



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

Office of the Vice President for Finance

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 July 13, 2012

Boulder Campus Item

The University Design Review Board met on Friday, July 13, 2012, in the Tower Room of the Health Sciences Library on the Anschutz Medical Campus.

DRB members present were: Victor Olgyay, John Prosser, Candy Roberts, and Jerry Seracuse. Also present was Teresa Osborne, (ex officio) Office of Budget and Finance, CU System.

CU-Boulder staff members present were: Tom Goodhew, Paul Leef, Wayne Northcutt, Phil Simpson, Tina Wells, and William Arndt of Facilities Management; and Cheryl Kent and Steve Najera of the Student Recreation Center.

Student Recreation Center Facilities Improvements: Design Development

Also present for the discussion were: Ken Wiseman of Cannon Design; Todd Mead and Robin Rooney of Civitas Landscape Architects; and Curtis Cox, Ben Hanlon, and Meg Rapp of Davis Partnership Architects.

Goodhew noted that Lois Brink has left the Design Review Board and Richelle Reilly was unable to attend today's meeting. Therefore the DRB will not be able to give full approval to any aspects of the landscape design at this meeting.

Mead said that the team had gotten clear direction from Facilities Management staff and from the last DRB meeting. The concept of a series of nested ellipses in the plan is still there. The sense of a porch at the entry has been emphasized. There is a grove of trees with seating west of the main entry and near the outdoor pool. Plantings will provide more screening of the pool fence. With the parking moved to the west, the new Sewall Field will provide a large open space near the building, and will have soft edges around the perimeter.

Wiseman said that the work on the entry has contributed to better circulation on the interior. Cox said the entry has been better aligned and relates well to the axis ending at the front of Carlson. The new porch is simple and understated. The arcade has been wrapped around to the east side for better continuity. On the pool side, the windows are simple and centered on the lawn.

On the north side, the room with the climbing wall will have more views to the outside. On the east side of the new entry wing, the windows line up with the windows on the west side. On the far east façade, the new tower element will help join the old and new.

Rapp talked about sustainability strategies. They have worked on the skylights in the big gyms. Energy re-use from the ice rink will be used first for hot water, then for heating the outdoor pool. They are also working with the Recreation Center staff on energy re-use and savings in the laundry system. Goodhew said they have added solar hot water panels for domestic hot water.

MATERIALS

Wiseman showed samples of the translucent panels that will be used in the walls around the ice rink. They are polycarbonate in a neutral color palette. The panels have two layers with an air space between them. They have a subtle lined pattern. Prosser asked if they could be laid with the pattern horizontal on the outside and vertical on the inside. Wiseman said no, the panels have to be used as manufactured. Cox said that the chosen glass has a cool and clean look with a low E rating. The concrete will essentially match the existing, even though the existing is structural and the new will be applied panels. These pre-cast panels will have a slightly warmer color. Roberts said that the colors should match when they are adjacent to existing concrete and/or are part of the same grid.

Seracuse had a question about the polycarbonate and the aluminum around the frames. Wiseman said that the panels are tongue-and-groove and the aluminum will not show. Cox said that the roof tile is a three-color mist. The sandstone walls will be pinker and chunkier than other main campus buildings, but will be similar to the existing building. Leef asked about the parapet walls. Cox said they will be stone where they are visible from the ground and colored concrete elsewhere.

COMMENTS

Prosser asked about a space for a stage in the pool area. The pool would be between the stage and the audience and the seating would extend up the hillside. He asked that the landscaping of the hillside seating strips be simplified. Seracuse had concerns about the location of the grill area near the pool. He asked that the team bring more detailed larger scale drawings of the pool area to the next presentation.

Prosser referred to the page in the packet that showed campus precedents of windows. All of them have surrounds. There are only a few buildings without window surrounds and they are not widely admired for their design. Roberts said that she was pleased with the changes since last time, but that there is still a lot of work to be done on the entry. She suggested that they look at the drawings for C4C – not for design but for the process. The entry needs to be a celebratory place. She felt that there should be no lintels about the openings on the arcade.

Olgvay said that the packet had a good energy analysis. He still has concerns, however, about the polycarbonate panels. Roberts expressed concerns about the new tower and door on the east. It needs more detailing. Although it is primarily an exit from the stair tower, the door could be used for special events when access is needed to the new terrace near the tennis courts. She also asked if some planters could be added to the wall east of the new outdoor pool. Seracuse asked for more detail on the paving patterns here. He also wondered if some roll-out awnings could be installed here, as it could become very hot in the late afternoon sun.

Roberts asked for some night view renderings; unlike academic buildings, this facility is used more at night. Also needed are larger scale drawings of the porch, the pool, and the most

important (i.e., most visible) elevations. She also asked for some clarification of the issues with the polycarbonate panels.

Although the board was not considering landscape issues, they asked if the green roof was still proposed for the entry porch. Prosser said he was concerned about the number of trees proposed around Sewall Field. The views of Sewall Hall should not be blocked.

It was moved by Seracuse, seconded by Olgvay, to give Design Development approval to the architectural portion of the proposal, with the understanding that the team will respond to the comments listed above at the next presentation. The motion passed unanimously.

Anschutz Medical Campus Item

The University Design Review Board met on Friday, July 13, 2012, in the Tower Room in the Health Sciences Library on the Anschutz Medical Campus.

DRB members present were: Victor Olgvay, John Prosser, Candy Roberts, and Jerry Seracuse. Also present was Teresa Osborne, (ex officio) Office of Budget and Finance, CU System.

Anschutz Campus staff members present were: Roy Alexander, Facilities Management; Kathy McNally, Facilities Management; and Tony Ruiz, Hospital Administration.

Also present for the discussion was Christopher Klein of Davis Partnership Architects.

Rocky Mountain Lions Eye Institute (RMLEI) Renovation and Expansion

Ruiz said that the concept for the project was expansion to the south, horizontally, with future vertical expansion as funding becomes available. Klein showed massing diagrams and photos of a model. The new wing would be two stories and would extend over the existing parking lot, creating a covered drop-off area for vehicles. He said that RMLEI wants a light look that is compatible with the existing structure but conveys a more modern feel. There is a three-story existing atrium which is proposed to be eliminated. A new vertical element in the façade is related to the existing stair tower. The new element marks the new entry. Ruiz said that they are impressed with the new in-patient tower and wants RMLEI to have similar large expanses of glass. There are, however, many places in an eye clinic where bright light is not desired.

Olgvay asked about the deeper floorplates on the new upper stories. Klein said that the floorplates would be much wider, and the check-in and waiting areas, now on the south edge, would be more to the middle; the exam and treatment areas would surround them. This will also give better control over daylight coming into the waiting areas. New surgical rooms would be on the second floor. In the exam areas on the third floor, daylight would be visible at the end of the exam lanes.

Prosser asked about the columns; Klein said they were on a grid of 30-38 feet. Cars would now be dropping off under the building, which is desirable because in recent years this has become a valet parking area. Now visitors will be able to wait under cover.

Seracuse asked about landscaping under the drop-off. He also asked about the proposed curve on the southeast corner of the new addition. Klein said that planting would be difficult under the building, and that the round corner was simply a way of making the building stand out when viewed from the streets.

Seracuse also asked about the materials. Klein said the brick would be the same as the existing building with some new areas of metal panels. The future 4th and 5th floors would be over the existing 3rd level floorplate, set back from the new addition. The structure would be designed, however, so that the entire building might eventually go to five floors. Seracuse said he would like to see more massing models.

Prosser said that he would like to see the existing atrium remain. Without it, the new space could become oppressive and heavy, unlike the light and airy feeling of other campus buildings. It would also help orient visitors to the layout of the clinic. Prosser also suggested that the upper floor addition might curve as it connects to the adjacent Cancer Center. It would reflect the curved walls of that building and would bring in more light.

Seracuse suggested that the vehicular entry might be more prominent, as it will mask the actual front door. Roberts said that the covered drop-off will work well (like a similar building at Porter Hospital). She is concerned, however, about the “sea of columns” under the new addition. The building needs to be visually brought to the ground. Seracuse suggested that some sort of trellis with vines could be installed at the ground level.

Olgay liked the concept. He said that there is a huge opportunity to bring light into the building where it is needed. He noted that the entry sequence, at the drop-off, could help patients adjust to the light change both going in and coming out. Prosser asked that comfortable seating be put in the valet parking area.

As this was an introductory conceptual presentation, no formal action was requested or given. Seracuse asked only that better massing options be brought with the next presentation. He stressed that in all health-related facilities, “human” spaces need to be developed.