



**University Design Review Board  
Summary of the Meeting of  
Thursday, July 9, 2015**

**University of Colorado Boulder  
Institute of Behavioral Science  
#155**

---

**DRB members present:** Don Brandes, Victor Olgyay, Michael Winters, and Teresa Osborne (ex officio).

Not present: Rick Epstein.

**Center for Academic Success and Excellence (CASE)**

Presenter(s): Wayne Northcutt

Architect(s): BOORA Architects/OZ Architecture

Description: Design Development presentation.

**Campus/Consultant Attendance:**

Derek Brandt, CU Student / DRB Note taker; David Danielson, CU-Boulder; Rob Dean, CU-Boulder; Nick Fiore, CU-Boulder; Tom Goodhew, CU-Boulder; Bill Haverly, CU-Boulder; Shannon Horn, CU-Boulder; Amy Kirtland, CU-Boulder; Kevin MacLennan, CU-Boulder; Wayne Northcutt, CU-Boulder; Richelle Reilly, CU-Boulder; Robin Suits, CU-Boulder; Michael Tingley, BOORA Architects; Scott O'Brien, GH Phipps Construction; Matt Leach, NORESCO; Amber Leach, NORESCO; Rick Petersen, OZ Architecture; and David Schafor, OZ Architecture.

**DRB Action: Center for Academic Success and Excellence (CASE)**

A motion to approve design development was made by Don Brandes and seconded by Mike Winters. The motion is contingent upon the University of Colorado Campus Architects and Landscape Architects and their ability to coordinate and communicate with the A/E firm to incorporate and consider the following DRB comments and recommendations, as much as practical, into the final design and construction documents.

**Unanimous vote for approval 3-0**

**A. Site and Landscape Comments and Recommendations**

**1. Entryways, Gateways and Connections**

- Grand stairway and entry on the south: Consider a more modest entry sign. See pages 25, 32 and 48...the grand stairway is blocked by the extensive placement of seatwalls. Consider turning the stairway to the west and simplifying the entry to embrace west entry sequence.
- Southeast entry – See pages 49 and 50: Consider reducing the placement and number of stone and concrete walls...review the vertical relationships.
- The connection from UMC seems weak and likely to encourage “cut-throughs” to reach the building. See page 39.
- The terminus of the north staircase to the portal seems unresolved compared to the terminus of the grand stairway to the south. Page 39.

## 2. Terraces

- All three terraces need some landscape feature to signify and further create a “Gateway and Welcome” to the university. See pages 14, 15 and 18. The addition of container trees would accentuate the architecture and the placement of the terraces – which are now hidden.
- The terraces need further articulation in terms of use, activities, services and furnishings. The solar orientation, views and vertical placement of the terraces is extraordinary and should be celebrated. Pages 18 and 20.
- Southwest terrace at Level 4. Consider a plan layout which would relocate the “landscape zone” to the interior of the terrace and allow the entire south edge of the terrace for activation with people. Seeing people along the edges at all three terraces will provide a more welcoming interaction.
- There are still issues of how to integrate certain plant material on the terraces and some of the paths themselves for further exploration and for softening some of the massing.

## 3. Connections and Linkages (Portals and Walkways)

- The concept of the entry portal and gateway to the campus is stronger with the future ceremonial drop-off to define a starting point. Hopefully there will be an opportunity to implement this in future development, and the vision does not get lost.
- See page 49. The Pedestrian Flow Diagram simply needs to have an accompanying site design. We need to decide if the “portal” is an active “place” or a “pass-through/hallway.” The urban design of the space is really a major “plaza” and should be designed to accommodate groups and individuals...kiosks, planters, music, seating, banners, etc.
- The potential addition of some softer landscape elements into the passive spaces defined by the diagram on page 46 would help tie the south end of the plaza at the grand stairway to the north end landscaped berm.
- The café provides an opportunity to help populate the plaza as well.
- At the north plaza edge (overlook), make sure the landscape opens up and frames the views out to the north and into the campus giving it that grand vantage point.
- Flatirons Terrace  
See pages 51-53. Well done! See page 53...skateboarding and the height of the walls without railings. Wing walls seem too thin. Concerned with nuisance flows of landscape terraces. See section on page 52.
- North stair: could some of the detailing from the Flatiron Terrace be relocated and periodically added along the stair journey to encourage gathering along the north stair as well?
- There could be more bike parking on the north side of the building. Consider moving the north hill east to create more room between the drive-through and the hill to create a bigger bike parking zone at the northwest.
- Euclid Avenue  
The south grand stairway could have more connection to the west. A lot of people will be walking from the UMC and the southwest edge of the stair/landscaping feels like a barrier to the entry – not permeable. Consider more bike parking in this location, too.
- The front door and gateway concept would be stronger and more pedestrian friendly if the entry to the garage came in from the west like the other vehicular traffic at this corner.
- The heavy landscaping at the southeast on Euclid Avenue between the sidewalk and office spaces creates a major barrier between the building and the street. The entry to this space at the southeast corner is good, but the corner is also closed and impermeable because of the landscape design. This edge should feel more connected to the street and the landscape design should better create a sense of entry. (We understand this is a secondary entry, but would benefit from a stronger definition of entry and a stronger, more permeable building street relationship.) The southeast corner should be more open and accessible; make this corner a “place” for students to hang out and inhabit.

### Site Planning and Landscape Summary:

The DRB will refer these site and landscape architectural comments and recommendations to the University of Colorado Boulder professional staff to incorporate into the final construction documents at their discretion. The DRB has requested that the final Design Development packet refer or reference the master circulation and access plan that illustrates how the University Club site accommodates the 'roundabout' with the CASE drop-off and entryway.

### B. Sustainability

- Colorado is a special place, with a climate that people yearn to experience. If this building does not recognize that and instead provides an experience that one could have in Ohio, an enjoyable opportunity is missed. The environmental design techniques deployed in this building should enhance the experience of being in Colorado. Our suggestions to do so are as follows:
  - Create several different zones of conditioning in the building. Consider providing a broader comfort zone in large public areas, such as lobbies. "Floating" the temperature with a larger temperature set point range in the multi-story lobby, will require less space conditioning and may increase occupant satisfaction.
  - Provide operable windows in areas where they can be effective. Specifically, consider them in offices on the perimeter, where they will increase occupant satisfaction and overall building resilience. The building is evidently designed to provide natural ventilation for the atrium; however, this is not clearly indicated in the design. Please show where air intakes and exhaust areas are located to provide atrium ventilation, and how this is integrated into the architecture. Coordinate the natural ventilation scheme with the garage exhaust scheme, so fresh air is brought into the building. Ensure that there is a robust "economizer" design to the mechanical system, with oversized ducts to reduce static pressure and allow for use of Colorado's large diurnal temperature swings for night flushing and precooling.
  - Successful daylighting in this building is more than windows and lighting controls. Provide glare control as well; ideally will be exterior shading of south-facing windows designed to seasonally control sunlight, shading in the summer to reduce solar heat gain, controlling glare, and providing beneficial solar heat gain in the winter. Other strategies to control glare, such as interior light shelves, could be evaluated and also work. The shading and daylighting strategy must be designed in context with the elevations, and may be different on different orientations. The lobby daylighting strategy (sawtooth vs. skylight) should be considered from the exterior as well as interior. Some controlled direct sunlight on the interior atrium walls could be spectacular and delightful. Consider utilizing more vertical glazing to replace the horizontal skylights. If vertical clerestories are facing south, useful seasonal heat gain and shading is possible. Also, the east vertical wall has potential exterior glazing, perhaps coordinated with ventilation.
  - Once daylight is let into the building, ensure that it is well distributed throughout the occupied spaces. For example, the conference areas adjacent to the atrium could have windows into the atrium and borrow daylight from the central space. In general, use light-colored materials in the interior design to reduce shadows and ensure good light distribution, and try to maintain transparency into offices and other enclosed spaces so they can "borrow" and "lend" light.
  - Consider further applying the results of the energy analysis to the design. While the pEUI appears to be good, there are likely additional cost-effective opportunities to employ. There is a substantial heating load remaining, and it was unclear from our discussion and documentation if this is an envelope insulation (u-value) issue or ventilation-driven issue. Perhaps both. The former can be addressed by using a better wall and window specification – a better window u-value would be a worthwhile

investment. Ventilation loads might be addressed with heat recovery ventilation (HRV).

#### C. Architecture

- The general language of the building is consistent with the campus. The big picture ideas are resolved; good gateway portal concept.
- Architectural considerations – to look at how the detailing can be further in line with other buildings with similar groupings of windows; to help break down some of the massing, and add richness.
- Ensure that the portal is light and engaging.
  - The patterning on the pass-through is successful. Be careful that the detailing and material is done to a quality level consistent with the campus and the sandstone on the outside walls. It must not look like “cheap” cement board. Look at the window detail (head/jamb/sill) to create unique and high-quality detail at the window. This is not yet demonstrated in the submittal.
  - Three samples of the “Fibre C” material were presented. There was not much contrast between two of them. Perhaps two textures are sufficient as depicted in the elevation drawings.
  - Bridges: The bridges should define the portal and gateway. They should be the architectural focus of the space.
  - Bridges: Lighten up the structure at the top and bottom as much as possible. Perhaps a full height truss will decrease the beam depths. Exposed ducts will allow a very shallow edge profile. Clear glass with vertical butt joints will help create transparency and delicacy.
  - The glass inside of the portal on both the east and west walls should be as clear as possible to provide transparency and interaction between inside and out.
- What is the detail of the metal spandrel panel – is there a pattern or is it flat? While the language is acceptable, we were hoping for a more unique interpretation of the campus architectural language and detailing for this vertical element.
- The windows/building at the base on the south should be better developed to provide pedestrian interest. It is too bad the colonnade was eliminated – that provided a strong scaling element. This could be done with a secondary pattern of columns to provide rhythm, a different header detail, or more relief in the stone, etc. This detailing should be then integrated with the landscape approach.
- Look carefully at the typical single or double punched window detail to ensure it has a quality and care consistent with this building. As shown, it looks to be too stripped down.
- On the north elevation, it would be ideal to better express the lobby/atrium. There is an opportunity at the northwest corner of the space where it turns from the pass-through space to the north elevation to make this a “special” corner to reveal the important public function contained within. Look at the plan to support this idea.
- The deck and façade outside the auditorium still seem underdeveloped. We discussed making this a real “place” and integrating some type of shading, recess, etc. Given the orientation, this will have great views but also will suffer from overheating and could have some of the problems of the big deck at the UMC which does not have enough definition. The architecture here should also help reveal this as an important gathering space – it is not expressed yet as a special part of the building or a special outdoor space that is tightly integrated with the building.
- The west elevation still seems underdeveloped. This is a very important side as seen from Broadway and the UMC, especially given the big parking lot/service area here which will ensure it will be highly visible for a long time to come. The articulation of the gable wall and the southwest corner are especially important to develop to better articulate this side.
- The west elevation at the stair cores could have some window articulation to help break down the mass and provide a more appealing façade from the approach road and daylight to the stairs.
- The deck and doors at the auditorium are a missed opportunity to make this a really unique and interesting side of the building.

**RC2 N Antenna – CU Anschutz Medical Campus (via conference call)**

Presenter(s): Andre Vite & Mike Vigil, CU Denver/Anschutz

Architect(s): City of Aurora Information Technology/Public Safety

Description: Add Antenna to Building Rooftop.

**Campus/Consultant Attendance:**

Derek Brandt, CU Student / DRB Note taker; Andre Vite, CU Anschutz; Doug Abraham and Jeff Cohen, CU Anschutz Medical Campus Police Department, and Mike Meehan, Project Manager.

Andre Vite – Campus Architect

There will be a series of six antenna approximately 15 - 17' tall, 2.5" diameter that can be any color. Only 13' will be visible from behind the parapet wall.

Doug Abraham - Chief of Police

- This project is replacing a 196' three-legged mast located at one of the police sub-stations with a group of six antennas. The existing 15 year-old radio system is no longer adequate due to the growth of buildings blocking signals on parts of the campus.
- The City of Aurora will replace our equipment if we let them use our buildings to provide adequate radio coverage. There will be access to the Digital Trunk radio system state-wide.

Mike asked if they could be placed 2 x 2, and have three rows, or line all six up if there's space. Doug replied that there is existing equipment so they are going to have to be in an 'L' space along the NE corner to dodge the existing equipment.

On behalf of the DRB, Don noted that this project is mutually beneficial to the City of Aurora and the university. He asked them to locate the 'L' shape layout. He also noted that it is a fairly benign improvement that won't dramatically affect the architecture.

**Unanimous vote for approval 3-0**

