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

Friday, March 9, 2012
1800 Grant Street, 1st Floor conference room

DRB members in attendance: Teresa Osborne (ex officio), John Prosser, Victor Olgyay, Candy Roberts, Lois Brink

Meeting minutes submitted by: Garrick Swanson and Charlotte Farewell (CCCD)

9:30 – 11:30 **Student Recreation Facilities Improvements Review**

Architect(s): Davis Partnership with Cannon Design and CIVITAS Landscape Architecture

Presenter(s): Brian Ericson, Davis Partnership; Ken Wiseman, Cannon Design; Todd Mead, CIVITAS Landscape; Tom Goodhew, CU-Boulder Planning

Summary: This was a workshop session to discuss building style and massing changes as a follow-up to prior DRB discussions. The project renovates and expands the Student Recreation Center to address critical space needs and deferred maintenance issues.

Key elements of this project include: doubling strength and conditioning spaces for drop-in weight and cardiovascular fitness training; adding an indoor multi-activity gym for programmed and informal recreation; adding an outdoor aquatics facility and deck area; doubling the multi-purpose areas.

The design team presented eight architectural options with four conceptual landscape plans (two of which included the pool and two of which did not). There was not a clear connection between sections, plans and elevations. The DRB stated that the design conversation is not being translated into drawings. The existing design language is the building block. Architecture and landscape should transition from the buildings, porch, terrace, garden and campus. This is more than a box with a terrace coming out into the landscape. It is necessary to incorporate an architectural element to communicate a sense of scale and connection between the architecture and landscape. The landscape architect and architect need to work together to explore how the relationship between landscape and architecture informs the design.

Hockey Rink:

Translucent panels on the south side have strong potential with different shades of translucency. Be careful about the patterns on the wall that will be projected onto the floor. Clarity of light and

clarity of vision can make or break the success of high activity sports area. A majority of the conversation has focused on aesthetics and not a performance-based design / concept. Use the light to enhance the visual impact and performance as well.

Lead Architect, Ken Wiseman, saw four options as having the most potential:

- Option 3
  - o Strength - addresses past concern to create a connection within the context of campus by pulling the vegetation out into the landscape
  - o Weakness - monetary and aesthetic issues

- Option 5
  - o Strength – softens the edge with the grid by creating a series of discrete, gathering spaces; has the opportunity to support energy models
  - o Weakness - Architecture does not speak of a recreation center

- Option 7
  - o Strength – Architecture is transparent – as you approach, one can see the front reception desk , see people coming and going / promotes safety
  - o Weakness – Does not match existing campus architecture

- Option 8:
  - o Strength – The tower is the most powerful aspect and architectural statement- clearly delineates building in landscape, opportunity to use wind energy
  - o Weakness – Tower is a new architecture statement to existing campus architecture

DRB Questions / Critique to help uncover roadblocks and move the project forward:

1. What are some of the essential qualities and new elements you are trying to pull into the design?
2. What is the core architectural strategy?
3. How are we using this to test the eight options explored?
4. The roof is an important concept to the building and overall statement of the campus.
5. What goal(s) is the design trying to express? – Do these goals relate with the parti diagram and key values of the existing building?
   - Express the function of the recreation center.
   - Expression of the ordering system – solids, voids.
   - Bookends of the architecture.
   - Scale the social entry to a human scale that is welcoming.
   - Express the architecture / character using the roof – tie into existing campus.
   - How do people fit into the design? People have not been part of the conversation.

What option does the DRB see as the most viable option out of the eight presented?

Option 7:

The architectural element is no more than a box with a trellis coming out. The transparency of the building is the strength to connect people to the inside and outside.

Option 5:

Supports the bookend design with one corner that breaks the rules for a welcome entry and social gathering space. This building expresses the design elements you have set

up. Design needs further work to express the culture of a campus building and define purpose of building.

Take elements of 5 and 7 to explore a composite design.

Wrap Up:
Challenge to design team – Construct and reinforce a design statement to guide and ground the project. Work with a more holistic palette of landscape and architecture to maintain a balance of design and relationships.

How do you capture the west views while still maintaining a performance-based building? Fill in the windows up to three feet from ground level to improve performance and manage solar heat gain. Think about bronze glass vs. other options.

Design team – We are working to adapt to the design constraints and opportunities.
Reiterate what the DRB has communicated to the design team:

1. Need a clear design approach and statement of massing and modeling.
2. Site- DRB needs to see a drawing that connects the landscape and architecture-think about building having an "iconic" element because it is used by so many students.
3. Design and incorporate a design sequence of experiences that connects the surrounding context in a cohesive relationship.
4. Develop a hierarchy.
5. Would like to see one clear idea that relates to the parti diagram and not eight strategies. Present in the framework of the parti.
6. Have a blend of new material and integration of existing materials on campus.

2:30 – 3:30 **Lane Center**
Architect(s): Anderson Mason Dale
Presenter(s): Paul Haack – AMD; John Graham – AMD; Gary Reynolds – UCCS
Description: Concept plan for the Lane Center. AMD has completed concept development – review of project update and proposed concept.
Summary: The layout of the building is too rigid when the structure is parallel to Nevada Avenue. Proposed architectural footprint does not reflect the building configuration of the diagram of formal to informal. Aligning the building to Nevada Avenue and not enhancing existing topographic conditions is a lost opportunity. The orientation of the building on the landscape plan is the preferred footprint orientation. Invest and explore handicap access on the south side. To offset the footprint could gain more space on the south to create a more interesting space for circulation and handicap access.

DRB is not confident in the siting of the building. Not worried about the aesthetics of the building. The concept is to design architecture and landscape that responds to topography and existing site conditions. Proposed concept does not reflect a relationship between Nevada Avenue and the campus.

Motion made – Motion supported to move from concept into schematic with contingencies that the team addresses:

- Decrease size of building length and width while still working with in square footage requirements
- Site planning and landscaping need concept development (1-2 concepts)
- South side: explore option for ramping and elevator

- Further develop the roof concept/design
- Diagram and incorporate view sheds into site planning and landscape
- As the first building in this area, the architecture needs to determine future micro master plan criteria.

Presentations and DRB Comments:

The consultant is designing for three landscape planting typologies: (heavy utility zone on west side creating a design and planting plan constraint). Utilities preclude any trees between the building and Nevada Avenue. The only potential tree planting is in the parking lot swale. The concept design includes:

1. Native and non-formal on the Nevada Avenue side.
2. Storm water swale running north and south in the parking lot.
3. Mixture of formal and non-formal transitioning from the building to the knoll.

Use the east side of the building as the start of a transitional planting zone from formal to informal. Integrate an organic pattern and planting plan to make a suggestive connection between the knoll and building. A garden space on the south end of building will bring a similar plant palette into the east plaza from the knoll making a connection between the east and west gardens.

The approximate distance between the proposed architecture buildings on the knoll side from east to west is 350 feet. Is this a missed opportunity for campus interaction? The proposed fire access and proposed path is dividing up the space. This is an opportunity to reinforce a multi-use area (soccer field). The more we can mix up the area the better. Relocate the service access so it is not in direct view from the pedestrian route. It is the first thing you see as you enter the knoll from the south.

The layout of the building is too rigid when the structure is parallel to Nevada Avenue. Proposed architectural footprint does not reflect the building configuration of the diagram of formal to informal. Suggest you offset the building footprint to open up the space between the buildings; freeing it from a rigid structure. Aligning the building to Nevada Avenue and not enhancing existing topographic conditions is a lost opportunity. The orientation of the building on the landscape plan is the preferred footprint orientation.

Invest and explore handicap access on the south side. To offset the footprint could gain more space on the south to create a more interesting space for circulation and handicap access. Drainage, access and circulation are not working together to further inform the development of concept.

Need to map out view corridors. How do they inform the footprint and circulation patterns? Reinforce how natural features define the character of Colorado Springs and the campus.

Building Concept:

Proposed floor to floor height is 15’ 4”. Height could decrease by 8” at the most; would like to see studies of floor space.

The concept is to design architecture and landscape that responds to topography and existing site conditions. Proposed concept does not reflect a relationship between Nevada Avenue and the campus. Important to take into consideration four sides of the building and think about best

entrance/access points (south might be better than west because of wind from the mountains). Rearrange the building entry from the west to the south so people enter under the canopy.

Precedent: Reference the architectural curves of the Anschutz Inpatient Clinic. The curves create a soft gesture creating an environment that is more comfortable without the feeling of a medical clinic.

A narrow building is conducive to day lighting. The current layout is not supportive of the potential to day light. Show the ability to daylight in the diagrams.

Stairs on the south side bleed inside and outside the building to create a connection with the landscape and architecture. Think about handicap access at the ground floor. South side needs to accommodate handicap access and wait time for pick up and drop off. What will they do while they wait?

Wrap up:

Motion made – Motion supported to move from concept into schematic, contingent upon the following:

- Decrease size of building length and width while still working within square footage requirements.
- Site planning and landscaping need concept development (1-2 concepts).
- South side: explore option for entrance, ramping and elevator .
- Further develop the roof concept/design.
    - Diagram and incorporate view corridors into site planning and landscape.
    - As the first building in this area, the architecture needs to determine future micro master plan criteria.