



**University Of Colorado
Design Review Board
Summary**

Summary of the Meeting of Thursday, April 9, 2015

The University Design Review Board met on Thursday, April 9, 2015, at 1800 Grant Street (Denver), 1st floor conference room.

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

10:15 - 12:00

Visual and Performing Arts Center (VaPA)

Architect(s): Semple Brown Design

Presenter(s): Bryan Schmidt and Chris Wineman, Semple Brown;
Carolyn Fox and Gary Reynolds, UCCS

Description: Design Development approval.

Campus/Consultant Attendance:

Derek Brandt, CU Student / DRB Note taker; Karl Burkhardt, CU Student / DRB Note taker; Carolyn Fox, UCCS; Brad Johnson, UCCS; Bryan Schmidt, Semple Brown; Chris Wineman, Semple Brown; Priscilla Marbaker, Tapis Associates, Inc.; Susan Reilly, Group 14 Engineers

A/E Presentation to the DRB:

Updates were given to the refinements in energy, landscape and building design. The Group 14 Engineers presented the current status of the LEED certification. A key energy consideration is the window glazing choice. A non-fritted glass with acceptable energy performance was designated. The landscape architectural consultant discussed the changes in the VaPA Garden and site furniture design. Changes to the building exterior materials, color, and lighting were presented.

DRB Action: VaPA Design Development

A motion to approve design development with the request that the final project be submitted with both the building, overall project site and landscape plan as a unified package. The resolution should reflect the following recommendations for VaPA design development approval as well as the recommendations noted on the January 22, 2015, meeting minutes for the North Nevada Infrastructure. The motion was made by Olgyay, seconded by Winters. The DRB voted for unanimous approval of design development with the following recommendations:

1. Screening for the loading area needs to be further integrated with building and/or landscape. The loading area is currently too perforated and not successful in providing the necessary visual screening.
2. Further explore the color option of infill paneling on the building 'bookends.' The west and north elevation window treatment is not successful in the color variation between openings. The design intent of a linear/strip opening does not seem realized by the color choices and the design punctuation of a darker grey bookend is too neutral.
3. Continue to study the penthouse design. The building would benefit from the same application of material and color as the south side elevation at a minimum with the potential of a more curved profile to match the south side architectural language.
4. All the project lighting needs to be examined. In the building interior, the electric lighting design as well as specification remains a significant opportunity to reduce capital and operating costs, as well as energy use. The quantity of site lighting can be reduced, and provide a hierarchy of surface brightness that coordinates with entrances and pathways. Avoid up lighting in trees that lights the night sky and negates the LEED SS 8 light pollution credit. Similarly, the exterior building lighting needs further integration with the building. More information needs to be provided regarding the proposed continual/linear LED up lighting fixture.
5. Develop further signage integration – locations, big panels along front, etc. The signage should support the larger idea of the building, rather than have the building as a backdrop for the signage. Also, look further at the display panel design, placement and building integration to the east near the entry.
6. Ensure that the landscape plan is fully integrated with the building, including: grading, irrigation, lighting, signage, scoring, planters, cross sections of railing, speakers, etc. Please check some of the cross-sections and construction details – some illustrate a railing with plantings, some do not. Look further at the entry plaza design to ensure the building architecture, entries, signage, pedestrian movement, etc., are integrated into a whole.
7. Consider re-locating the three (3) honey locust trees on the south portion of the lower garden.
8. Verify that the subsurface utilities and irrigation are located to allow for the potential tent locations.
9. For the entire project area verify that the grading, drainage and plantings are coordinated to create the desired effect of a "natural and undulating" landscape.
10. Consider simplifying the pavement patterns throughout the VaPA Building Courtyard area.
11. Consider eliminating the western pedestrian connection to the walkway that parallels the main entry boulevard drive. (See 3.2 on the North Nevada Infrastructure Plans).
12. Evaluate the pedestrian crossing from the Parking Lot/Future Building Site to the entry below the VaPA Garden – signage, terminus, and stairs. Also evaluate the pedestrian crossing from the bus drop-off to the entry plaza to ensure a safe crossing that is integrated with the plaza design and pedestrian system.
13. Coordinate the location of planters, landscape areas and the call-outs for landscape and site furnishings.

12:15 - 2:55

Village Center (Workshop)

Architect(s): KSQ Architects with GE Johnson Construction
 Presenter(s): Tom Goodhew, Project Planner and Chester Ehrig, KSQ
 Description: Schematic Design workshop for a new dining and community facility located in the Williams Village campus. The facility will replace the existing, aging, Darley Commons Building.

Campus/Consultant Attendance:

Derek Brandt, CU Student / DRB Note-taker; David Danielson, CU-Boulder; Nicholas Fiore, CU-Boulder; Tom Goodhew, CU-Boulder; Bill Haverly, CU-Boulder; Amy Kirtland, CU-Boulder; Wayne Northcutt, CU-Boulder; Richelle Reilly, CU-Boulder; Juergen Friese, CU-Boulder HDS; Steve Hecht, CU-Boulder HDS; Curt Huetson, CU-Boulder HDS; Jon Keiser, CU-Boulder HDS; Phil Blakeman, GE Johnson; Mark Haynes, GE Johnson; Joshua Ward, GE Johnson; Jamie Cali, KSQ Architects; Chester Ehrig, KSQ Architects; Daniel Gonzalez, KSQ Architects; Shannon Meyer, KSQ Architects; David Short, KSQ Architects; Greg Dorolek, Wenk Associates

Summary of DRB Questions/Clarifications/Comments:

Note: The Village Center project, originally submitted for schematic design approval, was unacceptable to the DRB because many of the previous recommendations were not adequately addressed in the submittal. In an effort to accelerate the schematic design package, the Board offered to reconvene before the next regularly scheduled meeting in May to review the status of the project and offer their recommendations. The Board made the following recommendations:

Overall Comments

- The palette of proposed building materials appears suitable. The contemporary design approach and intent is appropriate for the Williams Village context.
- The overall building mass, form and character are lacking a strong conceptual framework and need greater articulation, hierarchy and interest.
- The architecture should strengthen, inform and inspire outdoor spaces - once the north elevation is refined and resolved, it should create a strong and welcoming face to the building that is well integrated with the courtyard space.
- Continue to explore floor plan opportunities to expand indoor/outdoor opportunities in addition to program uses.
- The greenhouse design is acceptable and the materials are good.
- The conference drop-off design needs to be reviewed, and made more welcoming.
- A sense of place needs to be created at the building entries, especially on the north side.
- The loading dock east approach should be better screened.
- Conference space functionality needs help with noise and service and access. Consider alternative plan layouts to create better pre-function space and the connection from the conference area to the main entry; create better gathering spaces and provide the potential for natural light into the main conference spaces.

Sustainability

- Continue to explore low energy building design. In concept design the team has the opportunity to improve energy efficiency by designing the building form to work with the climate and create a beautiful, functional integrated design. Consider the following issues:
 - Get more daylight into more spaces, especially on the first floor, the conference areas, and the back of house spaces. Try to achieve the LEED IEQ 8.1 and 8.2 Daylighting credits.
 - Architecturally design the glass openings to let in light and heat when desired, and block it when not desired. Use functional exterior shading as a design element. Minimize the fight to control heat loss and gain.

- Extend the building balance point (passive design), i.e., design the building envelope to increase the amount of time the building can operate with mechanical systems turned off, or in a hybrid mode.
- Study natural ventilation and the way the building form can encourage beneficial air movement.
- Design a dining service layout that works with the architectural experience and facilitates smart energy use. Arrange kitchen equipment so it is possible to provide heat recovery off the refrigerators and ventilation hoods. Consider ganging the stacks on the roof for heat recovery and to optimize roof areas for other functions.
- Design the roof to be attractive, and allow for PV in a well thought-out pattern.
- Look for architectural solutions first rather than technological ones

Southwest elevation

- This elevation has pleasing elements and proportions, and is a good reference for a kit-of-parts for the rest of the building. Consider extending the roof overhang on the second floor to create a more functional covered outdoor space and a more dynamic architectural expression.

Southeast Elevation

- On blank alley walls precast could be added for additional articulation and to break down the massing.
- Study ways to make the entry more engaging.
- Consider ganging windows to provide a stronger architectural expression.
- Consider moving the entry so that it is opposite the Bear Creek courtyard rather than student rooms.

Northeast elevation

- Bring scale into the elevation through varying the outdoor patio wall height.
- Study the proportions of precast to windows.
- Look at circulation and access to better connect with Bear Creek.
- The slot window at the north corner is a strong idea and could be extended further throughout the building.

North Elevation

- Combine successful elements of the southwest elevation to create an engaging pedestrian friendly place.
- Articulate the building elevation - forecourts to create courtyards that refine the urban design and engage with the outdoors.
 - The rooftop at the building entry could become an outdoor dining terrace to increase the engagement with the outdoors.
 - Consider the depth of the overhang and the dripline. Consider extending to make more useable covered "porch" area facing north courtyard.
- Study first and second floor dining and the outdoor area experience.
- As suggested by the campus, study
 - Moving the recess into the building east toward 1st floor Grotto/Grab n' go, to create a covered area for dining/gathering and adding another entry accessible through the recess to define a 'living room' into the building.

- Further emphasize the elm bosque/arcade.
- The potential of two fireplaces as a destination.
- Bring the exterior stairs between the dining and recreation building north and west to define patio space adjacent to the building.

Workshop Summary:

The DRB extended their willingness to hold a “Special Meeting” to review a revised “Schematic Design” Submittal prior to the May, 2015 regularly scheduled DRB meeting based on the Workshop input and recommendations.

3:10 - 4:20

Systems Biotechnology - E Wing

Architect(s): HDR - not present

Presenter(s): Wayne Northcutt, Project Planner

Description: Concept Design for a 5th wing of the Jennie Smoly Caruthers Biotech building to construct teaching and research laboratories and classrooms to support current and new interdisciplinary programs for the Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering and the Biochemistry Division of the Chemistry and Biochemistry Department.

Campus/Consultant Attendance:

Derek Brandt, CU Student / DRB Note taker; David Danielson, CU-Boulder; Nicholas Fiore, CU-Boulder; Tom Goodhew, CU-Boulder; Bill Haverly, CU-Boulder; Amy Kirtland, CU-Boulder; Wayne Northcutt, CU-Boulder; Richelle Reilly, CU-Boulder.

A/E Presentation to the DRB:

The project architect presented an overview of the landscape and building design. The project is an addition to the existing Systems Biotechnology building and this wing was planned with the original design. The building caissons were constructed with the first phase. The building will connect on all three levels with the existing building.

DRB Action: Systems Biotechnology - E Wing Concept Design

A motion to approve concept design was made by Brandes, seconded by Epstein. The DRB voted for unanimous approval of concept design with the following recommendations:

1. As part of “Finishing the Thought” the design team should provide a thorough post-occupancy evaluation of the “initial thought” so as to improve on the existing building design. Improvements may include programmatic relationships, and, of course, improved laboratory daylighting, lighting, ventilation design and overall energy use.
2. Explore schematic studies for the northwest courtyard for arcade and pedestrian usage opportunities. Consider enlarging the arcade and extending paved areas to make a more useable space for studying, etc., in addition to circulation.
3. Study the extent, location, and materials of covered areas in relation to building on the northeast. The space should have the solidity and materiality of the building and not lightweight steel sheds.

4. Study and further develop the west façade in relation to its elevation, windows, stacks, and materiality. Consider how shading is integrated into the façade.
5. Further develop elevation studies on north side.
6. Develop further specificity of landscape, lighting, art placement.

Public meeting adjourned.