



Office of the Vice President for Finance

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

University Design Review Board
Minutes
Thursday, January 12, 2012

Table with 2 columns: Name, Attendance (Y/N). Rows include Victor Olgyay, Candy Fudge Roberts, Chair, Lois Brink, John Prosser, Jerry Seracuse, and Teresa Osborne - ex officio.

Agenda Items

UCCS Master Plan Update

- a. Architects: Ayers Saint Gross
b. Presenters: Kevin King, ASG & Gary Reynolds, UCCS
c. Campus staff present were: Gary Reynolds, UCCS

Summary of presentation:

This was a Web-Ex to update the DRB on the progress of the UCCS Master Plan.

ASG Introduction:

Campus plan has progressed a lot, although it has not been shown to the campus yet.

Today's presentation will:

- 1) review concept plan and program
2) present the results from an open house workshop
3) present the latest campus organization/design

At this point, ASG is done with the initial take of the campus, and is in a 'holding pattern' while the strategic plan is being developed. In February, the Master Plan (ten years) and Strategic Plan (eight years) will be combined and merged. The meeting will be a discussion with a more definitive plan/findings coming in March. A draft of this compilation will be presented in March to the DRB and to the Board of Regents in April.

ASG Presentation:

The goals of the UCCS Master Plan are:

- 1) Respect natural and cultural factors
2) Reinforce vibrant campus anchors
3) Connect campus destinations

Circulation Improvements:

- 1) Transit spine, independent of existing road network and traffic hassles
2) Pedestrian spine - enhance existing circulation to create a backbone

- 3) Recreation trails - expand pedestrian network outwards to connect with community network of trails

#### North Campus Program Elements:

Consolidate Athletics, move Performing/Visual Arts to this area; provide a Clinic/Research Component, Recreation Fields, Residential Student Housing (village concept w/ 900 bed minimum)

#### Summary of Community Workshop:

Asked two questions to workshop participants:

- 1) What would attract and retain students?
  - student life – community residence halls
  - unique natural landscape
  - quality and breadth of academic curriculum
  - small class sizes (intimate nature of classes and relationships w/ professors)
- 2) Where will the core of campus be?
  - second campus center needed to the north where future growth possible
  - strong desire to keep academic functions together (not spread out all over campus)
  - spine is important for connectivity
  - managing and increasing parking capacity (looking at structured parking, etc)
  - removing surface parking from core

At the workshop, a design charrette was held. Participants were given cut-outs of program elements and asked to produce a campus layout for 20,000 students, including housing, parking, classrooms, recreation, etc.

From the charrette, three main options emerged:

- 1) Compact core: academic in core, housing/athletic/parking at outside periphery
- 2) Second core along North Nevada: second core connected to existing core with student life in between – similar to dumbbell shape. Very dependent on transit between two cores.
- 3) Expand to north at Alpine Village - more mixture of uses, better for pedestrians and not as reliant on transit.

#### ASG Preferred Option:

- Based on constraints map, such as topography, culturally significant areas.
- Hope to engage campus population with protected resources – these areas not just set-aside but an active part of learning experience.
- 'Future Campus Organization' slide is the preferred alternative at this point.
- 'Preliminary Draft Plan' – initial pass at applying building footprints to plan

#### Overview of ASG Preferred Option:

Northern end - Oriented to Pulpit Rock; contains large sports venue, natatorium, parking with access off North Nevada, outdoor stadium, baseball field and competitive fields.

Opportunity for development of a field house.

#### North Nevada:

Main street idea with performing arts, upper division housing, clinic/research space; opportunity for future expansion to east with acquisition of Eagle Rock Village; provides green space which connects to the existing underpass (good for access to arts events and sporting events located to the north); utilize parking as a buffer on east side of main street roadway to protect views from neighborhood.

#### Arroyos Area:

- archaeological sensitive area
- village concept with a mixture of housing and research.
- green space frame views to Pikes Peak.
- transit link coming through this area.
- close one neighborhood road, which allows reallocation of road for transit only.
- building orientations conducive for incorporation of sustainable design concepts.

#### Alpine Village:

Contains: recreation center, housing, dining, student union, parking structure to replace parking which serves recreation center and Alpine Village; consolidated parking would allow new buildings in this area; new parking structure could have recreation field on top, at elevation of Alpine Village, to extend that space out to the west

North Campus Summary Slide (slide 30) shows capacity and expansion numbers

Core and East Campus MP mostly infill

Preliminary Draft Plan (slide 32)

#### Summary of DRB Discussion:

**Overall:** The packet was comprehensive with thoughtful solutions. The DRB would like a stronger correlation between the plan layout and the first slide of vision/concept revealing what is special and unique about the campus. It was noted that the mixture of uses across campus and the connection provided by the spine is a good idea.

**East Zone:** The long-term plan for the east zone (where nursing is currently located) has not been addressed yet. It will come forward when the strategic plan and the master plan come together in February.

**The transportation network:** it is critical to the success of the overall master plan. Campus Planning shows great understanding of program, but isn't perhaps resolved in three dimensional on how to provide a pedestrian-scaled experience and how it relates to existing Colorado Springs community. 20-25% structured parking is a good starting point; assumption for planning purposes. Parking location near performing arts: What is the next phase for this parking? How does it transition to structured parking? Perhaps the parking/buffer should be along Nevada, not by Eagle Rock neighborhood to make more sense in the long term.

**Areas for further consideration:** parking, massing (how will topography/hydrology influence massing for the Arroyo Village?), and sustainability. Would like to see same approach to the northern area (hydrology/wind/solar). Need information on how to protect solar access for buildings. Arid climates, southwest, arroyas would be suggested studies/areas to be included. How can the architectural systems across campus, that have been inventoried, be combined and married? What are suggestions for building materials going forward? How do edges/boundaries become blurred? What are the future plans of Heller?

**Building Massing:** On topic of massing, the site demands attention to matching massing with nature of site to prevent structures from being overpowering on site. Extraordinary opportunity presented by solar access and the fact that the campus doesn't go into shadows in the afternoon. Expansion of campus and buildings is a critical issue. Wants to know the acreage of the Eagle Rock subdivision and for the area to be factored in to the potential future growth as the area is all developable land.

**Conservation Areas:** Label protected areas as conservation zones, not preservation areas. The conservation title allows for the space to be used as an amenity and asset. DRB agrees with not allowing buildings in these zones, but would like to see trails and recreations areas extended into these zones to better integrate them into campus.

**Other comments:** Athletic Layouts: natatorium needs to go into sunlight, not on northeast side of building. The Alpine Village units are too geometric, whereas all other buildings are more organic layout. The Master plan needs to include a site for a natural amphitheatre, even if it's just simple. There has been lots of talk about making one and it is a great opportunity to connect 'town and gown.'

**Recommendations:** Spend time with visioning, not just programmatic delivery. The current plan doesn't present itself as hillside concept. Sustainability must incorporate relationship of building to site, particularly with topography, hydrology and storm water; explore architectural precedence for integration of site and architecture (i.e., hilltowns, buildings in arid climates, other arroyo areas, etc.); concern about cost-effective building sites, site costs are potentially very high due to topography; review minutes from September 9 and bring back examples of how to combine building and site.

General consensus was that Web-Ex was a good tool/experience.  
Meeting adjourned at 2:50.



**Board Action:**

Conceptual Design: *Approve/Disapprove*  
 Schematic Design: *Approve/Disapprove*  
 Design Development: *Approve/Disapprove*

No action required. General decision to move forward with design

Location:	1800 Grant St. - Denver Conference Rooms 502, 503
Time:	2:50-3:35
DRB members present:	Y/N
Victor <u>Olgyay</u>	Y
Candy Fudge <u>Roberts</u> , Chair	Y
Lois <u>Brink</u>	Y
John <u>Prosser</u>	Y
Jerry <u>Seracuse</u>	Y
Teresa <u>Osborne</u> - ex officio	Y



**AMC Major Entry Signage**

a. Design Team:

- Barbara G – artist from Tucson, AZ
- Mark K – LA – lead designer
- Jamie R – LA – Project Manager
- Kelly – LA and Graphic Artist
- Ken – project manager from the University

b. Campus staff present were:

- Ken Neeper
- Kathy McNally

 Summary of presentation:

This was a pre-design meeting for signage on the perimeter.

The approach is that it is more than a sign. It is an opportunity to create an icon to be there 100 years. They see an opportunity to create a boundary marker, as discussed in design guidelines. They recognize and respect the current plan, recognize it gained approval from the chancellor and donor, but also want to bring a fresh look to what was done before. The team hopes to get out and interview three entities on campus to ensure each one is represented in the piece. Hope to create a lasting impression, such as “balloon boy” at Children’s Hospital, and desire to illicit an emotional response from people.

There is a challenge in how best to overcome the fact that the pedestrian bridge blocks the view when arriving from the highway. Lighting also will be important with dark afternoons.

Design Team appreciates the level of detail in RFP, but also sees opportunity to take the design a step further. Team will take iconic approach to the design, analyze how best to incorporate hardscape, lighting, landscape design. It is not just about dressing up the existing design, but rather to come up with something fresh. Sees this as a high profile project, with an aggressive timeline (in ground by September 2012).

DRB Comments:

**Design Development** : ‘More than graphics’ approach is a significant concept. This will be the entry into a place of education, research and treatment. It should be welcoming and peaceful to soul. It should be a threshold to something different, a transition to a place where someone will help/heal you. It must illicit a spirit of hope. The DRB appreciates design team’s approach and recognition of the vision. The original plan didn’t respond to scale, landscape. DRB agrees with design team that it needs to be something more.

**History of Campus:** The parties involved on the campus have worked very hard with veterans’ groups. This project needs to respect the history of the place and its previous life as a veterans’ hospital. Building 500 was the original hospital on the campus. Since 1997, a lot effort has been expended to make campus comprehensive and cohesive. The University campus design centered around five words: integration, interdisciplinary, inter-professional, inter-industry, international (link to DIA). It was suggested that the design team review a copy of the history study done in 1998 as a good resource.

 Board Action:

Conceptual Design:	<i>Approve/Disapprove</i>
Schematic Design:	<i>Approve/Disapprove</i>
Design Development:	<i>Approve/Disapprove</i>

No action required. General decision to move forward with design