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

University of Colorado
Design Review Board
Meeting Notes

Notes of the Meeting of December 11, 2014

The University Design Review Board met on Thursday, December 11, 2014, at the CU-Boulder campus, Williams Village, Darley Commons, #103.

DRB members present were: Victor Olgyay (acting chair), Rick Epstein (via conference call), Candy Roberts, and Teresa Osborne (ex officio).

Attendance:

9:15 – 10:45 **Village Center Concept Design Presentation**

Presenter(s):	Tom Goodhew
Architects:	GE Johnson, KSQ Architects
Description:	Concept Design Approval Replacement of the Darley Commons building to provide dining, conference and community services to the Williams Village campus.

Attendance:

Karl Burkhart, CU student / DRB note taker; Samuel Starr, CU student / DRB note taker; Bill Haverly, CU-Boulder; Tom Goodhew, CU-Boulder; Nicholas Fiore, CU-Boulder; David Danielson, CU-Boulder; Amy Kirtland, CU-Boulder; Amy Beckstrom, CU Housing & Dining Services; Debbie Cook, CU Housing & Dining Services; Kambiz Khalili, CU Housing & Dining Services; Eldred Foster, CU Housing & Dining Services; Kris Kaye, CU Housing & Dining Services; John Fox, CU Housing & Dining Services; Curt Huetson, CU Housing & Dining Services; Jueryen Frinse, CU Housing & Dining Services; Steve Hecht, CU Housing & Dining Services; Alan Brown, CU Housing & Dining Services; Jon Keiser, CU Housing & Dining Services; Jim Sukenik, Baker Group; Stella Hodgkins, GE Johnson; Joshua Ward, GE Johnson; Mark Haynes, GE Johnson; Daniel Gonzalezm, KSQ Architects; David Short, KSQ Architects; Shannon Meyer, KSQ Architects; Jamie Cali, KSQ Architects, Greg Dorolek, Wenk Associates.

Presentation:

Big Picture Goals Presented by Consultant Firm

- Growth: 42% of campus residents live at Williams Village with added potential for future growth.
- Place: Architecture should create an iconic place at the pedestrian level. Quieter than adjacent Williams Village towers. Variety of spaces. A sense of “coming home.”
- Indoor/Outdoor: visual, physical and metaphorical. Variety of outdoor spaces.

Circulation

- Main entry located at the North Green.
- Conference entry located to the south.
- Enhancing safety of bike and pedestrian connection to Baseline Rd.

North Green

- Goal to preserve the existing green and its proportion to the village.
- Plaza – grove of trees and outdoor fire feature.
- Area 6 is flexible for now. Possible focal point for students.
- Area 10 hosts an entrepreneurial space.
- Fire feature will light and invite people into the plaza space during fall and winter months.
- From the promenade, the green site is 6 feet high.
- Hosts multi-seasonal uses.

West Lawn and conference entry plaza

- Separation between main entry and private conference use.
- Graded to accommodate a movable festival tent.
- Green screening device to screen the service dock.
- Managing a large amount of roof-shed in rain events.
- Integrating stormwater garden.
- Learning landscape component.
- Bike hub clustered to the south.
- Restricting parking along the south.
- Northeast patio overlooking the North Green.
- Located a lot of utilities but landscape team remains optimistic about planting trees.

Stormwater

- Almost doubling the site's existing stormwater load.
- Permeable paving utilized in plazas to reduce stormwater load.
- Plan A – Expand the exiting stormwater pond.
- Plan B – Engineer new stormwater pipe system.

Greenhouse

- 2 story, 3000 sf greenhouse supplies the dining hall component with fresh greens and leaf lettuce.

Building and Materials

- Brick and limestone become critical choices.
- All metal trim and details to be black.
- Klauder principles have been studied.
- Identified scale, proportion and entry hierarchy as overarching themes.
- Colonnade / arcade
- Replicates window proportion and replication of Ketchum Hall (arts and sciences building).

Sustainability

- Team is pursuing LEED Platinum certification.
- Most important sustainability goal is energy.
- Targeting net zero energy consumption.
- 45 KBTU per square foot.
- Window to wall ration about 33%.
- Daylighting the building through clerestory windows.
- Specifying highly efficient kitchen equipment.
- Exploring 3 star green restaurant certification.

- Highlighting beauty and biophilia.
- Identifying tendency to focus on life-like attributes.
- Improved health and well-being through sensory experience.

DRB Comments and Recommendation:

Commended team on excellent work and submittal package.

1. **Big Concept**
   - The design should support "big picture" concepts of "coming home," "growth" and indoor/outdoor. These concepts need to be expressed stronger in the design.
   - Building still feels like it is not supported by indoor/outdoor concept. It is very insular and closed and should be more open and welcoming.

   Make it a place to come home to –
   - Scale of the buildings and the form of open spaces need refinement - Create a strong positive outdoor space that is defined by the building.
   - Refer to Williams Village guidelines; the activity within the building should be visible. The building should be iconic and reflective of its role as the central gathering space. It does not need to be iconic from U.S. 36, just iconic to the interior of the Williams Village setting.
   - Articulation of concepts of making it a place should be enhanced by reflecting the original Sasaki plan, especially
     - the circulation pattern around the building
       - Look at east/west connection and engage west lawn area.
       - Diagonal connector adjacent to Bear Creek needs to be strengthened.
       - South entry along this circulation pattern needs to be designed to engage the corridor.
     - The north plaza is too much the same and too open/wants small areas that are more intimate. It needs a stronger unifying design.
     - Reconsider the eastern sunken ramped pathway adjacent to the recreation center.
     - The existing northeast/southwest pedestrian diagonal desire lines in the current plaza are not accommodated in the proposed design. These pedestrian needs should be recognized with the new design.
     - Consider articulating building massing so as to reduce shadowing on the north plaza.
   - Develop the indoor/outdoor opportunities at focused locations.
   - Emphasize the front door and look for opportunities to locate active areas next to entry areas.

2. **Circulation**
   - Courtyards and rooftop terraces need to be defined as larger positive spaces.
   - Encouraged team revisit circulation in terms of the particularly narrow corridor at the South Entry.
   - Encouraged green screen be articulated stronger in terms of pedestrian scale and connectivity.
   - Encouraged additional elements in north plaza to support additional activities: movie night screen, etc.
   - Suggested further opportunity to integrate greenhouse into overall project.
   - Visible from more than just 2nd floor dining.
   - Encouraged team revisit North Green circulation and main entry.
     - Suggested making stairs more apparent from exterior, pulling people into the space with the stairs.

- Interior feels like too many small hallways. Emphasize the main areas and hierarchy.
- Activity should be visible as an important part of the building.
- Revisit Williams Village Guidelines.
- The concept of a quiet building feels appropriate; make the destination and activity the iconic, organizing element.
- Embracing "coming home" experience is missing.
- Arcade loses the active expression of the dining program.
- Express on the exterior the interior staircase and other functions.
    - Entryways should align with the access to the dining areas.
- Building does not feel welcoming – there is no primary entrance and welcoming space.
- The vertical arcade elements do not let the building read as a dining hall.

3. Sustainability

- The goals of energy as a primary are admirable; however, "net zero ready" is likely to be difficult to reach unless overall EUI is reduced further to the 25-30 range.
- Kitchen equipment is a large energy user; the architecture should show how this is addressed in the building design (e.g., hoods and heat recovery equipment on refrigerators, etc.) and the strategy for reducing impact. Think about what needs to be consolidated and what needs to be dispersed.
- Consider how scattered serving venues are addressed in this regard. Heat recovery is a good energy efficiency approach, but difficult when utilities and kitchen units are dispersed. What does this mean in design of floor plans?
- Grills and hoods should be arranged into segments to allow control to turn equipment on/off as needed.
    - Roof is currently not showing mechanical equipment vertical conveyance. How will this be addressed?

4. Roof

- This project is surrounded by tall buildings so the roof is highly visible. It is the fifth elevation – it should be designed.
- Perhaps the rooftop can accommodate some functional use. It could be green space, energy generation (PV and solar hot water) or inhabitable deck space. On the very deep second floor plate, consider using the roof design to let in daylight for energy benefits to displace electric light, for passive heat gain, or for spatial interest. At the very least, this façade should be a pleasure for those in the adjacent towers to observe; at best it should encourage people to go to the building.

5. Greenhouse

- Part of the energy dynamic of the building. On the south, the greenhouse should deliver heat when the building needs heat, and assist with the ventilation when that is beneficial.
- Encouraged more experiential and functional integration. Greenhouse needs to be connected into the building/make it part of the program and thermodynamics of the building. Perhaps the greenhouse needs to have a horizontal as well as vertical component, so it is more easily integrated into the student experience. Suggested further opportunity to integrate greenhouse into overall project. It is shown as an isolated element and not integrated strongly into the overall design: both in elevation and your experience of it from within. It should be visible from more than just 2nd floor dining.

6. Architecture

- Encouraged team to revisit North Green circulation and main entry. Suggested making stairs more apparent from exterior, especially the main stair, pulling people into the space with the stairs. This could include an outdoor stair directly to the dining hall, and outdoor decks.

- Express on the exterior the other interior stairs.
    - Entryways should align with the access to the dining areas.
- Interior feels like too many small hallways.
- The concept of a quiet building feels appropriate; make the destination and activity the iconic, organizing element. The building can be quiet but should be unique, distinctive, and welcoming.
- Arcade loses the active expression of the dining program.
- Building does not feel welcoming – there is no primary entrance and welcoming space.
- The vertical arcade elements do not let the building read as a dining hall.
- The outdoor dining space on the second floor seems leftover. It needs to read as a key aspect of the architecture and integral to it. Consider how screening for the western sun is integrated into the deck space.
- The arcade is a potential strong, unique element.
- Concerned over scale; too narrow for gathering and too wide for circulation.
- Encouraged integration of some north plaza elements (fire and stage) into building interior.
- Suggested materiality integrated with examples of precast concrete on campus.
- Consider a more engaging and whimsical architectural expression. This is supposed to be a unique, iconic, and easily recognizable building in Williams Village.
- Emphasized village-like feeling strategically throughout the building at places of gathering.
- Building feels closed and academic; not open and inviting.
- Suggested transparency as an expression of interior uses of dining and gathering.
- Referenced the dining hall at UCCS with all glass pedestrian level.
- Encouraged team embrace a new, unique concept within the Klauder architectural vocabulary; not just recycling it here.
- Currently, circulation through dining area is necessary in order to discover a rooftop terrace.
- This outdoor space should be more obvious from stair and entries.
- Indoor/outdoor, light/shadow, points of compression.
- Massing, circulation and hierarchy should be revisited.
- Currently the design reads as a background building; this should be a foreground building.
- Reference to main campus is relevant but what is unique about this building?
- Encouraged team to not just explore Klauder principles, but also ask why, and how Klauder should be translated to this building, in this place, with these materials.
- Suggested team study Klauder *principles* rather than color and detail. Go back to Klauder experience, not just details. Encouraged a more playful expression of Klauder style. Now it is too literal.
    - Klauder connection – not only about the details, but about the principles.
        - How you move through the spaces.
        - The building massing.
        - The simplicity.
        - The proportion and indoor/outdoor place making.
        - Use light, massing, circulation, and create whimsy.
        - Design as a foreground building.
        - Create intimate spaces inside and out.
- Reference back to main campus architecture but define the identity of this building.
- The arcade is the expression of indoor/outdoor but Klauder used arcades as a connector. On this plan, the arcade is the moment and other details from Klauder were added on.
- What makes this building special – create a hierarchy.
- Make the activity of the building evident.
- Materiality – make the building have a unique architecture of its own.
- Dining hall should show engaged student areas.
- Put money where there is a nexus of activity –simplify areas that are not important.

- The dining floor plan – the living room should have a view to the outdoor spaces (they feel like leftover spaces).

DRB Motion

Motion to approve Conceptual Design was made by Candy Roberts. Vote for approval of Conceptual Design was made with the condition that the DRB comments and recommendations, as noted in the recorded DRB meeting notes of December 22, 2014, will be addressed in a future work session or in the next submittal.

Public meeting adjourned on December 11, 2014, at 11:45 a.m.