



1800 Grant Street, Suite 800
Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 860-5600
Fax: (303) 860-5640

University of Colorado Design Review Board Minutes

Minutes of the Meeting of April 12, 2013

The University Design Review Board met on Friday, April 12, 2013
1800 Grant Street, 8th Floor Conference Room
(Denver)

DRB members present were: Candy Roberts, Victor Olgyay, Rick Epstein, Don Brandes, and Teresa Osborne (ex officio).

UCCS Academic Office Building

Architect(s): Nunn-SlaterPaull

Presenter(s): Clayton Cole (SP); Jennifer Cordes (SP), Gwen Gilley (SP), Gary Reynolds (UCCS); Carolyn Fox (UCCS)

Individuals present: Carolyn Fox, University Architect - University of Colorado Colorado Springs; Gary Reynolds, Executive Director – University of Colorado Colorado Springs; Heath Mizer, Landscape Architect – Civitas Inc.; Todd Mead, Principal Landscape Architect – Civitas Inc.; Tyson Nunn, Nunn Construction; Gwen Gilley, Project Manager – SlaterPaull Architects; Jennifer Cordes, Principal – SlaterPaull Architects; and Clayton Cole, Senior Project Manager – SlaterPaull Architects.

Jennifer Cordes:

- Reviewed the design progress that had been made since the last meeting.
- Gave a quick overview of existing conditions – noted no significant changes had occurred.
- Identified a goal to achieve LEED gold certification.
- Noted “connection” is the key concept driving the design.
- Noted the rooftop patio is an add-alt at this point due to budget constraints.
- Noted one window per office is operable.

Todd Mead:

- Noted the opportunity for social space(s) and capitalizing on the views offered.

- Described the existing conditions of the site – noting the importance of the spine to the overall design and the intent to reflect that in the interior architecture.
- Discussed the shallow bioswale and suggested planting material.
- Touched on the orientation and location of the planted street buffer to maximize views in building hallways.

Gwen Gilley:

- Noted layout adjustments on the floor plan(s).
- Discussed the intended purpose of the conference room location.

Heath Mizer:

- Reviewed landscape typologies.
- Noted the storm water being captured in the courtyard plaza will remain as surface water.
- Discussed the opportunity to utilize the detention basin as a key storm water management element.
- Noted the screening opportunities using Sumac and grasses on the east side of the building.
- Discussed using site sections to display the proposed seat walls integration into the landscape illustrating how the west staircase would function.
- Touched on the landscape filter box on the east porous detention area.
- Discussed the native plant pallet and site accessories/furnishings.
- Discussed the site lighting plan.

Candy Roberts:

- Suggested the design team send their Design Development drawings to the Board members for review.
- Noted the benches on the west side need to face each other.
- Noted the placement of the trash receptacles in the front entry – architecturally this is not ideal.
- Inquired about the glass transparency of the entry façade.
- Expressed concern for the white material - above and below the windows on the top floor – diminishing the quality of the canopy. Suggested trying to break it apart to be more substantial.

Rick Epstein:

- Inquired about the location and intent of the street-planting buffer on Austin Bluffs Parkway. He suggested more continuous shrubs would do a better job of screening.
- Noted the potential need for more bicycle racks near the building.
- Expressed concern for the lack of development of the top floor's materiality, including the columns and the roof.
- Suggested more attention to detail. Noted the lack of detail on the brick detailing, especially the treatment of the windows at head and sill.

Victor Olgay:

- Inquired about the use of different materials to create the bridge over/through the bio-swale.
- Seconded Roberts' idea to consider breaking apart the materiality of the top floor to be more substantial.
- Noted the sunshades are successful in some areas and not successful in others.
- Inquired about the windows being operable throughout the building.
- Noted the success of the continuous sunshades on the south side of the building but thought the individual sunshades on the east were not successful. Suggested a single shade per level to maximize cohesiveness.
- Noted the lack of light penetration with removal of the light louvers.
- Noted the potential to optimize light penetration by using different glass panels with different shading coefficients.
- Asked for a detailed copy of the energy models that have been conducted and how it's influencing design decisions.

Don Brandes:

- Complimented the design team on their successful progression since the last meeting.
- Noted the phasing of the building has been accommodated with future expansion in mind.
- Noted the importance to review the tree protection guidelines.

Roberts made a motion for the Design Team to send the latest Design Development documents for review and return for a formal approval. The Board seconded the motion and thanked the design team for their progress on this project.

University of Colorado Hospital Rocky Mountain Lions Eye Institute pre-presentation discussion – Anschutz Medical Campus

Andre Vite:

- Noted the opportunity to push the view corridor out to create a strong loggia.
- Expressed concern for the curtain wall detailing – experiential aspect.
- Suggested implementing some form of “architectural relief” on the front entrée to break up the glass.

Rick Epstein:

- Noted the proposed plan reads as a series of additions vs. an iconic building.
- Noted the lack of proportion and appropriate use of the front entry. Experientially, it does not work as proposed.
- Suggested shortening the depth of the front colonnade by half.
- Depth of overhang, undifferentiated length, underwhelming sense of entry, and both corners of the buildings are lacking statements.

Victor Olgyay:

- Inquired about the feasibility to pull that entry sequence back +/-10 feet or, move the first floor programming out +/-10 feet.
- Suggested using the edge condition proposed on page 17 as a condition that should be used throughout. By wrapping the corners, it creates a strong condition that creates a stronger, more iconic building.

Don Brandes:

- Noted the lack of confusion with the “symbolic entry” and inaccurate diagrams.
- Noted the vision concerns that need to be addressed and how that influenced the design.
- Noted the concern for shade, shadow, wind, lights, and plants.
- Inquired about what specifically needs to be developed for schematic approval.
- Suggested the colonnade needs more exploration – weather conditions, plant material, circulation, etc.

Candy Roberts:

- Noted the issue with the lack of programming on the first floor – which was addressed in the first meeting.
- Complimented the design team on the architectural step-back proposed.
- Noted the importance of the northeast corner of the building and its need to be iconic – suggested a vertical “sliver” element.
- Noted the need to create a strong entry and remove the 30’ front extension.
- Have it read as a unified architectural unit – not pieces of a building amalgamated.

University of Colorado Hospital – Rocky Mountain Lions Eye Institute

Architect(s): Davis Partnership

Presenter(s): Hugh Brown and Kevin Scott – Davis Partnership Architects

Individuals present: Hugh Brown, Principal – Davis Partnership Architects; Lynn Moore, Principal – Davis Partnership Architects; Tony Ruiz, Project Executive – University of Colorado Hospital; Andre Vite, Campus Architect – University of Colorado Denver; John White, University of Colorado Hospital; and Kevin Scott, Principal – Davis Partnership Architects.

Lynn Moore:

- Discussed the context of the project within the medical campus.
- Discussed site views.
- Noted key elements in the micro-master plan including: pedestrian and vehicular circulation, important linkages, public transit, and historic view corridors.
- Discussed the intricate walkways and bicycle paths that will be integrated into the new design.
- Reviewed entry daylight studies conducted throughout the four seasons.
- Reviewed the conceptual site plan highlighting existing landscape features.

- Discussed the intent to implement different paving patterns through the front entry to slow traffic.
- Reviewed some key elements in the grading plan.
- Discussed the landscape zones on site and the proposed plant materials for each zone.

Kevin Scott:

- Discussed precedent studies and building material palettes.
- Discussed the three front entry design studies – architecture, and material.
- Noted the canopy options found on campus and what aspects could work on the building.

Hugh Brown:

- Suggested implementing a clock tower or an obelisk in the parking lot to link the project together.

Tony Ruiz:

- Noted the desire to keep the existing Lions Eye Institute stone staircase as a trademark or beacon.

Candy Roberts:

- Expressed concern for the disconnect between the existing staircase and the proposed architectural plan.
- Noted the lack of a strong entry point.

Victor Olgay:

- Thanked the design team for taking the time to conduct several different studies on the corner treatment.

Rick Epstein:

- Noted the desire to give the building an iconic quality that sets itself apart, but also sits within the family of Anschutz design.
- Noted the four main problematic elements that need to be addressed:
 - Depth of colonnade – suggested reducing by 10-20 feet.
 - The building lacks a strong sense of entry. It is hidden and recessed. South façade - undifferentiated length. This has the further problem of not reinforcing a sense of entry.
 - Corners: Southeast corner – lacking iconic quality. This could be helped by cantilevering the glass slot. The northeast corner is weak and does not create a strong identity at this important corner. Option B of this corner does the best job of starting to strengthen the corner.
- Reinforced the need to create a strong iconic corner to help balance the building architecturally and give it a sense of identity as it now has with the stone stair tower.

Don Brandes:

- Noted the sense of arrival and entry is extremely important.

- Expressed the lack of inter-relation of the canopy and building cover – too much space between the two of them. Suggested utilizing pots and specific plant material to create a welcoming usable space.
- Inquired about the feasibility of combining the seating area(s) into one instead of the separate space for employees and patients.
- Expressed concern for shade, shadow, wind, lights, and plant treatment.
- Noted the unusual layout of the walkway transitioning from the parking lot to the covered drop off area.

Olgyay made a motion for Concept Design approval. The Board seconded the motion and thanked the design team for their progress on this project.

Late Add - Anschutz Campus Signage

Teresa Osborne:

- Noted the proposed curvature of the sign needs to be reduced so it can be seen and read from Colfax.

Andre Vite:

- Questioned whether it should be reduced or be kept as a monumental sign.
- Suggested implementing roadway signage to inform potential users of the main entry to the hospital.

Don Brandes:

- Suggested keeping it as monumental signage and implement appropriate roadway signage 160' feet from street entrance.

Candy Roberts:

- Noted the signage doesn't need to be the exact same height due to existing conditions, elevations, etc.

Rick Epstein:

- Noted that if the curve of the signage changes, the "ends" need to be completed (capped) with the appropriate landscaping elements.