



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, October 13, 2016
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Location: First Floor Conference Room, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, Colorado

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Rick Epstein, Michael Winters, Teresa Osborne (ex officio), and Carolyn Fox and Gary Reynolds, campus Board representatives for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs Campus (“UCCS”).

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker.

9:30 - 11:00 Study Session – UCCS, CU Anschutz Medical Campus and CU Boulder

The Board met in a private session to review a number of administrative items with Ms. Osborne; to discuss the items on the meeting agenda; and to discuss UCCS matters with Ms. Fox and Mr. Reynolds prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the public portion of the meeting to order at 11:20 a.m., after which the Board and the individuals present for the meeting introduced themselves.

11:00 - 12:30 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.
Amanda Occhi, Electrical Engineer, Farnsworth Group, Inc.

UCCS Campus Presenter:

Carolyn Fox, Executive Director, Construction & Planning,
University Architect, UCCS Campus Planning & Facilities
Management

Other UCCS Campus Representatives Present:

Gary Reynolds, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration

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

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

Mr. Lauer began the presentation on the proposed Schematic Design (“SD”) submission for the Ent project to the Board, by reviewing the direction regarding this project provided by the Board at its August 11, 2016, meeting.

Ms. Occhi responded to questions from the Board regarding the energy study and the proposed quantitative energy goal of 45kbtu/sqft/yr EUI (energy use intensity) rather than the goal of 30kbtu/sqft/yr EUI recommended by the Board at its August 11 meeting.

Mr. Lauer then reviewed more specific details of the SD submittal package, including the proposed site design and site plan, the preliminary landscape concept plan, a grading plan, the utility plan, a site section plan, the existing context, the floor plan, the ceiling plan, the proposed roof plan, proposed exterior elevations for two alternative designs, a building section, an office sun shading study, and a clerestory daylighting study for the proposed building design.

Mr. Hopper and Ms. Occhi reviewed the sustainability report prepared by Farnsworth Group, Inc. and indicated that, on a conservative basis, a preliminary scoring would result in a LEED Silver rating. Mr. Lauer indicated that they believe LEED Gold will be achieved.

Mr. Brandes thanked the presentation team for the progress made on the proposed design for the Ent project and for addressing a large number of the recommendations made by the Board at its August 11 meeting.

The Board provided the following direction:

Overall Project Considerations:

The Board expressed a preference for the building design option included on pages SD 14 – 16 which consisted of a combination of both stone and metal. The Board also noted that the inclusion of the metal elements to the building was an appropriate addition to the design of the building.

Regarding the preliminary landscape concept plan, the Board agreed with the proposed palette of planting materials and felt that it was in line with what should be expected of a mature landscaping plan for the site. UCCS representatives present indicated that the 24” strip located to the west of the drive way as it was reconfigured by the Board was owned by UCCS and could be used for landscaping purposes.

Site, Civil, and Landscape Considerations:

- Consider reconfiguring the access, parking and circulation into the site by flipping the parking area located to the north side of the building so that the two-way traffic stays in a straight line as it approaches the building with the parking spaces to the east, rather than the drive curving to the east before it approaches the parking spaces as proposed. Such reconfiguration may help with the location and configuration of the water detention pond, the trail connection(s), and the location and size of the proposed retaining walls.
- Review the construction limit lines in terms of meeting grade, the utility locates and levels of disturbance.

- Include in the forthcoming submittal for the Design Development review by the Board a detailed landscape and site improvement plan, appropriately scaled and notated, including a legend and a detailed kit-of-parts, referencing, at a minimum, a planting plan noting species, varieties, sizes and quantities of the plant materials, an irrigation plan, a detailed lighting plan, and details regarding site grading, signage, storm detention, walkways and walkway surfaces, potential trail and bicycle connections, a welcoming kiosk or a similar function. Continue to explore the location of the path from the east and its integration with the pedestrian system.
- Further investigate the use of permeable pavers, possibly in the parking space areas, which may also help reduce the size of the water detention pond.
- Continue ongoing communication with Ms. Fox as the Design Development submittal is finalized.

Architectural Considerations:

- Consider making the entry canopy deeper and more substantial, possibly cantilevering it over the proposed columns.
- For both of the canopies, consider eliminating the stone wrap on the columns, making the columns steel from the top all the way to the foundation, and investigate using a wide-flange steel section rather than a tube steel section in order to create additional texture and differentiation when compared to the wooden beams in the ceiling of the canopies.
- Consider extending the upper edge of the windows to the lower edge of the metal band and thus eliminate the stone between the bottom of the metal and the top of the windows or, as another option, use metal infill above the windows, keeping the height of the windows surrounding the building consistent.
- On the north side of the building, consider enlarging the windows by installing a metal or spandrel panel above the access doors and “grouping” and enlarging the restroom windows using translucent glass to make it more consistent with the other larger windows in the breakroom and on the west façade.
- Regarding the materiality on the east side of the building, consider reducing the amount of stone and replacing it with elements that are more consistent with other sides of the building and consider adjusting the jog and location of the window along the east wall so they are more consistent with the existing lines of the canopy roofs.
- Investigate the size and location of the clerestory in relation to the building floor plan and lobby rather than in relation to the front door and consider enlarging the clerestory.

Energy and Sustainability Considerations:

- Ensure that the shading study has been included within the calculations and results of the sustainability report so that the shading study is not only a visual tool but is also a functional tool as it can influence the performance of the building.
- Complete an energy audit with the goal of obtaining LEED Gold certification for the Design Development submittal.
- Continue additional consideration for any other methods and techniques that can be used to increase the energy efficiency and sustainability of the building and the site.

Mr. Lauer responded to a question by Mr. Epstein regarding developing a net zero project by indicating that he feels that this is most often driven by budget constraints of the project owner

and that when an owner is willing to spend the money required to develop net zero standards, it can definitely be done.

The Board met briefly in executive session after which Mr. Brandes moved to approve the Schematic Design submission with the conditions noted above regarding: 1) overall project considerations; 2) site, civil and landscape considerations; 3) architectural considerations; and 4) energy and sustainability considerations. Mr. Epstein seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

1:00 - 2:00

Ent Center for the Arts Signage – UCCS

Architects: Semple Brown Design, Denver, Colorado
ArtHouse Design, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

Bryan Schmidt, Principal, Semple Brown Design
Drew Schwyhart, Associate, Semple Brown Design
Marty Gregg, Principal, ArtHouse Design
Zach Kotel, Senior Designer, ArtHouse Design

UCCS Campus Presenter:

Carolyn Fox, Executive Director, Construction & Planning,
University Architect, UCCS Campus Planning & Facilities
Management

Other UCCS Campus Representatives Present:

Gary Reynolds, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration

Description: Design Development Presentation of Exterior Signage for
the Ent Center for the Arts

Presentation to the Board:

Mr. Schmidt began the presentation by sharing a slide show including a number of photographs taken recently which reflected the current-day status of the project and a number of elevation drawings of the completed project showing the building both with and without the proposed signage. Also available for inspection were a number of samples of the exterior wall and proposed signage elements.

Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Kotel then described the proposed signage elements, including the Ent and the CU branding, placement on the building, colors, materiality, and lighting. Also described were a proposed monument sign and accompanying landscaping plan, area traffic roads and traffic patterns.

The Board inquired about the various stages of the required approval processes beyond the Design Review Board. Mr. Reynolds responded by describing the entities who have reviewed the signage to date which included the CU Branding Board, the Ent Credit Union, UCCS, the Colorado Springs Fire Department and their respective comments regarding the signage. It was determined that the proposed color of the current CU signage will need to be reviewed and approved by the CU Branding Board.

The Board then discussed the proposed placement of the signage. It was noted, because of the iconic significance of this building to the UCCS campus, how important it will be to keep the design of the building pure and not add signage that will be detrimental to or detract from the design of the building. The Board then reviewed other placement options, signage criteria, and weathering and maintenance of the materiality with the design team.

After discussing a number of options, the Board agreed that there should be no signage on the featured, lenticular curved sections or on the upper flat panel sections of the building between the lenticular sections.

Mr. Brandes moved for the approval of the final Design Development submittal with the following conditions:

1. Two CU logo signs be located on the building, one on the upper northwest section and one on the upper northeast section where the darker-colored corrugated wall elements are located; with each sign being sized and in the silver and black color as originally proposed, subject to review and approval by the CU Branding Board, as noted below;
2. The address sign be located below the CU logo on the northwest side of the building, subject to review and approval by the Colorado Springs Fire Department, as noted below;
3. One of two Ent Center for the Arts building signs be located on a flat panel below the lenticular element to the right of the primary entrance, sized accordingly, and made with the same materials and with the same lighting elements as originally proposed with any adjustments which might be necessary to accommodate the new location;
4. The second of two Ent Center for the Arts building signs be located on a flat panel on the northwest side of the building, near the dark corrugated wall element, with the specific location to be determined, taking into consideration the desired grouping of signage on the northwest side of the building, and with the size and exact design and lighting specifications to be resolved accordingly;
5. The monument sign be placed and landscaped as proposed by the design team with the addition of two CU logo signs to be located at the top of the front and back sides of the column element of the monument sign and with the addition of appropriate lighting for each side; and
6. As required, representatives from the University and from the design team, as needed, will return to the other agencies, i.e., the Colorado Springs Fire Department, the Ent Credit Union, UCCS, and the CU Branding Committee, in order to review the signage locations and specifications proposed by the Board in order to obtain each such respective entities' final review and approval.

Mr. Epstein seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

The Board requested that the design team send to the Board a final signage graphic package showing the new locations for the conditionally approved signage based on the other regulatory and committee reviews.

2:15 - 2:30

Breckenridge Parking Lot Expansion (Consent Agenda) – CU Anschutz Medical Campus (“CU Anschutz”)

Architects: Kimley Horn, Denver, Colorado

CU-Anschutz Campus Presenter:

André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional Planning

Description: A total of 179 parking spaces will be added to the Breckenridge Parking Lot. The expansion will be towards the west, occupying the existing field to the south of the Pharmacy Building.

Presentation to the Board:

Mr. Vite provided a brief update regarding the history and design of the proposed expansion of the Breckenridge Parking Lot at CU Anschutz. Mr. Vite noted that this expansion will be a temporary expansion while other expansion needs at CU Anschutz are developed.

No DRB action regarding this item was required.

2:30 - 2:45

UCH Trailers (Consent Agenda) – CU Anschutz Medical Campus

Architects: Davis Partnership Architects, Denver, Colorado

CU-Anschutz Campus Presenter:

André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional Planning

Description: Update on UCH's progress on the trailers assembled in the laydown yard behind the Anschutz Outpatient Pavilion. Occupants of the trailers will be the CU Denver cancer researchers being displaced from the third floor of the Anschutz Cancer Pavilion ("ACP") to allow for the expansion of the cancer center clinical space. Occupancy is anticipated in mid-October.

Presentation to the Board:

Mr. Vite provided a brief history of a number of double-wide trailers and a construction trailer which have been placed in the laydown yard along and recent photographs showing the current status of the trailers. Approximately 18,000 sq. ft. of office and meeting space within the trailers is being used by ACP faculty during the duration of renovation work of the ACP, approximately two to three years. Ms. Brown suggested that the trailers be painted but be painted in such a way that it is clear that the trailers are temporary.

Mr. Vite and the Board also discussed potential changes being considered for the CU Anschutz campus, including a potentially new interdisciplinary building for the Center for Personalized Medicine.

There being no further business, the public meeting for Thursday, October 13, was adjourned at 3:25 p.m. The public meeting for the month of October was continued on Friday, October 14.