MEETING NOTES
University Design Review Board

Tuesday, June 3, 2014

University of Colorado Boulder
Folsom Field
East Stadium Club Level (5th floor) North Side Room

Design Review Board Members Present:
Candy Roberts
Victor Olgyay
Rick Epstein
Don Brandes
Teresa Osborne (ex officio)

CU Boulder Staff Present:
Athletics – Tom McGann
Architect – William Haverly
Planner – Tom Goodhew
Minutes – William Arndt

10:00 – 11:30 Grounds and Recycling Facility

Presenter(s): Aller Lingle & Massey; Brad Massey
Description: Schematic Design and Design Development

Presentation:
Brad Massey
• The team has explored a refinement of elevations and jointing patterns.
• Brought samples of materials, trims, precast.
• Refined the north-west side of project.
• The team has been on site exploring mockups with IPF personnel.
• Explored and included in the design additional scoring details.

Jason
• The team has refined the landscape plan.
• Planting language is mostly shrub areas with tree canopy above.
• The design reflects elevating terrain to mitigate the apparent size of the fence.
• The total height of the fence is no different than previous iterations.
- Design shows a robust stand of evergreens to screen the building with deciduous trees closer to pond, downhill to the east.
- Fencing is to be a system of precast panel [like the building] interspersed with black vinyl privacy slats in chain link fence.
- Highly visible areas near the walk/trail will be concrete and return to chain link fence in less visible areas.
- Fence is about 30% precast concrete.

Brad
- Developed the entry to the south with additional handicap stall.
- The team has resolved parking area cross-slopes.
- Design includes a 14’x15’ plaza area creating an edge condition separating people and vehicles.
- A low seat-wall wraps around west, surrounding a tree grate.

Material Samples:
- Looking at 2 types of precast concrete.
- There is an architectural plant and a structural plant.
- Architectural plant concrete is significantly more expensive.
- Structural plant can mix 4 colors.
- Board form will not add additional cost.

Design Review Board Comments:

Don Brandes
- Appreciates adding the plaza area in parking but not sure seat wall is necessary.
- Suggests additional benches instead of seat wall.

Candy Roberts
- Suggests that the parking area plaza wall is too small.
- If it is to be a seat wall it would be great to the north or west.
- Agrees with the suggestion of benches.

Don Brandes
- Refers to fence and gates on Page 7.
  o Suggests team should study design and construction materials for gates.
  o Some treatments could use more detail/relief.
- Refers to the plating plan on page 11.
  o Planting plan needs refinement. Currently missing some plants and call-outs.
- Refers to mulch/groundcover on page 16.
- Refers to the combination of precast and black clad vinyl, pages 15-19.
  o Suggests a dark green instead of black vinyl.
  o If precast concrete is used, even in 4’ sections could use green screening and color.
  o Suggests clematis or weigelia to add variety and color.
- Refers to the green screen on page 20.
  o Suggests a 4’ modular metal screen attached to façade.
  o Possibility of a green screen to the northwest where the trail comes by to the building.
  o Increase precast with green screen treatment.
  o Also suggests introducing green screen language as a portion of the entryway.

Rick Epstein
- Suggests something over the front of the wall to become a little more architectural.
Don Brandes -
• Where the gates are visible we would like to minimize black vinyl and add some sort of screening.
• Asked what is the distance from fence to path. [answer] about 15 feet.
• Being so visible by trail users, an organic groundcover would enhance the area.

Candy Roberts
• Does the fence have to be so high? - [answer] yes, there are materials that sit at 9’ high that must be screened.

Rick Epstein
• Regarding the mechanical screen, there is an opportunity to integrate more with the language of the building, not just an add-on - [answer] - Brad Massey: the perspectives are drawn with the mechanical screening.
  o Designed to be hidden from view. Will only see mechanical screening from parking garage.
• Suggests team should integrate mechanical screening with the rest of the building language.
• Appreciates the work that has been done. See the building as an attractive addition to campus.
• Thought the team went a little too far with creating a punched window look.
  o Suggests an open-lantern look to open up the building interior with light.
• Refers to pg. 29 second floor plan.
  o The stair seems huge.
  o Suggests it can tighten up a little bit, more lantern like or storefront like.
• Refers to travel path on the first floor.
  o Garden may be integrated a little better.
  o Look at re-working interior stairs at west to create a more refined plan and elevational resolution to the west entry.
• There is an opportunity to be more aggressive with horizontal and vertical banding.
  o In some places there is a double band below the windows.
  o Would suggest letting board-form stop under the windows.
• Vertical joints are precast panel width.
  o Look at a reveal so it looks like a double line maybe at every other panel.
  o This is a small thing that will add a lot of detail.

[response Brad Massey]
• Board form steps up at corners to follow the language of stepped up floors in building.

Rick Epstein
• At entrance would rather widen the glazing.
• The entry garden is great but could be better integrated with the entry tower.

Tom Goodhew –
• IPF and Recycling personnel rely on function of interior wall space.
• Careful in adding too many windows.

Victor Olgyay
• Refers to the interior floor plan.
• There is a huge opportunity in the EW hallway.
• Get windows on either end of hallway.
• Creates an organizing element and also natural light and ventilation.

Candy Roberts
• Suggests getting rid of the fence. [at least try to make the chain link vinyl go away]
• Opportunity to put green on the building. [or the wall, but preferably the corners of the building and entry]
• This would say a lot about the function of the building and sustainable initiatives of campus.
[response Jason]
  - Would you be opposed to ivy/vines climbing on the building?

[answer Candy Roberts]
  - Would not be opposed at all. If designed intentionally can be a nice element.

Candy Roberts
  - If you want board form you must go with architectural plant.
  - Suggests that detailing out elevations would be helpful.
  - It would be great to get larger-sized samples [4x4] out on the site to see how it looks.

Rick Epstein
  - Board forming would add a lot of character to the building.

Tom Goodhew
  - Until the team can pin down the supplier, it will be hard to decide which detail to go with.
  - Stresscon is the company CU-Boulder has typically worked with.

Don Brandes
  - There are 3 factors that could drive the decision.
  - The relative cost reduction puts me in the structural camp.
  - Visibility of board form character needs to be evaluated.
  - The color and texture differentiation between the parking structure and the Grounds Building may inform a reasonable and cost-effective solution.

Victor Olgyay
  - What we are looking for is differentiation in texture and some contrast.

Rick Epstein
  - Green screen type screening material.
  - Alternatives to black vinyl.
  - Extend green screen to building.
  - Entry and eliminating the wall.
  - Stair orientation.
  - Daylighting inside.
  - Integrated design.
  - Mechanical screening.
  - Come to finalized decisions with color, scoring, texture, board forming.
  - Adding more windows to band.
  - Main entrances to east and west more lantern-like, as day lighting opportunity inside building.

Don Brandes
  - Based on my previous comments, I would defer final design resolution for site and landscape improvements to Richelle Reilly (Campus Landscape Architect) on the appropriate use and placement of either clad/cyclone fencing or the placement of the concrete fencing. I also would suggest that the use of the wire screen vines be further examined.
  - Communicate with Rochelle and Tom on appropriation of fencing and cladding as discussed today and reflected in written comments.

Candy Roberts
  - Develop a strategy to test samples on site or perhaps an existing building with chosen materials.

Tom Goodhew
• It will probably be a couple months until a mock-up test on site.

**Design Review Board moves to grant DD approval with conditions as discussed in meeting notes:**

Candy Roberts – motions to grant DD approval  
Don Brandes - seconds  
Rick Epstein – in favor  
Victor Olgyay - in favor

11:45 – 12:15  **Lunch Break**

12:15 – 2:45  **Athletics Complex Site Design & Design Development**

Presenter(s): Populous - Michael Ray, Brian Smith, Jeremy Krug  
Description: Schematic Design  
1. Indoor Practice Facility  
Design Development  
1. North East Corner Building

**IPF Building Presentation:**

Michael Ray
- Site sections  
  o Unifying composition at existing stadium field level carries through locker rooms and onto indoor practice field.  
  o Two layers of parking under field.  
  o Pedestrian connection overtop the weight room.  
- Added variety of egress and entry points.  
  o Two at south primarily for football players. 10’ wide to provide egress for events in stadium.  
  o Lower exit at northwest corner.  
  o Exits are designed for 2000 people.  
  o 580 structured parking spaces now, but still working out details.  
  o Will get back to DRB with a range of min/max spaces.

Don Brandes
- Are you satisfied that one entrance for access and egress is adequate for the parking structure?

Michael Ray
- Fighting against grade, trying to allow for maximum egress.  
- Code consultant has been brought back on board to further develop.  
- Confirms that the indoor track goes underneath Folsom Field end zone. [~20 feet]  
  - With 18 inches of root zone [typical green roof section].

Teresa Osborne
- Is the top of the roof of IPF level with the club seating?  
- How high does the peak come up to the existing stadium building?
Tom McGann—
- Should be able to see over the building from the clubhouse at Folsom Field. Will sit ~55’ above grade.

Michael Ray
- We will be able to see over the IPF building.

Michael Ray –
- IPF North Elevation.
  - Windows have been redesigned to read as one system.
  - Materials would include sandstone, precast trim, red tile roof, Kalwall and steel divisions.
- IPF West Elevation.
  - Resolved 25’ grade change with wall and stair system.
  - Transparent windows as opposed to translucent.
- IPF East Elevation.
  - In every case but the west elevation windows will be Kalwall.

Tom
- Is there a way for the precast to protrude? - [answer] working with a precaster now to see what is possible.
- At minimum, only a 2 inch protrusion. Would like to get 4 inches.

Operations Northeast Corner Building Presentation:

Michael Ray
- Recovery pools for athletes.
- Administrative areas.
- Roof terrace.
- East elevation starting to see louvers appear.
- Added an entry porch to the bottom of the tower to integrate into the exterior grand stair.
- North elevation created a gable end to break up directionality of roof lines.
- West elevation shows exhaust louvers that exhaust into area between building and Dal Ward.
  - Bringing in historic chimney language that is functional and aesthetic.

Candy Roberts
- Asked where the shiner materials are used - [answer] shiner is in column and in loggias.

Rick Epstein
- Lower level looks taller but in some renderings the lower level looks equal to upper levels.
- There should be some variation in arcade heights from lower level to upper level.
- The decorative railing might be more dominant than what is shown in the renderings.

Michael Ray
- In the athletic coaches’ office area, moved stairs and elevator to create a receptionist desk and waiting room in the tower.

Tom
- Athletic coaches’ office reception area is a really nice addition.

Michael Ray
- Enlarged plan at corner building entry - 3’ wide corridor is uncomfortable.
- Opportunity to raise grade about 2’, eliminate some stairs and eliminate rail.
  - Opens up entry.
- Including 2 elevator wells with one operational elevator installed, other for the future.
• Model - clerestory elements introduced in retail area.
• Stair landing to remain open, with visual connection through wall.

Candy Roberts
• Is there any landscaping in the plan?

Tom Goodhew
• Suggested exploring opportunity for climbing vegetation.

Don Brandes – Comments for the NE Building
• The ADA and general parking at the entryway seem very constrained. It would be ideal to allow more pedestrian space at the entryway.
• The parking lot, drop-off and stairway entry do not seem clear to me in terms of grading, pavement materials, landscape, lighting, signage and furnishings.
• The NE Building, Practice Facility, Stairway, and Drop-off area need to be studied as one design element in terms of entryways, accessibility, materials and scale. They are all connected.

Victor Olgyay
• Asymmetrical roof at base of the tower does not bring resolution to the base of the tower.

Candy Roberts
• Appreciates what the asymmetrical base of tower is doing, but not sure about aesthetics.
• Don’t really feel any entrances are as strong as they could be. North corner entry seems the most resolved.
• Suggests exploration into “great” entryways.
• Window articulation in tower “just feels good.”

Rick Epstein
• Closed corners in tower entry make it feel too solid. Look at entry/tower base to make it more open and inviting. The area needs a more graceful transition from the road and plaza. There needs to be an elimination of 3 or 4 parking spaces to ensure that the transition from parking to entry (including ramp) is successful.
• Not sure massiveness of tower base quite works from elevational, spatial, experiential perspective.
• Not as robust a resolution.
• Downward sloping roof at tower base is not inviting as an entry. Re-work the roof at the entry to better integrate with the tower base and entry.
• Appreciates differentiation in tower windows.

Victor Olgyay
• Agrees with Don Brandes, thinks it is important to move the parking spaces away from the ticket office and entrance.
• Strange moment at tower base and base of stairs. Could benefit from opening up the space.

Rick Epstein
• Little random pieces left over from trying to resolve different conditions at the west end of the north elevation. Re-work the elements to create a simpler and stronger composition.
• Still feels like it needs another pass to order elements together.
• The robustness of the CU look is evident in the design but there is still a jumbled, foreign vocabulary in some cases.
• Not convinced a gable roof is the answer for northwest corner.
• Suggested further exploration.
• Perhaps the bridge can be open and not covered, or use a flat roof.
Candy Roberts
- Suggested a flat roof for the pedestrian bridge is enclosed.
- Liked the precast concrete sample.

Victor Olgyay
- Asked about the temporary stairs. [answer] only for the first season, if main stair can be opened for use, not necessary.

Rick Epstein
- Suggested exploring the grand stair area to improve flow, widen.
- Minority of the stairs flow, most stairs resolve into a wall. Make the clear flow area more direct.
- Suggested team look at terraced instead of huge walls between the different levels. Consider landscaping in these areas.

Candy Roberts
- Architecturally the buttresses work. Maybe they are less pronounced.
- Suggests moving top stair towards wall; widening landings.

Tom McGann
- Liked design now because it allows for 3 tiers of security on game day.

Victor Olgyay
- Suggested team explore additional planters or other ways to soften the grand stair space.

Chris
- Structure has been analyzed to be a cost effective solution, still have a clay tile roof, allow for buildings to interact with one another.
- Looked at multiple structure types before budget drove the current structural solution.
- Articulation, daylighting, views, campus aesthetics, building skin are close to budget.

Michael Ray
- The fact that a 300 meter track is inside the building really drives many of the design decisions.

Design Review Board Comments:

Don Brandes – NE Operation Building
- Please carefully review previous DRB comments for the NE Operations Building.
  - Resolution of layout and grading for adjacent parking, ADA, entry stair plan and elevations, and landscape treatments next to building.
  - Resolution of field side elevations from study to final drawing.
    - Resolution of layout and grading for adjacent parking, ADA, entry stair plan and elevations, and landscape treatments next to building.
    - Resolution of field side elevations from study to final drawing.
- IPF
  - Pg. 4 – need site improvement plan and grading plan for IPF building.
  - Pg. 4 – the schematic design for IPF building and design development for NE operations building; need to delineate the horizontal and vertical relationship of adjoining drop-off area, entry stair plan and parking structure access.
  - Pages 8-11: modify views to show access drive and pedestrian walks. Show views from across Boulder Creek.
  - Pg. 9 - drainage from the roof - would use of parapet help?
  - Pg. 14- consider views from roof from 6th and 7th floors of stadium and NE operations building.
Candy Roberts
- Stated that the project could benefit from moving the IPF 20 yards [60 feet] south.
- This would mean one end zone instead of two.
- Important to go on the record that direction is led by football program and athletic facilities.

Rick Epstein
- Appreciated picking up field as datum.
- Renaming IPF as a field house. On campuses around the nation, buildings like this are called fieldhouses.
- The building can’t just feel like a metal building covering a field. It should mean more.
- Should strive for collegiate aesthetic.
- Maybe we should think about the name with a donor-named fieldhouse.
- Suggested looking at other fieldhouses such as Dartmouth, Penn State, or Iowa.
- Using an arched roof, metal could make sense. Would be iconic on Boulder campus.
- What is the nature of the building on this campus?
- Moving building south gives move breathing room from the city, from the creek, etc.
- Concern that there is not enough room between the north wall and the entry drive. It is very pinched, especially given the size of the wall.
- Suggested IPF windows may not be best as Kalwall. Right now appears to have a punched window look where Kalwall typically is more of a larger surface.
- Anticipates concern over the scale of the north wall.

Victor Olgyay
- Massing is quite impressive.
- What are the options for the roof? Seems like there are issues [snow, rain, gables] still to be resolved.
  - If we go to a metal roof it certainly shouldn’t look like it is mimicking clay tile roofs.

Candy Roberts
- If we go with a gabled roof, it should be clay tile.
- There are multiple generations of clay tile on campus; maybe explore coloration, patterning.
- As the building elevates to the north, beginning to feel unauthentic.
- Suggests doing something on the ends and corners to give the building a style.

Don Brandes –Comments on the Practice Facility
- The floor plate (width and length) and finish floor elevation (FFE) for the Practice Facility is set. The relative interior peak height of the building is also set.
- From an architectural massing standpoint, there is an issue with the overall character and vernacular of the building that still seems imposing and un-articulated.
- Encourage the team to study alternative wall, roof and massing studies – given that the location, height, width and length are determined, what can be done to enhance the visual appearance of the building.

Teresa Osborne
- Asked what are the horizontal dimensions. [answer] 240 x 400+ feet

Candy Roberts
- Suggested a barrel-shaped arched roof.
- On this campus, if we go with a sloped roof it has to be tile.
- If we keep this structure, handling snowfall, rainfall coming off the roof is going to be a challenge.
- Would like to see application of “authentic,” exposed steel structure of the fieldhouse language.
Bill Haverly
- We have yet to see a design solution that can realistically work within the Boulder campus.
- Ice and snow falling off the IPF rooftop can literally kill someone.
- The building is monstrous. Suggest breaking it up as much as possible.
- Feel confident with the footprint of the building.
- Would like to avoid at all costs redesigning the structure.
- Main order was to move the building out of the floodplain and improve the building as an entrance on Folsom.

Rick Epstein
- Embracing the size of the building and acknowledging the typology of the fieldhouse.
- Reference back to traditional campus might be slowing the process.
  - Building has to very much feel like a CU-Boulder building.
- Make the building iconic on its own terms since it is so unique in scale and function.
- Use the structure and leverage constraints to move design forward.
- How can the structure reinforce light within the building, efficiency, skin, glazing, etc.?
- How can these things reinforce the idea of the building?
- This building has to be designed as an integrated design solution, not just a façade exploration; maybe the structural engineer, landscape architect or mechanical engineer has the architectural solution or a perspective that can help the design.

Victor Olgyay
- An attractive building.
- Dealing with the runoff issues.
- Kalwall will be regretful. Think about clear glass.
- Maybe a different roof shape.
- Maybe adjusting the trusses could be a huge improvement in massing.
- We want to make a building that people are going to be proud of; not the cheapest solution.

Don Brandes
- Foundation and floor plate is set horizontally and vertically.
- Agreement for access, parking, etc.
- Roof plane needs to be studied more. Maybe it is broken up; maybe it is articulated further as two planes.
- Technical consideration that involves drainage, snowmelt on the roof.
- Explore ways to modify or articulate structure without starting over.

**Design Review Board moves to grant DD AND approval with conditions as discussed in meeting notes:**

Motion to approve corner building for DD
Victor Olgyay – motions
Don Brandes – seconded
Rick Epstein – in favor
Candy Roberts – in favor

Motion to approve IPF for SD (site location, footprint only) [lite] – General Disposition of Building
Victor Olgyay – motions
Don Brandes – seconded
Rick Epstein – in favor
Candy Roberts – in favor
Next meeting with Populus is scheduled for June 17th.

Candy Roberts suggests a charrette on June 17th.