worked with Richelle Reilly, campus landscape architect with Facilities Planning, regarding the site and landscaping schematic design package for the CASA/ARL building. As she was unable to join this meeting, Mr. Brandes reviewed a preliminary schematic design package prepared by Ms. Reilly.

It included, among other things, a review of how the CASA/ARL building fits within the overall campus master plan, site views of the existing CASA building from Colorado Avenue and from 38th Street, and information regarding existing topography and utilities, flood hazard zones,

drainage improvements, and pedestrian connectivity and pathways for the overall campus, including East Campus. Mr. Brandes noted that some of his earlier concerns regarding the drainage to the west side of the CASA/ARL complex new building had now been addressed.

Ms. Reilly also developed an overall schematic design grading and landscaping plan which included the length of Colorado Avenue and the turn into 38th Street and included a combination of landscaping which will work well with the grade, with the horizontal nature of the building and which will help soften the appearance of the building. Additional landscaping, pedestrian connections through the drainage and storage areas on the west side of the building, and proposed plantings which will address the shade and shadow issues for the courtyard were also included.

Mr. Brandes indicated that the proposed plan provided a simple and understated landscape that would be appropriate and would fit into the complex from an architectural standpoint and that he was comfortable with the site and landscaping schematic design as it has been developed.

Mr. Haverly indicated that the overall site landscaping development plan should be considered as a concept plan for the future and is not included within the budget for this CASA/ARL project. The budget for this project would include some of the proposed landscaping in the courtyard, remediation regarding the removal of any irrigation, and the restoration of the existing turf surrounding the building. He also noted that this schematic design package is consistent with discussions which he and Ms. Reilly have had regarding a concept plan for the entire East Campus.

The Board requested that, based on the budget, the limits of landscaping work proposed for this CASA/ARL building project be indicated on the schematic design plan.

The Board also suggested that staff review the location of the existing water hydrant, the existing conditions and the as-built plans for the existing building in order to confirm that the hydrant won't need to be relocated as the result of the proposed CASA\ARL improvements.

Mr. Epstein commented on the site and landscaping concept plan and how it should relate to a potential master plan for the East Campus, noting there may be opportunities to add some additional landscaping features that would make a stronger statement, especially where there is a substantial width between Colorado Avenue and any building, including the CASA/ARL complex, as these areas may be large enough to create an entry feature that staff may want to include within the master plan scenario. Mr. Haverly noted that Ms. Reilly has considered the landscaping in the entire area and has attempted to propose a consistent statement but that she would continue to look at the gateways and additional landscaping for those gateways.

Mr. Winters moved to approve the request for Schematic Design for the CASA/ARL Building with the following conditions:

- further explore options regarding the texture of the concrete panels and supply samples to the Board prior to the submission of the design development package;
- if possible, maintain coping on the three masses of the proposed building elements; and
- explore moving the service door, currently located on the outside of the new Clean Room, into the service courtyard area.

The motion unanimously passed.

Mr. Brandes indicated that the design development package would need to be completed within the next week to ten days and that the Board will work with staff in order to help accomplish this as quickly as possible.

Additionally, Mr. Brandes requested that the landscaping notes which he had earlier provided to Ms. Reilly are included in the design development package for site and landscape and that any issues addressed by Mr. Winters in the motion are included in the design development building package. He also reinforced the request that the Board be provided with the concrete texturing samples prior to meeting on the design development package.

The next regularly scheduled Board meeting will be July 14, 2016. If needed, the Board will schedule a conference call prior to this date.

Regarding a separate but related matter, Mr. Haverly requested that, if possible, an informal session with the Board be scheduled so that as many of the Board as could participate come to East Campus in order to walk the area with himself and a few representatives from the planning department so they can provide input regarding the development of an East Campus master plan and the development of the forthcoming aerospace building.

Mr. Brandes agreed that the Board, as a group, should look at the existing planning and design guidelines and master plans in order to establish consistent, pre-design guidelines to indicate what the main principles of the East Campus should be.

Additionally, Mr. Epstein also requested that, if possible, staff determine whether or not a student intern might be tasked with gathering data on precedents and how other university campuses across the country have dealt with similar issues.

There being no further business, the meeting (conference call) was adjourned at 8:57 a.m.