



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board Minutes

Minutes of the Meeting of April 10, 2014

The University Design Review Board met on Thursday, April 10, 2014, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, 1st floor conference room.

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

8:15 - 9:00

CU Denver Campus Facilities Master Plan

Presenter: Michael Del Giudice

Description: CU Denver Campus Master Planning Effort

Del Giudice explained that this is really the first master plan effort of this nature for the Denver campus. The plan process includes engaging identified partners, neighbors, community organizations, as well as the CU Board of Regents, students, faculty and staff. The current Denver strategic plan and national trends will be the basis for focus groups' conversations on "issues/opportunities." The master plan will focus on three precincts: Downtown [areas of interest and development], CU Neighborhood as defined by AHEC; and CU Denver Shared Use Areas. Del Giudice clarified that although CU Denver includes both the Anschutz and Denver campuses, this plan guides only the Denver campus.

Next Steps in the process include:

1. Interview stakeholder groups
2. Completing an inventory and data assessment on existing building and campus infrastructure
3. Engaging focus group workshops
4. Presenting findings to committees
5. Board of Regent approval
6. Colorado Commission on Higher Education presentation

Epstein suggests exploring relationships with others, including the Anschutz Medical Campus, Boulder and UCCS campuses, the Downtown Partnership, and other institutions at Auraria. These programmatic relationships could help define the downtown footprint of the campus. Look for opportunities for partnerships.

Roberts suggested expanding the concept of the downtown area as the urban campus. This could expand to where students live such as LoDo, LoHi, Union Station, and Capitol Hill. Those areas where the younger populations in the city live represent an opportunity for further enrollment growth.

Olgay suggested studying travel [commute] patterns of students. Del Giudice noted that they are planning a zip code study similar to the one done for Anschutz to see where students actually live.

Osborne asked whether the focus groups will examine programmatic differences from our Auraria partners and specialized space needs. Del Giudice responded that the changing enrollment demographics, including more international students and a younger freshman class, have identified a need for more student amenities such as recreational opportunities.

Brandes stated that communication between so many focus groups is going to be tough. He encourages monthly presentations to the Downtown Denver Partnership board. Additionally, several other areas should be addressed in the plan, including hotel and convention opportunities; and integrated infrastructure planning, including multimodal transit, traffic, drainage, utilities, urban design, etc. Also, a precedent study list and a series of inspirational lectures will help focus groups thinking 3-5 years down the road. He suggested reviewing Central Piedmont Community College, Charlotte, North Carolina. They have connected with corporations for job creation and student opportunity.

Del Giudice agreed and emphasized that the Facilities Master Plan must challenge the way we think of academic space. Planning research has identified trends on campus that will be part of these conversations, including:

- Disruptive technology - identifies opportunity for student success. Supports flexible spaces that will allow better use.
- Urban campus - the city is actually the campus. They are working to make students feel that the city is the campus.
- Learning campus [anywhere, anyone, anytime] - need to create learning environment everywhere. Places for students to meet, continue conversation.
- Thinking more in terms of innovative, urban learning.

10:15 - 11:45

Visual and Performing Arts Complex (VaPA) – UCCS

Architect(s): H3 and Semple Brown

Presenter(s): Geoff Lynch, H3; John Fontillas, H3; Chris Wineman, SBD; Bryan Schmidt, SBD; Gary Reynolds, UCCS; Carolyn Fox, UCCS

Description: VaPA Concept Approval

Reynolds introduced the project request for Conceptual Design approval with the understanding that there are still some changes to be made. They are working to address comments from the last DRB presentation.

The design team gave an overview of the project intent and how it relates to the micro-master plan for the project site. The topography was described and its relationship to the proposed site elements. Existing drainage and roadway patterns have defined building placement options. Under the refined plan, the building has moved east, oriented to a revised boulevard alignment. Temporary parking is proposed south of the boulevard as well as north of the site in the softball field location. The building is oriented for views to Pulpit Rock and Pikes Peak.

The building design places public spaces along the south side of the building with more intimate lobby spaces for separate programs. Natural light will be an element to connect students, building and landscape. Materials have not been selected; they are beginning to sketch out a palette for the building to include solar shading and a variety of facade materials (metal panels, brick and windows).

Model Review

- Open, acoustically tall recital and performance halls.
- Smart classrooms, offices at back with views and north light.
- Providing two main stairs and two enclosed fire stairs. Working on minimizing dead-ends for egress/safety.
- Rooftop utility boxes to be minimized yet functional.
- Connection to future phases
 - Second floor connection to phase two programs.
 - Goal is to provide one loading dock for all phases.

The building will be rated LEED Gold. Studies will be provided by Group14. The building will include 35% energy use reduction and 45% water use reduction from average buildings.

Comments from the DRB

Epstein asked about the lack of building concept plans and whether the referenced evocative Richard Serra images are a part of future design. The consultant team responded that the goal for the building is something artistic, timeless, yet powerful and clear. Not something too loud, but an obvious destination.

Roberts – asked how expensive is the temporary parking; what is the parking plan? Is there an ability to have a dedicated entrance to the art gallery? The consultant team responded that they are trying to increase parking spaces from 250 to 500 by utilizing the existing ball diamonds as they are already flat and thus avoid topographic issues. Additionally, the future Health and Wellness Building will need its own parking and this may influence art gallery visitor volume and experience.

Brandes – recommends Conceptual Design approval conditional upon resolve of the following site issues:

- Detailed grading and drainage plan is required showing existing conditions, future development and proposed utilities. Future parking diagrams need cross-sections, more detailed parking lot layouts with horizontal and vertical controls. Existing contours and proposed contours should be shown. Larger scale may be required in entryway areas.
- The future parking lots can be terraced with grades and drainage – show detail.
- The entryway to VaPA needs further study, especially drop-off, temporary parking, bus loading, emergency, service and delivery, long-term parking, faculty/reserved parking, etc.
- Define and show a hierarchy of landscape zones - native, arroyo, restoration, climatic control, buffering, transitional zones, formal, roadway, parking/bio-swales, ornamental, seasonal, irrigated, non-irrigated, wildflowers, seed, turfs.
- Walks, trails, paths, courtyards, art display areas, sculpture gardens, exterior storage; outdoor classroom spaces need definition.
- Propose concepts for landscape site furnishings. Lighting, signage, way findings, monumentation, naming, regulatory, informal/educational, directional.
- Provide visual studies of architectural massing, and site cross-sections of conceptual plans, including connection vs. entry, and look into future growth and focus all parking in one area.

Epstein – seconded the motion with conditions to resolve the building design as outlined in the following comments from board members. Specifically, provide clarity in pedestrian circulation. Define the programming for the garden area and whole landscape system. Encourage team to continue exploring moving the southern parking lot. For the building design:

- Develop a stronger story about how the design idea translates into the building form.
- The art gallery seems a missed opportunity. Lost behind other programs. It needs more direct public access and identity.
 - Pinch points inside the building might make the gallery hard to access.

- Explicit and clear exploration of daylighting opportunity for each space. Might help in terms of how programs are arranged. Locate spaces that benefit from daylight in zones that can be daylight. Similarly, if a programmed space can benefit from daylight 90% of the time, and 10% of the time it is not desired, consider designing to use daylight.
- Encourage further exploration of the entries. Make sure the front entry architecture, landscape are well integrated. The concept as presented seemed weak in this regard and needed further development. Stair to the north - encourage this to not to be the lowest common denominator. Make the back entrance visible from the parking lot. This can be a main entrance for many students. This is an important elevation.
- The deck at the west is not integrated with the building programmatically – how can it reinforce/complement the interior circulation and access.
- The drive seems still not clear. Continue to explore options per Gary's #5: how does the car access reinforce the sense of entry to VaPA. The current proposal with the roundabout seems to be counter to the entry to VaPA – not intuitive.
- The board was not supportive of the new parking lot south of the entry drive. It creates a confusing sense of arrival for cars, as well as de-emphasizing the main front door.

Olgyay - reemphasized the need to explore daylighting in the interior spaces. This should be thought of as an integrated approach to drive down costs and improve efficiency. The energy analysis was illustrative and appeared to show a large heating load for this building. If accurate, this indicates an opportunity for the south façade to be designed to passively reduce this load using seasonal solar gain in the public spaces.

Concept design should indicate an approach to the mechanical systems and building energy performance measures. Consider displacement ventilation in the tall performance spaces for both efficiency and acoustical control. Strive for more efficient mechanical/ducting systems – providing a schematic layout at this point will allow for integration of large ducts and structural systems without compromising either.

Roberts – provide direction to look at exterior, fenestration, and how interior relates. Look at phases 2 and 3 and develop vertical communication/circulation patterns that accommodate the future growth. Detail the sequencing of the entry and provide opportunities for gathering space and shelter. Show how the deck and lobbies relate to the garden and outdoor spaces. Explore and develop opportunities in exterior and landscaping materials. Provide sketches and ideas for design concepts.

Motion: Grant conceptual design approval under the condition of comments as written and approved.

2:00 – 3:00 Grounds IPF Introduction

Presenter(s): Tom Goodhew

Description: Concept Design

Goodhew introduced the design concept overview stating this is a design build contract. The design team has explored three to four site plan options. Proposed design established because of large equipment needs. Equipment yard placed at the north of two rectangular buildings. The buildings have access on three sides for grounds crew functions. Administrative space happens above the grounds space. Screening is provided for yard and first floor space but upper floors will be visible from surrounding environs. The building design has the campus standard clay-tile roof, and the design team is still exploring wall materials [board form, precast, etc.].

Simpson asked if the consultant explored flipping the footprint and considered the depth of utilities within that location. The consultant team responded that it has been explored. For turn-around space for vehicles, that would mean moving to building even more. The design accommodates the estimated depths of the existing utility lines. There are no utility easements.

Comments from DRB

Roberts - Asked if the grounds' exterior uses [mulch, rock, misc. yard uses, etc.] have been mapped out. The consultant team responded they are starting to work out the big equipment first, then organize smaller elements. Roberts further instructed that a low wall should be designed to screen yard materials (no fence). Costs should be used for landscape improvements rather than expensive building exteriors. The least attractive exterior elements need to be screened the most.

Brandes – summarized the board's comments granting conceptual approval with the following conditions:

- Prepare grading, drainage and storm drainage plan showing differential runoff from existing and proposed topography and utility access and depth of bury.
- On the north end of the building - increase screening through landscape materials and berms. Find other ways to address screening other than the fence.
- Evaluate architecture vs. site improvement costs. Does the aesthetic improve through an architectural or landscape solution or a combination of both? Explore more solutions.
- Provide an entry to the west and incorporate opportunities for air and light in the building. Sustainable building design should correspond with the operations within the building.
- Study the building location siting through cross sections and fly-throughs without 20 year vegetation. Give more thought to the building views, especially from the north, and how they are articulated. Consider shifting the building footprint. Photometrics will be useful in determining the type of landscape improvements needed for screening (walls, trees, berms, etc.). There is generally not support for chain link with screening material on it as a screening approach. It looks like a construction fence, not a finished building.
- Study how to make the building flexible for the future and make the interior spaces habitable. Dead end corridors should be redesigned.
- Building sustainability needs to be studied, including the possibility of passive solar collection/daylighting, fenestration which optimizes ventilation, including second floor windows. Consider using materials with a high-recycled content to articulate the building, and green walls/roofs that highlight grounds maintenance. Also consider using transpired air collectors on the south walls. This is a perfect building for it (example: <http://www.sbec.eu.com/en/concepts/ts/cs/>)
- Think about the visitor route for interior tours (possible catwalks).
- Consider the east-west circulation on the south of the building and defining the exterior pedestrian routes.
- The main entry to the building on the west needs development.
- Consider how to make this a great place to work: break room, natural light in the offices and main areas, access to outdoors, etc.
- Consider how to make all architectural moves have maximum impact: given the utilitarian nature of the building, each move should contribute to the overall design in multiple ways - to the daylighting, views, ventilation, to break up a wall, function, etc.

Brandes - **Motion: Grant conceptual design approval under the condition of comments as written and approved.**

Candy Roberts - seconded

Rick Epstein - approved

Victor Olgay - approved

3:00 – 5:00

CU-Boulder Athletics Complex – Site Analysis and Development

Presenter(s): Populous; Jeremy Krug, Michael Rey, Brian Smith

Description: CU Boulder Athletic Complex - Schematic Design Approval

Items to be addressed:

- Goal is to see where we are to date on the athletic complex.

- Seeking Schematic Design approval for site plan and NE corner building, and Design Development approval on end-zone club and seating.

Overview from the Consultant Team

The project is on an accelerated schedule. There have been updates to the DRB calendar – The interior Dal Ward renovations schedule has changed moving to next month.

The team is approaching the project with a broader master plan view. The entry boulevard is a divided boulevard condition with 12' travel lanes, shared bike/sidewalk condition, and 20' landscape median. At the Colorado and Folsom Gateway they are still studying the notion of a roundabout. Signage and monumentation can take on a concentric form of rotary. The pedestrian gateway at Colorado will include the ticket building with possible addition for concessions. The grading/drainage issues must be resolved to create habitable space. The area in front of the ticket building may become the gateway with a pocket park/plaza.

Further design on the “Buff Walk” may include “Legacy” and “Rally” plazas, and street-fest areas. The Buff Walk will have a more formal campus landscape language. Approaching Boulder Creek, areas will be undisturbed. The pathway will be treated as a lower and upper hill design with cottonwoods and riparian near the creek and ponderosa pines at higher elevations transitioning along Folsom Street to marry the formal and native materials. On Folsom Street they are exploring an opportunity to relocate fence inside tree lawn.

The entry boulevard grading and drainage will have a gentle approach grade matching existing along Folsom Street. The project does impact the Boulder Creek floodplain. The overall development will place fill in the floodplain and must be approved by FEMA. Area drains pie around indoor fields, run north to water quality "pond." The "pond" will be a shallow, attractive landscape that can serve storm water function. Roof drains from Dal Ward will discharge into this water quality "pond." The design team is challenged to disperse that water throughout the site in order to avoid a six foot deep pond at the main entry.

NE Corner Building Overview – The campus design precedents include towers as nodes and identify locations which give narrative and identity to building. The tower will provide circulation at the northwest tower [private access for staff, athletes, coaches, user groups]. They are still working on design for vertical circulation with the underground parking. They are designing a combined public entry sequence with the Buff Walk [2nd floor]. The concourse [3rd floor] ties into the Folsom concourse with a bridge.

Overview of Dal Ward Seating and Northwest Seating - Dal Ward architecture extended to create seating defined by ornamental rail and varied seating types.

Brandes – made a motion for Schematic Design approval for the NE Corner Building and NE Site under special conditions as noted:

- Prepare a Construction Limit Line Drawing which designates SD approval for the "northern portion" of the project [does not address the northern gateway].
- Resolve the 9' fall from Dal Ward to Folsom.
- Show access from the existing bridge and path to the drop-off area with existing and proposed grading, width and materials.
- Provide detail for storm water quality pond, including integrated storm water management in terms of pipe and swale. Show piping (nearly 1000') and the outfall sizing of the pond.
- The budget must include an allocation for the site remediation, including geotechnical study, re-vegetation establishment plan with irrigation.
- Verify the adequacy of the budget to landscape the northern portion of the site.

- Show the design of the retaining walls (they are noted but not designed) with top of wall and bottom of wall elevations.
- The budget should include signage and monumentation.
- Concerned with BMP integration - focus on landscape elements to re-vegetate and refurbish this area.

Northeast Corner Building – The level of specificity in design/detail/fenestration is not typical at the level it needs to be for approval. The ONLY reason that SD approval is being made is because of the ongoing participation of DRB members on a weekly basis with the design team. At the next DRB meeting, the building needs to be presented to show that it has met the conditions below. Additional information needs to be provided for the following:

- First floor plan level.
 - Further study of ticketing function.
 - Affects stairway/vertical circulation.
 - Functionally how it works on game day.
 - The upper and lower plazas need to be activated.
 - Further study of the entries [particularly main entry].
 - The way doors are reflected is not consistent with elevation.
 - Not as powerful as it needs to be for an important entry.
 - Explore its relation to the lower plaza and the tower. A non-tower entry should be explored.
- Construction limits should be developed.
- Integration of the bridge to Dal Ward.
 - Needs further study how this integrates with neighboring functions.
- Need to develop the Buff Walk further.
- 25-foot drop and circulation north/south is currently shown as a staircase and should be studied to look for stronger ways to make this connection and grade transition. A more gradual and spread-out solution with gathering places in between top and bottom elevations should be studied.
- Opportunities for a permanent ticket office and retail locations to activate the Buff Walk should be studied as it is an important program element for Athletics.
- Integration of tower into elevation.
- Explore further opportunities for daylighting.
 - Particularly as an opportunity in elevation.
 - The plans need to better exploit daylighting and views. This might affect the elevations.
- 5th Level - opportunity for a deck looking outwards to the north.
- Continuity with the concourse.
 - Right now there are two separate ideas. They should be integrated. The concourse level needs to be drawn on the plans and show how the bridge and circulation work to extend the concourse. The concourse needs to be master planned with Dal Ward to see how it will continue or end.
- Should not feel like a building just stuck next to Folsom Field and building.
 - Opportunity for integration.
- Base of the tower as major entry not yet reflected.
- East elevation - the stair is still in process.
 - Look at the lower third of the building in concert with stairs. The opportunities to support and be part of the stair element are not yet taken advantage of. The section through this space with the indoor field also needs to be considered.
- North Elevation - ambiguity at the west end and integration with tower.
 - North and west elevation does not seem to turn the corner gracefully.
 - The hierarchy of the west is not clear. It seems very busy.
- Resolution of entry and grading conditions, especially at west end. This might affect both circulation and the elevations.
 - Balance of complexity and simplicity needs to be better explored.

- West elevation - height of banding and concrete base seems massive and out of scale.
 - Perhaps vertical scoring consistent with the Dal Ward base or a break in material.
 - Refer to the existing east elevation of Folsom Field for Architectural concepts to tie the look of the new and existing buildings.
- Critical to know what is in the budget and what is not – provide data. Do not show elements in the elevation that are not in the budget, except as an add alternate.
- South elevation
 - Slot condition between the existing stadium and the NE corner building is not addressed/the materiality, circulation, connections, relation to Buff Walk, etc., need to be further explored.
 - Need to show unity and clarity through the project as a whole. There is now a separation between plans, elevations, and site that needs to be resolved.
- Develop schemes for the desire to extend the concourse level to connect around Dal Ward and connect with the concourse in the west stands.
- Show relevant floor plans of existing Folsom Field Building as it relates to the concourse level with the NE Building.

Motion to approve Schematic Design under the condition of noted comments from DRB as noted in final and approved meeting notes.

Don Brandes - moved to approve
 Candy Roberts - seconded
 Victor Olgyay - approved
 Rick Epstein - approved

Design Development Approval - End Zone Seating and Dal Ward Renovations

DRB Comments

- Study further the design of the ornamental railing. It seems to be too busy.
 - Perhaps a combination of the ornamental and simple version of the railing will resolve the design.
- Integrate the seating at the concourse level.
- Develop schemes for the desire to extend the concourse level to connect around Dal Ward and connect with the concourse in the west stands.
- Show relevant floor plans of existing Folsom Field Building as it relates to the concourse level with the NE Building.

Motion to approve Design Development under the condition of noted comments from DRB as noted in final and approved meeting notes.

Don Brandes -moved to approve
 Candy Roberts - seconded
 Don Brandes - approved
 Victor Olgyay - approved

Follow-up comments:

Epstein - Commended the team on the work done in a short period of time.

Brandes - Need to continue to over-communicate these issues week-to-week to keep moving forward.