



University of Colorado Design Review Board Minutes

Minutes of the Meeting of May 8, 2014

The University Design Review Board met on Thursday, May 8, 2014, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, 6th floor conference room.

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

12:45-1:15

Dental Clinic Signage – Anschutz Medical Campus

Architect: Andre Vite

Presenter: Andre Vite

Description: New building signage proposed for the east and east facades of the previously named “Lazzara Center for Oral-Facial Health.”

Vite explained the former name of Lazzara and why sign was taken down because of snow accumulation. The task was for new signage to be seen from 17th Street from access to parking lot to serve as a way finding purpose. A mock-up was used that was scale appropriate on the wellness center. Aluminum pins were held off and appropriate colors were used. He noted that on metal, colors are more yellow than gold.

Roberts questioned if they still needed banners for way finding.

Brandes asked what is the upgrade for pedestrians. Vite answered it was needed for vehicular way finding for Fire/Emergency for the name and address.

Brandes commented that he thought the typology and scale looked fine.

Motion was made that the Dental Clinic Signage – Anschutz Medical Campus be approved.

Don Brandes – moved to approve

Victor Olgyay - seconded

Motion was unanimously approved.

1:30-3:30

Visual and Performing Arts Complex – UCCS

Architect(s) Semple Brown Design and H3 Collaboration Architects

Presenter(s) George Lynch (H3) John Fontillas (H3) Semple Brown (SBD) Bryan Schmidt (SBD) Gary Reynolds (UCCS) Carolyn Fox (UCCS)
Description: A Workshop for the schematic design of the Visual and Performing Arts Complex.

Fox began the workshop with the idea “imagine great vistas!” She said let’s start where we ended. Exploring the landform of a large knoll. Scheme J - The North Campus Plan was displayed with Phases 1 and 2.

Circulation to the project has been refined with new drop-off and roadway access. Student parking had shifted as part of the orientation.

Epstein asked question about the distance of the circle. Answer - Not part of the scope.

Reynolds - Budget has risen from \$56 to \$60 million; \$10 million has been put into infrastructure for surrounding area and is part of another package. This project concentrates within 5 feet of the building. Everything else is part of another plan. Health and Wellness #2 has different funding.

Design Build Team - The design team outlined the proposed site concepts

Key Points:

1. *Create a sense of intimacy.*
2. *Provide clear accessible front entrance.*

Roberts asked how you incorporate gardens to create an intimate space on a flat slope of 5%. What is the story/feeling about this site informing the building structure?

Design Team.

The design team presented pros and cons of three schemes: Prosceniums, Tilted planes, and Ribbons.

The Chancellor likes the ribbon flowing elements; the juxtaposition of the boxes on top representing the craginess of the mountains.

The view from Nevada Avenue is important.

Design Review Board Comments

- The Board agreed with the proposed Ribbon concept. As the design progresses they emphasized the following areas:
 - Connect the arts with natural light.
 - Continue to refine the design, especially the experience going to and in the building.
 - Make the exterior terracing something more special and informed with the land.
- Use the form to give you the idea. The use of natural penetrations, shading, sheltering and a variety of different forms.
- Take a look at the materiality, ribbon concept and contours.

Take design to another level. The land form is critical to the design.

- The formality and informality of the drop-off needs to be enhanced.
- Define the landscape manmade vs. nature; pay attention to transition areas between concepts.
- Note that it is a noisy area; the front is inspirational. Continue grading, and understand the connectivity and parking flows.
- Look at the regional geology; drainage is unique to Colorado Springs; decide if inspiration is clouds or music.
- Refine the landscaping and grading; make terraces more sympathetic to natural landform.

Next Steps: Continue the workshop with a meeting on one of the following dates: June 2nd/3rd, June 30th, or July 17th/18th.



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting of May 9, 2014

Boulder Campus Items

The University Design Review Board met on Friday, May 9, 2014, in the sixth floor conference room at 1800 Grant Street in Denver.

DRB members present were: Don Brandes, Rick Epstein, Victor Olgyay, and Candy Roberts. Also present was Teresa Osborne (ex officio), Office of Budget and Finance. CU-Boulder staff members present were: Dave Danielson, Bill Haverly, Richelle Reilly, and William Arndt of Facilities Management; and Tom McGann, Office of the Director of Athletics.

IMPROVEMENTS TO THE FOLSOM FIELD COMPLEX FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Also present for the discussion were: Ken Cecil, J3 Engineering Consultants; Michael Rey, Populous; and Allyson Gutierrez and Chris Knight, Mortenson Construction.

Haverly thanked the DRB for their hard work on this project, with its unusual scope and tight schedule. He said that no approvals were being sought at this meeting. The intent is to confirm that the design team had met the conditions from the last approval.

Rey spoke about the west wall of the new Northeast Building, adjacent to the tunnel from the north and across from the Dal Ward Center. Some windows have been put here, to help make the façade more interesting and to allow light into three offices (mostly as clerestories because of their height from the floor). The walls will be pre-cast concrete intended to match the walls of Dal Ward. At the top will be a railing along the aisle accessing the seating.

Rey showed the plans of this area, and noted that the geometry caused some very “funky” angles in the wall which are hard to show in flat elevation. He also said there were some large areas of blank concrete which could be used for branding opportunities or for changeable banners.

On the new seating at Dal Ward, the “X” pattern of the railings will be continued as they step down on the sides of the area. He showed elevations and views of the new seating, which will have simplified front panels and countertops, re-using existing aluminum seating. The front panels will be perforated metal to allow ventilation.

Epstein spoke of the relationship of the new windows on the Northeast Building base and said they looked good but needed another level of refinement. He noted the large wall and wondered if there might be some other horizontal lines to break it up. At the portal into the locker room, from which the team will emerge before games, he suggested that it become more of a portal, either architecturally or with graphics. Roberts noted that the detail in the railings at the lower levels were unlike anything else in the stadium. She also asked for more refinement of the south wall of the new “wedge” seating, just south of the locker room doors. It can’t be seen from the field, but will be seen by runners coming in for the Bolder Boulder and possibly by TV cameras.

Rey showed the north elevation of the Northeast Building in cutaway to show the programs within it. He pointed out the bridge connection to the existing sky suites building, and various alternatives for the “Club Tower,” the architectural element on the southwest side of the Northeast Building which will be seen prominently from the rest of the stadium.

Rey went through the various levels. Level 1 will have the locker rooms and a direct connection to the indoor practice facility. On the north façade there is a change in grade from the east to the west end. Level 2 will house Sports Performance and its entry is from the east. Level 3 has a connection to the existing east concourse. Levels 4 and 5 will house offices. Level 6 is the potential roof terrace. The north and east balconies at this level are in the budget. The colonnade will be left open but could be enclosed later. Mechanical equipment will also be housed on this roof.

The elevations of this building showed the new tower, which will be almost as tall as the skybox building. The elevation from the field shows the seating outside the coaches’ offices. This seating will be for coaches’ families as a security measure on game days. Roberts asked for more detail on materials and design, especially of the row of columns. Epstein said this design may be too fussy in comparison to existing stadium features. He said the use of large walls of sandstone may appear to be heavy. Olgay asked if the design would look too aristocratic compared to the rest of the seating.

McGann said that this highly visible area could be an opportunity for branding when seen on television. It could become a landmark which would instantly identify the image as Folsom Field. Epstein said there might be more visual connections with the skybox building, especially on the east elevation. This could possibly be more structural metal, which is a significant part of the skybox building. Concerning the north elevation, Epstein said that the main entry at the bottom of the new tower does not seem fully realized and needs work. Brandes offered the team its appreciation for their good work since the April meeting.

Reilly introduced the site development. She said the focus for this meeting is the north section, including the new road. The project will need a permit from FEMA because there will be significant changes in the grading adjacent to the floodway.

Cecil said there will be two phases: The first is pre-flood plain development, and the second is the access road, which cannot be built until approval from FEMA. To accommodate the steep slope, new concrete walls will be added near the parking

areas. These walls will be as much as six feet high, and may be faced with stone salvaged from the 1921 walls being removed for the Northeast Building. They are also considering what will be necessary to re-vegetate the hillsides. The new water quality pond on the east needs to be developed, along with a bioswale to the east of the indoor practice facility. Cecil showed elevations indicating the magnitude and height to the walls. He noted that there will need to be some sort of safety barrier at the top of the walls. Reilly said that may be a low wall with a railing. A new trail will be built up to the existing footbridge over the creek which was closed after the flooding in September.

The goal is to maximize the parking in this area. There is a large space at the bottom of the stairs to the Buff Walk which will eventually lead to a new footbridge across the creek. This area must read as a pedestrian plaza. Cars dropping people off will go through the plaza to the U-turn at the west of the parking, and back to the drop-off. The plaza will consist of permeable pavers, probably 4" x 6". Areas will be raised to slow traffic. Olgay said the DRB needs to see more detail on materials and design of this area.

Reilly said the design of the new pond will be simple and elegant. The area around it will have an accessible sidewalk connecting to a bus stop on Folsom Street. Walls for wells around existing trees may also use the salvaged 1921 stones.

Brandes commented on the plaza and the proposed rolling curb. He said that may not be necessary and asked the team to look at the entry court at the St. Julien Hotel in downtown Boulder, which successfully separates pedestrians and vehicles. Olgay said that members of the DRB like the design, but would like to see it made better. Haverly said that the staff feels that all of the conditions from the April meeting were met.

GROUND BUILDING / INTERMEDIATE PROCESSING CENTER (IPC) RELOCATION

Also present for the discussion were: Brad Massey, Aller-Lingle-Massey Architects; Sean Convery, Cator-Ruma & Associates; and Henry Ehrgott, Whiting-Turner Contracting Co.

Roberts said she had attended workshops on this project and much progress has been made, but there are still questions, primarily about the site issues. She thanked the team for the photo simulations as requested, but said that hiding the building behind lots of trees is not the answer. Brandes apologized for their suggestion at the last meeting to add to the landscaping budget at the expense of building design. He said a compromise needs to be made, and that the solution may be to reduce superficial design elements from the building and concentrate on making a simple industrial building with good lines and proportions. He said that every attempt should be made to move the entire building to the south. This would help not only the aesthetics but the functionality of the facility.

Brandes noted the strong design for access on all four sides of the building. He noted the suggestion to make the building 8' shorter on the north and south, but suggested

that the entire 16' be taken from the south end. Roberts asked if the double height area on the north might be partly lowered to a story and a half. If more storage is needed for equipment, perhaps some shed roofs could be added, further bringing down the perceived height.

Epstein asked if some of the office area could be lowered. He said that small industrial buildings can be well designed and even add to the overall aesthetics. He mentioned the 1910 Power House on the main campus as a building with a great deal of appeal.

Roberts suggested that moving the footprint might reduce the amount of fencing needed. Some of the cost of landscaping could be redistributed to make the fencing more attractive.

Roberts talked about the truck ramp on the east side. She noted that it fulfills a requirement for ADA access, but wondered what the actual cost of a small elevator would be, eliminating the need for the larger ramp. She also asked if moving the building to the north and starting the ramp farther to the south might reduce some of its size. Massey said that some of the extra paved space on the ramp is to accommodate bagged trash and recyclables that have to be removed from Folsom Field immediately after events and stored until they could be sorted.

Roberts also asked about the pre-cast walls. Perhaps there could be variations in the texture to provide visual interest without using sandstone and red tiles. The placement of windows could also add to the interest. She said it was important for every office to have a window, if possible. The windows should serve the interiors, but should have some sort of regularity on the exterior.

Epstein agreed that sandstone was not necessary on this building. There could be more glass to highlight the main entry, and the staircase could become a visual focal point. There could be a few shed roofs, but with metal rather than red tile.

Haverly said there might be more vertical windows, and Epstein said that some of the windows might be translucent rather than transparent. Roberts agreed that there may not be a need for any red tile. But Epstein added that the DRB does not want to dictate design to the team but wants them to "give it their best shot" in creating an interesting and functional building. Brandes said that the most important thing was not to slow down the schedule. He said members of the board are happy to continue attending workshop sessions. He thanked the team for their progress since the April meeting.