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

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Workshop Meeting Notes

Date:	Thursday, October 18, 2018
Time:	12:00 – 3:30 p.m.
Location:	View Conference Room, Second Floor, Village Center Dining and Community Commons, Boulder, CO

DRB members present: Don Brandes; Sarah Brown; Victor Olgyay; Chris Shears, Mike Winters; and Cheri Gerou (ex officio).

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:
Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker.

Don Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 11:55 a.m.

12:00 – 1:00 p.m. **Work Session and Lunch – Board Only**

The Board met to briefly to discuss the item on the agenda for this date prior to convening the public portion of the meeting. The intent of the meeting was to review the progress of the Business and Engineering Schools Expansion – no formal action was taken by the DRB.

1:00 – 3:00 p.m. **Business and Engineering Schools Expansion – *CU Boulder***
Pre-Design Development Workshop (Information/Direction)

Architects:
AndersonMasonDale Architects, Denver, Colorado
Civitas Architects, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:
Andrew Nielson, AndersonMasonDale
John Everin, AndersonMasonDale
Craig Vickers, RLA, Civitas

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:
Jan Becker, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning

Others Present:
Ben Blanchard, AndersonMasonDale
Beth Mosenthal, AndersonMasonDale
Samuel Kirchner, Civitas

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Jennie Freeman, Campus Landscape Specialist, Facilities Planning
Jennie Gerke, Interim Associate Dean of Libraries
Stephanie Gillin, Assistant Dean, Leeds School of Business
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager, Facilities Planning
Keane Ray, Project Manager, Facilities Planning
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning

Description:
Pre-Design Development workshop for an addition and renovation to the Koelbel Building and the Engineering Center for the Leeds School of Business and the College of Engineering and Applied Science

A/E Presentation:

Update from Campus:
- Expect to bring DD submittal to November DRB meeting
- Project spending authority is $45M, project budget is currently $43.5M
- Expect to begin construction in May 2019
- Based on meeting discussions, campus will forward sketches to DRB for review prior to proceeding forward towards Design Development documents.

AndersonMasonDale Architects (“AMD”) updated the DRB on the changes to the project since last reviewed:
- Elevation and north/south location changes were discussed:
  - Existing engineering building is 3.5 feet lower
  - Existing classrooms are 27 feet further north than shown earlier
- First level classrooms are moved further to the south and eliminate lower level courtyard (there is now a mechanical room at that location)
- Passageway between the buildings is considerably taller (approximate 3’-0”)
- Engineering portion of building is treated with concrete and added stone to blend with existing vernacular
- West façade (at porch) moved forward

Civitas updated DRB on the changes to the project since last reviewed:
- Moves with the buildings caused changes within landscape plan
- Elevation changes created more steps at area outside changes outside west façade at quadrangle – West Entry Plaza
- Outdoor event space at West Entry Plaza has enlarged in hard space for events with “layers” of formality – a series of courtyards. This may allow for layered steps in one area for more intimate spaces – pre-progam spaces, and more social spaces (seat wall to north and bleacher condition to the south) on the “program space” level
- Monumental seat bench (approximately 50’-0”) is positioned to be ideal for viewing Flatirons

- Plantings were discussed: Ginko (male) trees to frame view from building and counter balance Coffee Tree
- East Entry now accommodates stairs to east entry door
- East Entry View could straighten sidewalk and divide bike racks for more integration into the landscape to the north

DRB Comments from Meeting:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Continue to explore levels of courtyards and plaza spaces that accommodate students and special events while accommodating the vertical grades in a seamless and coordinated manner.
- Consider relocating stairs to create more usable courtyards leading to the upper terrace area.
- Explore the mix of plant materials for the large expanse of the landscape area at the West Entry plaza to reflect the Boulder front range and mix of native plant materials.
- Continue to plan and design the placement of bike parking, landscape improvements, and site design at the East entry.
- Please continue to develop and refine the project site and landscape "kit of parts," constructions details, materials, grading, planting plans and details, site funishings, signage, drainage, lighting, and related site improvements.
- Explore how the "iconic" bench at the West Entry Plaza can be used throughout the year and not diminished by skakeboard use.
- The "Gateway Guiding Principle" diagramed on page 3 of the submittal seems diminished and complicated with the existing Engineering School breakroom which projects southward into the Gateway, on the east side of the new addition. The negative impact to the new addition by this minor existing element is shown on pages 33 and 39.

B. Architecture:

- Consider further exploration of east bridge as it intersects with the Engineering building – the fenestration seems to lack coordination.
- Explore the physical circulation when walking out of the Engineering building and into the Business School. It seems in conflict with the parti shown on page 15 of updated presentation.
- Consider the split pathways to the tunnel, Business School is problematic in several respects – the ADA access is not ideal, it subdivides the available open space at the entrance.
- Study the symmetry of the entry. It has created a feeling that the entry is a whole other building that is very regimented and organized. It now relates less to the asymmetry of the engineering building than previously. The earlier asymmetry of the entry seemed less imposing and more vertical in its proportionality. It would be helpful to have the asymmetrical scheme shown on page 8 as well to better compare the two schemes.
- Consider a study that keeps the center entry and explores the sketch on page 13 which gives more expression of a vertical fenestration versus a "squattier" rendition on your elevation on page 12. A study that creates a less formalized joinery of the buildings would be appreciated.

- Explore the fundamental design significance that exists in the two structures and let that inform the proposed fenestrations and formal patterns.
- Study the circulation which tends to make the emergency egress from the Business School equal to the main access path from the south.
- Clarify paths at west side to eliminate a decision point when approaching the building from the west.
- Consider further study of the tunnel passage. It still seems to lack a level of significance, as per our June notes. This should be a desirable destination, a "place" – it lacks architectural design, the "left over" character of the space is exacerbated by the structural colums obscuring the entrance to the Engineering School.
- DRB recognizes on page 16 – the concrete columns, the window details, and ceiling detail – are improvements.
- Further explore the overhead stepped lintel; seems to be another foreign element, seems overly fussy. It seems to introduce another language to an already confusing building. Again, the sketch on page 13 seems to capture the desired effect.
- Study the stone on the upper level at the bridge connection – this should be further explored. Even the slot on the east side should be knitted back into architecture – the slot is good.
- Consider a joint at where the bridge structure connects with the shed roof of the Engineering School.
- Re-consider that the bridge detail could be all metal rather than the heavy stone materials.

C. Energy and Sustainability:

- Please note that at the Design Development level of submittal, a detailed energy model should be prepared and presented.
- Please present and explain how the energy model and level of sustainability informed and improved the overall planning and architectural design.
- DRB acknowledges that the energy model should be provided at Schematic Design to reinforce sustainability goals. Our assumption is that the goals are still 25 EUI as per the June minutes – please confirm.
- Please provide information on daylighting, daylight distribution, and energy use.
- Re-consider value of skylights to lower level classrooms. The current approach to lighting the classrooms has a very compromised luminance distribution.
- Provide design for the mechanical and duct layout for DRB's understanding of location of mechanical room and loss of daylighting for classrooms.
- Consider continuing the Engineering building sunshades on the "auditorium" block.
- Describe how the auditorium daylighting is improved in the current design.

DRB Action:

Beyond sharing the comments as noted above, no action was required or taken.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.