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, November 10, 2016
Time:	9:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Location:	Richard D. Krugman Conference Hall, Second Floor, Research Complex 2 Building, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Rick Epstein, Victor Olgyay (by phone), Michael Winters, Teresa Osborne (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 Research Park Design Review Board to order at 8:05 a.m., after which the Board and the individuals present for the meeting introduced themselves.

9:30 - 10:30 Study Session – CU Boulder & UCCS

The Board met in a private session to discuss the items on the agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the public portion of the Design Review Board meeting to order at 10:30 a.m., after which introductions of everyone present were made.

10:30 - 12:00 Williams Village East Residence Hall – CU Boulder

Architects: Whiting-Turner Contracting Company, Denver, Colorado
alm2s, Fort Collins, Colorado, design principals/local architects
KWK Architects, St. Louis, Missouri, lead design architects
Bruce Hendee, BHA Design Incorporated, Fort Collins, Colorado, landscape architects

Presenters: Brad Massey, Principal, alm2s, architects, Fort Collins
Bruce Hendee, Landscape Architect, BHA
Paul Wuennenberg, Principal, KWK Architects
Henry Ehrgot, Design-Build Team Manager, Whiting-Turner Contracting

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager, Facilities Planning

Others Present:
Javier Esteban, Principal, KWK Architects
Mark Faul, Vice President, Whiting-Turner Contracting
Heather Heiland, Whiting-Turner Contracting
Chad Koscinski, Project Architect, alm2s
Roger Sherman, BHA Design Incorporated
Mark Thornbrough, Martin/Martin Civil Engineering

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Jan Becker, Planner, Facilities Planning
Chris Ewing, Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design & Construction
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning, Design and Construction
Wayne Northcutt, Architect – Facilities Planner
Richelle Reilly, Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Heidi Roge, Project Manager, Housing Administration

Description: Project Introduction of new residence hall building

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

Mr. Goodhew began the presentation by providing a brief history of the Williams Village campus property and a brief history of housing development and housing needs for the CU Boulder campus. He and Mr. Haverly also responded to questions by Mr. Winters regarding the budget, the proposed size of the project, and the availability of proposed parking area.

Mr. Massey introduced the project design/architectural/contracting team (the "Project Team") after which members of the Project Team reviewed various design elements of the proposed project known as Williams Village East Residence Hall ("Will Vill East"). These elements included goals and objectives for the overall Williams Village campus and the proposed project site (also known as "Pod D"); proposed building program/project scope and budget; applicable portions of the 2001 Williams Village campus master plan; connectivity and overall campus context; site architectural and other influences; flood plain; views of and from the project site; the potential promenade walk experience; site analysis; building programs and typical residential diagrams for both options of 568 beds and 700 beds; and sustainability opportunities.

The Board made various inquiries of the presentation team, including connectivity, student engagement with Bear Creek, and the potential development of the roadway along the east side of the project site. The Board also indicated that the roadway be developed in a more graceful way rather than just introducing a standard access road to the edge of the site.

Staff also responded to questions from the Board, after which the Board also briefly discussed the site development budget, site improvements, utility improvements, flood plain issues, roadway and parking lot development. The design team indicated that the proposed $60M

construction project budget should be sufficient in order to complete the proposed 568-bed building at the same quality level of construction as was Will Vill North.

Following this discussion, Mr. Brandes thanked the design team for the presentation and noted that the intent of the pre-design submittal process is for the Board to share comments, concerns, and direction with the design team and that a formal review and approval process is not required at this level.

The Board provided the following comments and/or direction:

Site and Landscape Architectural Issues

- The entire project site is an all-encompassing, four-sided site and all directions surrounding the site should be analyzed as such, including the need for:
    1. a more in-depth analysis of the flood way and flood plain and how these factors will influence the site and the Will Vill East building;
    2. an existing conditions survey, which should include a site analysis of the grading, limits of construction, utilities, vegetative cover, etc.;
- There are a number of substantial elements other than the Will Vill East building itself which will be definitive influences to the shape, character and texture of the new building. The design team needs to better characterize these influences to develop a unique residence hall that can take advantage of Bear Creek, the Village Green fields, the courtyards, parking, walking across the Williams Village campus to Darley Commons, the promenade, connections to Bear Creek, etc. All of these existing and future elements will contribute to creating a unique site and inform the composition of the proposed architecture. Specifically, we would encourage the consultant team to further evaluate:
    1. The Bear Creek Corridor from a hydrological, flood plain, and health, safety, and welfare perspectives and how the Bear Creek Corridor relates and connects to Williams Village and to Will Vill North;
    2. The Village Green area needs to be more defined in terms of its future use and how it will relate to the North residence, promenade and Bear Creek Corridor;
    3. The promenade, including the transition from the transit station to the Bear Creek Corridor. The concept for an urban to a natural gradation and how this will be designed and implemented through the alignment, lighting, material, width, seating, terminuses or midpoints, etc.;
    4. The existing and future connection from Baseline Road into the project area and eventually across Bear Creek to the undeveloped area; and
    5. The site (courtyards/open space areas) and building to building programming from Will Vill North to Will Vill East and how these existing and proposed relationships will influence the orientation of the buildings, and the outdoor student spaces.

Architectural Issues

- Because the massing of the existing buildings is very large, determine if there is a way to help break the scale down, perhaps using the blocking diagrams with the vertical cores as a way to do so, and determine if there is a way to articulate the pods more as pods rather than one large building that is connected. Is there a way to use the massing to

identify the pods or use the vertical circulation elements so the building doesn't look like one large residence and also is not a replica of the Will Vill North building;
- Regarding the architectural elements, the Will Vill East building can share elements with the other buildings but it shouldn't look exactly like the others; include a variation in the fenestration and the patterning so the design is distinct but related;
- What is different from Will Vill North and what is similar. What makes this building unique and gives it a special identity;
- While moving forward with the project, both the building and the site and the Design Review Board process, continue to keep in mind the goals of the project as they were initially defined during this meeting; and
- Regarding the building programming of either 568 beds or 700 beds, the Board encouraged staff to make a decision on this before the project is submitted to the Board at concept design level.

Sustainability Issues

- The Board also encouraged the design team to review what was learned from the original Williams Village towers, from the original Darley Commons building and how this was translated into the Bear Creek Apartments, and what was learned from Bear Creek Apartments that was translated into Will Vill North. Will Vill North, in particular, should be carefully studied in a post-occupancy evaluation (POE) type review to inform the design approach for Will Vill East. What appeared cutting edge as a LEED platinum building six years ago when Will Vill North was built may not be an appropriate level of aspiration now; other institutions, such as Cornell University, are building "passive house" dormitories that are twice as efficient as Will Vill North (see http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/14/realestate/worlds-tallest-passive-house-breaks-ground-on-roosevelt-island.html). We should consider creating higher performing buildings not only from an energy standpoint, but from a community perspective as well.
- The team should set clear, aggressive, and definitive energy and sustainability goals now so the design of the building can be driven by this information.

[Mr. Epstein joined the meeting during the above comments.]

Mr. Brandes encouraged the project team to review the Design Review Board's procedures for a conceptual submittal and indicated that notes of this meeting will be prepared and distributed.

After taking a break for lunch, the meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned and the Research Park Design Review Board meeting was called to order at 12:30 p.m. Introductions of everyone present for the next agenda item were made.

12:30 - 2:00 **Aerospace Engineering Sciences ("AES") Building – CU Boulder**

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

Presenters: Jennifer Cordes, Principal, Hord Coplan Macht
Anthony Mazzeo, Principal, PLOT Landscape Architecture
Kent Freed, Principal, PLOT Landscape Architecture

Chris Boardman, Principal, RATIO Architects

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:
Wayne Northcutt, Architect – Facilities Planner

Others Present:
Ro-Tien Lang, Architect, Hord Coplan Macht, Inc.
Dave Schafer, Architect, RATIO Architects

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Jan Becker, Planner, Facilities Planning
Chris Ewing, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Design & Construction
James Faber, Project Manager, Construction Management, Facilities
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director, Facilities Planning
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning, Design and Construction
Richelle Reilly, Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Matthew Rhode, Aerospace Engineering Sciences
Douglas Smith, Assistant Dean, College of Engineering, CU Boulder

Description: Concept Review of New Building on East Campus

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

Mr. Northcutt began the presentation by briefly reviewing the pre-design presentation provided to the Board at its meeting held on October 14, 2016. He noted that a conference call with the Board had been held in order to discuss the presentation for this meeting. As a result of this call, additional supplemental information including a topography schematic, a utility schematic plan, and site circulation diagrams had been prepared for the meeting. He also indicated that the design team is targeting a EUI of between 45 to 50 for the AES Building.

Ms. Cordes and Mr. Boardman reviewed the concept design submittal package which included a review of the goals of the AES Building Project; the program elements; a review of the proposed budget; building and quad open space diagram options and a framework plan; elements of a micro-master plan update which include an enhanced riparian-scape, a flight field, a “sky mound,” a potential future quad, restored prairie area, and a bio-filter area; transition landscape options and concepts; building massing, potential floor plans, and site plan options; potential East Campus vocabulary options; and programmatic elements of the building design options. A *Sketch Up* model of the preferred option was also shared with the Board.

Mr. Haverly reminded the Board that because a master plan for the East Campus has not yet been updated, the elements of the site design presented at the meeting may change according to the to-be-determined provisions of the future master plan. He also noted that the use of a building may not necessarily provide for the design of a building and that designing the new building for use today by the AES program may be a challenge because the use of the building may potentially change decades into the future and this possibility needs to be taken into consideration.

Upon the completion of the presentation, the Board discussed the submittal package with the design team during which it shared the following comments and direction:

Site and Landscape Architectural Issues

- An existing conditions survey, including a study of the Skunk Creek floodway and flood plain, vegetation, grades, the construction of limit lines, etc., should be further evaluated, along with how these existing conditions affect or influence the site planning and design of the project.
- The edges and perimeter of the project site need to be reviewed based upon programmed and budgeted improvements within the project limits and future improvements that are out of scope and not budgeted.
- Skunk Creek is an organizing element on East Campus. The corridor is currently undeveloped, underutilized, without demarcation, funding, or a known budget for reclamation. Please share with the DRB what you consider the relationship of the Skunk Creek Corridor to the proposed project.
- Overall, it seems like a more rigorous evaluation and definition of the site conditions, and demarcation of the limits of the project area would suggest alternative site planning alternatives for entry, access, open space, building locations, crossings, and other site and building options.
- The proposed framework grid for the placement of the building and the circular nature of Discovery Drive seem to be in opposition to each other, and the geometry seems awkward and unresolved so this may need further investigation;
- Consider the master planning alternatives and how the building might respond to current and future conditions. This building will have a significant impact on the future master plan – the geometry and position need to be considered in this light.
- The vegetation of the area still needs to be studied and a landscaping plan needs to be determined.
    - Regarding the plan views of the building, the winged-roofed building plan presented in the *Sketch Up* model was generally preferred, and the *Sketch Up* model starts to break down the monolithic verticality shown in other building sketches and helps address the massing by introducing smaller elements which have been connected.

Architectural Issues

- It seems that the options for phase 2 which were added to the back and north of the building were added after the placement of the building was fixed; as such, perhaps the site placement of the entire area, including the south side of the parcel, should be reviewed;
- The orientation of the pedestrian bridge as it crosses the creek and how it lands in the parking lot to the west should be based upon topography not yet known so this will need further review once the topography has been analyzed;
- The purpose of the bridge needs to be defined; the placement of this bridge should take advantage of the existing parking lot, and the end points from the exit of the building to where the connection is made with the parking lot need to be considered; additionally, the master plan for the East Campus may need to be completed before the final placement of the bridge can be determined;

- Additional design ideas should be studied:
    - a stronger building and flight path area connection;
    - consider extending the wedge geometry of the flight field into the permeable form of the building
    - "open up" the east edge of the building in order to remove some of the "block" appearance shown in several of the views;
    - Add more expression to the roof;
    - the connection and relationship of the sky mound to the building may need further exploration; and
    - the solar orientation of the building also should be reviewed;
- Investigate adding a vertical element to the roof to mimic the radar and possibly become a landmark element for the building;
- The materiality of the building needs to be explored; perhaps one side of the building can be tied to patterning and textures more similar to the palette of the existing buildings on East Campus, and perhaps a metal palette which would be more representative of the AES program within the building can be used for the front of the building; if metal is used, consider how it can have a timeless quality;
- The preferred building massing diagrams expressed the permeable form;
- The geometry of the building represented within the micro-master plan in relationship to the other elements of the project site may need further investigation; and
- The geometry and relationships between the AES building, the adjacent buildings, and the circle drive in front of the MacAllister Building also seem awkward, so these relationships, along with the proposed framework alignment, also may need further exploration.

Mr. Haverly thanked the design team for their presentation. He indicated that the presentation given to the Board was a *work session* rather than a formal submission for conceptual design review and approval. Mr. Brandes affirmed that Mr. Haverly is the CU Boulder campus liaison for the Aerospace Project and is also a full member of the Research Park Design Review Board, for all four review phases through design development approval.

Regarding the future conceptual design review phase, Mr. Brandes indicated that at conceptual, the submittal package should take into consideration:

- Clear project goals and objectives for the project, coupled with a synthesis of existing conditions of the site, confirmation and definition of the program and budget. The concept design submittal should provide:
    - Based on a clear understanding of project goals, program, budget, project limits, and schedule, please provide a rigorous site analysis that illustrates developable and non-developable areas of the site;
    - Present alternative site development and architectural concepts that achieve the project goals and related project requirements
    - Conceptual design should suggest and illustrate alternative site and architectural options from which the Board can mutually determine a consensus on a preferred direction which will enable the consultant design team to move forward and prepare the schematic design submittal in a timely and professional manner.
- While preparing the submittal package, keep in mind the expression, "Do no harm to the future of the master plan for the site;"

- Understand that the alternatives for the areas north of the building were positively received but regarding how these areas and the areas to the south of the building might work in the future need to be investigated; and
- Keep in mind that the submittal package can be done with the same level of abstractness as has been done regarding the area north of the building and, for example, should include, but not be limited to, the following:
    - what will the project scope include and not include;
    - possible alternatives for what the road alignments could look like;
    - how does this site and these alignments fit into the East Campus of the future;
    - what options are affordable and will work within budget and scope of the project as it moves forward;
    - even if the bridge geometry and location is ultimately not part of the micro-master plan, it is a strong defining element in the design and should be considered; and
    - also think through the range of options regarding other abstract elements that may drive the site planning and building design and how they might affect the master planning process, specifically regarding this site and building since they will already exist when the master planning process begins and should be taken into consideration.

The design team requested additional direction from the Board regarding the anticipated scope of the project, including the master plan and how far their planning for the AES site should go beyond their own project. Mr. Brandes indicated that the Board would articulate and further define in the DRB Meeting Notes of November 10, 2016, what should be prepared for the conceptual design submittal.

Mr. Haverly moved to table any formal action regarding conceptual design approval and, based on today's discussion to ask the consultant team to possibly return to the DRB for the meeting on December 8, 2016, for conceptual design. Based on the DRB Meeting Notes and comments of November 10, 2016, the consultant group would have clear direction. Mr. Epstein seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Research Park Design Review Board was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Mr. Brandes then convened the meeting of the University of Colorado Design Review Board immediately following the adjournment noted above.

2:15 - 3:45 **Ent Service Center – UCCS**

Architects: Keys + Lauer Architects, Colorado Springs, Colorado

Presenters: Victor Lauer, Principal, Keys + Lauer Architects
Lisa Carpenter, Architect, Keys + Lauer Architects
Dan Hopper, Mechanical Engineer, Farnsworth Group, Inc.

UCCS Campus Representative Present:
Gary Reynolds, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration

Description: Design Development Submission for an approximate 5,000 sq. ft. building for a new branch of the Ent Credit Union ("Ent")

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

The Board began the presentation by indicating how pleased all of the directors were with the positive progress that had been made on the Ent Service Center project over the last few months.

While discussing the final Design Development ("DD") submission with the design team from Keys + Lauer Architects, the Board provided the following direction:

Sustainability and Energy:

- Regarding the Site Lighting Plan on page DD05, and LEED Site Credit 8 (light pollution reduction), consider overlaying the existing site lighting plan with a contour line showing compliance with the LEED Credit SS7 criteria. To adjust the design so that the site light does not exceed the property boundary; the design can either reduce the overall amount of light on the site, or aim the fixtures to the interior of the site so there is no spill over outside of the property boundary, or adjust the property boundary so the light is within the property boundary.
    - The Site Lighting Plan provides an opportunity to use perceptual-based lighting design, and emphasize the architecture. Consider highlighting the entrance to the building, the monument sign, the drive-through canopies, and other areas of interest, and then the rest of the site may be able to have reduced light levels, with just the areas of important visual or security interests lit. While this is a relatively simple site, considering the lighting design from a pedestrian scale wayfinding and experience with appropriate scale fixtures will provide a more friendly and pleasant experience.
- The calculation to achieve the LEED credits for storm water quality and quantity includes the amount of site area available for water infiltration. The design team should review the calculations to ensure the design meets the criteria for SSc6.1 and 6.2. This may also affect how the boundary is defined in order to ensure that the LEED credits are achieved. Coordinating these issues will integrate design and performance.
- Regarding the Roof Plan on page DD12:
    - Certain elements, such as drainage, stacks for pluming, etc., did not appear to be included but which should be located on the roof and which affect the roof plan. In addition, where the roof drainage occurs needs to be coordinated with the site stormwater drainage plan and, of course, the aforementioned SSc6.1 and 6.2.
    - The roof material should be compliant with the LEED credit SSc7.2, making sure that it is acceptable and called out, etc.
    - Although the photovoltaic ("PV") areas are shown on the roof, they are shown as area allocations, whereas, in reality, the PV will be made up of a known number of modules or panels, each with a known size. By design development, the actual size of the PV areas should be shown as the size and arrangement of the modules, similar to how bricks are generally specified.
    - The PV area on the upper roof has great orientation and solar access; however, the mounting configurations showing how the PV units are installed isn't shown

on the plan; laying the modules flat is less expensive to install and less visually obtrusive but this not as efficient as if they were installed at a 30 – 40% tilt to the south. Please indicate the way the PV is intended to be integrated into the roof system.

- Because the roof of the drive-through canopy is a few feet lower than the rest of the building, any time the sun goes past south, the PV area along the eastern edge of the canopy will be shaded by the building. Review the roof solar access in order to ensure the proposed PV units are not being shaded. If the canopy modules are shaded, they may need to be located further to the east to ensure that they are not shaded during the day when the most energy will be collected. Consider locating the PV on the north side of the main building if there is sufficient room, and they do not conflict with other elements located on the roof or are compromised by other roof shading.
- Sheet DD18: The illustration of the South Office in the winter shows the sunlight penetration likely providing appropriate heat gain in the winter, it is likely unacceptable because of the large amount of direct glare for the office occupant. They will draw the blinds and block the heat and daylight. So, first, based on the *heating need* of the facility, provide *exterior shading*. For a facility like this in Colorado Springs, it may require shading 75% of the time between March and October, and letting in direct sunlight November through March, perhaps a 45 degree exterior shading angle on the south. Since the sun angles are different on the west side of the building, you will need a different angle to provide appropriate heat gain control, more like a 30 degree exterior shading angle. There will be more low-angled sunshine in the summer time on the west side, so if it is not caught by the canopy over the west side, it will need to be caught by the shading device in order to block the heat gain.
- Second, provide interior glare control based on the time of occupancy of the facility, to direct light away from the occupant's tasks. Check the sun angles during occupancy (for example, 9 a.m. – 5 p.m.) when direct light is coming in (for example, November through March), and provide glare control at those times. There are many types of glare control available that can be accomplished by installing a small, light interior shelf which could be sized to catch the low-angle sunlight; using an inverted blind that directs sunlight to the ceiling; or by using other commercial products that are available for this purpose; or other solutions that can be designed as part of the interior architectural design.

- Regarding the Clerestory Daylight Study on page DD19, it is a similar situation in that heat gain should be allowed in when it is desirable and protection from glare should be added for any location where people will be working.
- Between the windows and the central space, the building form provides the opportunity for good daylighting. If the technical sun angles are calculated correctly, the building will perform well and the solar heat gain and daylighting will provide an effective energy efficiency strategy.
- From the illustrations shown, it is not clear if appropriate levels of heat gain are provided in winter. This clerestory, in combination with the exterior windows, should be able to reach high levels of Daylight Autonomy (DA).
- Daylight Autonomy is the amount of time where there is sufficient glare-free daylight during which the electric lights can be dimmed or turned down; this number can be included within the energy model which will, in turn, show this amount of energy is being

saved and can more accurately indicate how the building is performing. These calculations should be done so the design can be adjusted to optimize the window size, specifications and energy performance.

- Regarding the energy analysis shown on page DD20, using the proposed geothermal system for heating and cooling is exciting news. Even though it is often more expensive, if it can be installed during the normal construction sequence for the building, it can be very helpful since it is using a source of heating and cooling that is more efficient than heating and cooling systems provided via air ducts. Mr. Lauer confirmed that the geothermal system is planned for the building.

    - The analysis with the geothermal system is showing a 45 kBtu per square foot energy use index. It is not evident what the end use energy is being used for. If it is thermal conditioning, the conclusions in the last submittal's sustainability report must be questioned. The suggested R values for the roof and walls seemed to only reach code, and it is likely that by increasing these closer to passive house levels, the building EUI could be reduced significantly, and capital costs could be saved by reducing the quantity if geothermal wells required to be drilled. The windows U value, frames and airtightness will have a significant impact on overall energy use. A design development level energy analysis specifically regarding the end uses of energy could be included in the building as design information which, when applied to this design, could result in a building that may perform 50% better than it does now and be more cost effective. If indeed the energy use is brought down to the range of 25 EUI, the amount of PV on the building may be enough to make this a net zero project.
    - The end result of adjusting, coordinating and integrating efficiencies across the system, such as adding in the cost of additional insulation that can also reduce the cost of the mechanical system, can effectively drive the building costs down, while also being a significantly better performing building from energy and sustainability viewpoints.

<u>Architecture</u>

- The new design of the canopies with the wooden beam detail for the front entrance and the drive-through canopy, including the I-beam channel which skirts around the building, is a nice addition and is successful and acceptable to the Board.
- On page DD16, the wooden beam detail on the upper canopy should be eliminated so the roof of the clerestory is simpler and doesn't include the detail of the other two canopies.
- On page DD17, detail section #3, where the stone facing meets the ground, it was suggested that a gravel edge be included surrounding the building in order to protect the stone facing. Mr. Lauer indicated that the soils report hadn't been received yet, but that a short concrete apron will be installed in order to protect the stone.
- On page DD18, detail section #1, the detail of how the shading devices are hung or attached isn't indicated but should be added; Mr. Lauer indicated this detail would be included in the construction document phase, but that at this time, he is envisioning using a metal stand-off bracket coming from the building to the back side of the shading device and that they will use however many that will be needed to properly support the devices. He also indicated that they will try to not to go into the mullion whenever possible.

- Regarding the materiality shown on page DD16, it was confirmed that the stone facing will match the signature stone which has been used on the Roaring Fork Dining Hall on the UCCS campus. Mr. Lauer also showed the Board samples of the metal which will be used for the panels, mullions, louvre colors, etc. He indicated that the steel columns will be powder coated to match and that the other metal elements will be factory finished and anodized. The Board requested that the colors for the metal elements be reviewed in order to eliminate any potential patterning coming from the colors of these elements and to ensure that the mullions won't get lost in the glazing for the windows.
- Regarding the lighting for the building, Mr. Lauer confirmed that recessed can lights will be used to light and accent underneath both the drive-through canopy and the front entry canopy. The only other building-mounted lighting planned for at this point will be over the employee entrance door. If the fire department requests it, they may also have to install a light over the door to the mechanical room. It was also suggested that an LED light be added underneath the recess of the metal banding of the canopy in order to provide a little more light to the building.
- The Board suggested that the drainage for the front canopy be redesigned to provide a roof drain so that there are no visible downspouts or scuppers.
- On page DD17, it was suggested that a channel be used instead of the metal trim as shown in the detailed drawing as it would add a little more detail and would be more substantial.
- Also on this page, it was suggested that the metal cap on all of the roof and canopy edges be made a little thinner as it currently feels a little heavy; minimizing the cap and making the color match the metal panel color would help deemphasize the cap and make it more subtle.
- On page DD15, after discussing possible options regarding proposed elevations for the southeast corner, the Board decided that using the stone face as the outside wall treatment and wrapping it all the way around the corners would be the simplest option, and it was suggested that where there is a large stone wall as shown on page DD14, that engaged columns could be added to break up the stone wall, giving the appearance of added support, and using metal panels between these columns.
- Also on page DD15, the Board expressed a preference for the alternate northwest corner design as shown in detail section #1 rather than the option shown on page DD13.

<u>Site and Landscape Architecture</u>

- The Board requested that the bike rack currently located on the northwest corner be moved to the south end of the front sidewalk so visitors walking past the bike rack aren't obstructed by bicycles placed in the bike rack while they are trying to get into the building.
- Regarding the Ent signage, it was asked if the signage could be a single color similar to how it is being done on the Ent Center for the Arts. Mr. Reynolds indicated that this would not be likely since this is a building for the Ent Credit Union and the owners will likely want to use their logo as shown in the DD documents.
- Regarding additional signage, Mr. Lauer noted that, at the request of the owner, a small monument sign be placed on the edge of the street. He indicated that it would be faced with stone facing that matches the building and would be lit from the inside. The Board agreed with this addition.

- The Board requested that where the sidewalk on the west side connects with the main sidewalk, that it be striped and lit, perhaps with a bollard on each side midway through the intersection. Mr. Lauer indicated that this would be acceptable.
- Regarding a landscaping plan shared with Mr. Brandes:
    - Mr. Lauer confirmed that the emerald ash trees proposed in the plan will be removed and replaced with an alternative.
    - Mr. Brandes indicated that the storm water, detention pond and utility connections are okay as shown.
    - Mr. Brandes also indicated that the construction limit lines might need to be reviewed as there will be grading and disturbing the ground surface outside the construction limit lines as shown. Given this, he suggested that an intergovernmental agreement among the City of Colorado Springs, the University and the Ent Credit Union, providing for construction easements in order to work outside of the construction limit lines and providing for the placement of the irrigation, back flow preventers, planting materials, etc., will be needed.
    - He also suggested that making planting areas a continuous area rather than using planting pockets to stop and start the planting areas as shown on page LS1 of the planting plan should save on irrigation and planting materials.
    - The suggested planting materials for the entry area were acceptable.
    - Regarding the landscape maintenance contract, Mr. Brandes suggested that the contract include a guaranty of 80% coverage and that, if possible, the warranty be increased from 1 year to 2 years.
    - Mr. Lauer confirmed that the low cedar fence mentioned in the landscaping plan details was not part of this landscaping plan but had been included in the plan in error.
    - Mr. Lauer also indicated that regarding the 3' retaining wall in the front, their civil engineer is not sure it will be needed but they are reviewing it. Mr. Brandes suggested that it might be a good idea to include it anyway. Mr. Lauer agreed and indicated that if it is installed, it will be faced with the same stone in order to match the building.
    - Add bollard lighting where the walk meets the sidewalk to the east. Also add striping or rumble strips at the entry where the walk crosses the road.

(Ms. Brown left the meeting during the above discussion and wasn't present for the final vote.)

Mr. Lauer indicated that they will likely continue to pursue LEED gold certification but upon investigating some of the recommendations concerning the energy efficiencies and sustainability noted above, they may pursue a platinum certification if it seems as though it would be feasible.

Mr. Brandes indicated the Board's pleasure with the end result of the planning process and noted that Mr. Lauer and his team were great to work with.

Mr. Brandes then moved to approve the Design Development submission for the Ent Credit Union building with the condition that the final Design Development drawings reflect the comments made during this discussion. Additionally, Mr. Lauer should provide to Mr. Reynolds, Ms. Osborne, or both of them, copies of the Design Development set within 45 days, one set by paper and electronically, as a means of providing a final "check and balance" for the Board. Mr. Lauer agreed to these conditions. Mr. Brandes noted that while the approved plans are substantially correct, the Board acknowledges that during construction, some changes and

modifications may be required. Mr. Winters seconded the motion, which unanimously passed. Ms. Osborne was provided with Ms. Brown's proxy to vote in favor of the motion to approve.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 3:49 p.m. after which the members of the Board took a tour of portions of the CU Anschutz Medical Campus.