



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 May 10, 2013

The University Design Review Board met on Friday, May 10, 2013
1800 Grant Street, 1st Floor Conference Room
(Denver)

DRB members present were: Candy Roberts, Victor Olgyay, Rick Epstein, Don Brandes, and Teresa Osborne (ex officio).

Stanton Parking Garage and Recreational Field - UCCS

Architect(s): Mortenson/Davis Partnership
Presenter(s): Brit Probst, and Gary Reynolds
Individuals present: Curtis Cox, Project Manager - Davis Partnership; Brit Probst, Principal – Davis Partnership; Joe Plaskett, Senior Project Manager - Mortenson Construction; Chris Knight, Design Phase Manager – Mortenson Construction; and Charles Cummings, Project Manager – UCCS.

Brit Probst:

- Discussed updates that have been made since the last meeting.

Don Brandes:

- Suggested implementing an inset or a platform to transition into/off of the field.
- Suggested implementing sod on the front of the recreation center (southeast) to “complete” the landscape throughout.
- Inquired about the feasibility of implementing a PA system.

Curtis Cox:

- Noted that the design implements a series of metal grates at the entrances to help eliminate the tracking of rubber particles from the field.
- Discussed the treatment of the glass on the stair tower and the curtain wall.

Candy Roberts:

- Inquired about the glass treatment on the curtain wall.
- Inquired about the seasonal use of the facility and the HVAC needs.

Victor Olgyay:

- Recommended cross-ventilation airflow through the open stairwell.
- Discussed techniques used to increase cross-ventilation opportunities.
- Thanked the design team for their progress on the project.

The Board thanked the design team for their hard work and progression on the design.

Anschutz Medical Campus Master Plan Study

Architect(s): AndersonMasonDale

Presenter(s): Michael Del Giudice and David Pfeifer

Individuals present: Andre Vite, Campus Architect – University of Colorado Denver; David Houston, Project Manager - AndersonMasonDale Architects; David Pfeifer, Principal - AndersonMasonDale Architects; Grace McEniry, AndersonMasonDale.

David Pfeifer:

- Discussed significant updates that have been made since the last meeting.
- Noted that some new material – neighborhood characterization, visualization of development envelopes, height densities – are currently being completed.
- Noted that adequate traffic analysis has been completed and the results are now being reviewed.

David Houston:

- Noted that numbered items [1-7] were taken from the board's last meeting.
 - Define the different documents and their relationships and scope.
 - Site Wide Coordinated Plan – Phase One
 - Site Wide Coordinated Plan – Phase Two
 - Anschutz Medical Campus Master Plan
 - Anschutz Medical Campus Design Guidelines
 - Anschutz Medical Campus Financial Plan
 - Anschutz Medical Campus Education Plan
 - Future Planning Efforts
 - Articulate a clear narrative about the intent of the 1998 master plan and what changes have been made.
 - Clarify problems and challenges that currently exist and define strategies that will be employed.
 - Address the need for a decision-making body to clearly articulate the advantage of stakeholders.
 - Identify the user groups for each of the two master plans.
 - Coordinated Master Plan – Phase Two.
 - Anschutz Medical Campus contents.
- Noted the hospital is growing at a more aggressive rate than the University.

Andre Vite:

- Noted that each master plan needs to stand alone as well as accompany the supporting documents.
- Noted the history and evolution of the campus and the need to increase density throughout the campus while interconnecting public spaces.
- Less about building, more about the public realm.
- Noted the master plan will speak directly to the exceptional teamwork on behalf of the governing bodies.
- The master plan is intentionally keeping loose boundaries – flexibility.
- Noted campus growth is conducted based on a 20-year build-out schedule.
- Noted they are tasked with a 10-year growth master plan.

Don Brandes:

- Suggested presenting the status and purpose of the efforts to inform individuals involved.
- From a construct standpoint, the site-wide planning is broken down into two phases – developmental and usage framework.
- 217-acre Anschutz Medical Campus will borrow from the master plan document in developing the five key zones.
- Noted the need for a new carrying capacity load to understand density and growth limitations.
- Suggested taking three overlay zones within the 217-acre [office building] and creating diagrams and prototypes to thoroughly understand how they will function.
- Noted the lack of natural systems/carrying capacity studies that have been conducted and expressed the importance of understanding these aspects.
- Access, circulation, and parking – how will they function?
- Noted the information and directional signage needs throughout the campus.

Candy Roberts:

- Inquired about the discussion and intention as they pertain to the diagrams and maps.
- Noted the importance of this documentation and its future impact on the medical campus development.
- Suggested understanding and testing the suggested edges and boundaries – how do they start to integrate into one another?
- Expressed concern for the traffic engineering – street traffic, road treatment, landscape planting – and the lack of understanding and research.
- Suggested implementing city-planning techniques – connectivity, open space, public transit, and future growth opportunities.

Victor Olgyay:

- Inquired about presenting a chapter in the master plan that discusses the collaborative efforts by all the governing bodies.
- Inquired about how predictions were made for 10-year growth patterns.
- Noted the opportunity to plan for the future growth of the hospital and not plan as development occurs.

- Suggested the consideration of implementing bike paths on the roadways and a series of connected, important green spaces.

Rick Epstein:

- Noted the importance of including the Aurora Planning and Zoning committee in the stakeholder groups present in the meetings.
- Inquired about any new material that needs to be discussed.
- Inquired about development capacity in the area: height densities, etc. – obvious omissions in the master plan.
- Noted the need to be explicit on how heights and densities are determined and defined - a uniform approach.
- Recommended the design team do more research in regard to pedestrian vehicular traffic and how bike lanes could be incorporated throughout the campus.
- Noted hierarchy of nodes, open space, and transit are lacking in the current documentation. These improvements will drastically help the maps and diagrams.

No formal decisions were made. The Board thanked the design team for their hard work and progression on the design.
