University of Colorado
Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado
Design Review Board
Minutes

Minutes of the Meeting of November 13, 2014

The University Design Review Board met on Thursday, November 13, 2014, at 1800 Grant Street (Denver), 6th floor, Denver conference room.

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

Attendance:

Doug Hanney, Bryan Construction; Stan Rovira, UCCS; Emily Magnuson, NV5; Todd Cartwright, Cartwright Engineering; David Land, Davis Partnership; Lana Bilbo, CU Office of the President; Karl Burkhart, DRB Note taker; Samuel Starr, DRB Note taker

8:45 – 10:15 **North Nevada Infrastructure**

Presenters: Todd Cartwright (NV5), David Land (Davis Partnership), Gary Reynolds (UCCS)
Description: Presentation of the grading, drainage and utility infrastructure design.

A/E Presentation to the DRB:

Overall Drainage

- The grading plan supports building goal of LEED certification through bioswale stormwater management and sustainable earthwork.
- Designed to appear natural and not overly engineered.

Circulation

- Diverse circulation and transportation achieved through bike racks and bus access supports goal of LEED certification.
- Pedestrian spine moved to the west side of the transportation spine.
- Added a bus pull-off area at the east lot on both sides of the transportation spine.
  - 12 ft. wide travel lanes with 10 ft. wide sidewalks.
  - Room for an additional bus shelter to either side of the pull-off area.
- Added an acceleration/deceleration lane in the transportation spine to reduce auto traffic stacking.
- Pedestrian crossings are integrated into boulevard medians.

    - Provide protection/shelter from auto traffic mid-crossing.
- Pedestrian path crosses the roundabout to the south.
    - Set back one car length to help with pedestrian safety.

Utilities

- Proposing a new sewer line to the VaPA building.
- Electric, water, sewer and fiber-optic utilities run along Nevada.
- Electric, water and sewer run through the transportation spine.

Phasing

- Phase 1A to start immediately.
- Phase 1B May to August 2015
- Phase 1C May to August 2016

Concept

- Landscape supports building's curved, lenticular, ribbon-like concept.

Drainage

- Bioswales clean water that is piped into three detention ponds to accommodate complete project phasing.
    - One detention pond for the east parking lot.
    - One detention pond for the building and site.
    - One detention pond for the South parking lot.
- Pond two is sized to accommodate all of phase 2.
- Bioswales and excess pond volume improve water quality.
- 3:1 maximum grade applied to bioswales.

Screening

- Screening has been added to the back side of the VaPA loading dock.

Overall Grading

- Two retaining walls at pedestrian friendly height separate VaPA from the lawn area.
    - Maximum height of 5 ft. height is not constant; will taper off to ends.
- Retaining walls avoid a flat “engineered” appearance.
- Lower retaining walls are located east of the transportation spine.
- Retaining wall / seatwall combination located at the entry plaza.
- The over-lot grading plan leaves room to adjust with +/- 1 ft. flexibility.
- The eastern parking lot pedestrian path is graded to under a 5% slope.
- The ribbon path through the sculpture garden graded to under a 5% slope as well; this is not required but diversifies access.
- The pedestrian spine graded to a 3% slope.
- Created an additional direct non-ADA route from the temporary south lot.

Building Update with Gary Reynolds (UCCS)

- The VaPA architecture team is pursuing cost estimates for designs by both Semple Brown and H3.
- These are to be presented at the December 2014, DRB meeting.
- Working on landscape and grading plans.
- Building footprint, circulation and exterior are not changing.
    - Working to integrate with the landscape.
    - Landscape plan to be presented in December as well.

Summary of DRB Questions/Clarifications:

How are the pedestrian crossings articulated in paving?

- Paving will change with the pedestrian path to supersede the auto path.

What is the time frame for building on the temporary south lot?

- 10 to 20 years.

Summary of DRB Comments and Recommendations:

DRB would like to see the following planning and design elements integrated into future submittals:

- Please review and comply with prior submittals from October 8th and November 13th meetings.
- One of the original goals was to promote sustainable education of landscape and hydrology.
  - Reflect this through native ecologies, signage and wayfinding; an opportunity for interaction.
- Encourage more seamless integration of the site and the grading plan, especially in regards to the architectural concept and the site concept.
- One objective of the campus is to reduce piped stormwater management. Can the extent of pipe be reduced.
- Evaluate snow storage.
- Review the severity and extent of retaining wall on all cross-slopes.
- Please provide more detail in terms of lighting, paving, planting, signage, furnishings, etc.
- Study two sets of materials palettes. One for VaPA architecture and one for the site improvements. Make sure these relate though.
- Reduce the redundancy in pathway and walkway systems.
  - Currently seems excessive, adding to cost and site disturbance.
  - Portal should remain an important connection.
  - Suggests team study the entire complex as the architecture develops. (interior and exterior)
  - Suggests team study a hierarchy to linkages and connections.
    - It is essential to link to the pedestrian spine.
    - It is secondary to divert to different areas of VaPA.
    - All paths arriving at the entry plaza may create conflict for highly-trafficked events and various users within one building.
    - Clarify campus-wide connections versus VaPA connections.
    - Look at options for accessible access from underpass; along entry boulevard or other options to minimize impacts on grading, need for walls, etc.
- Suggests ecology, geology, hydrology can be integrated as an educational component.
- Acknowledge that this submittal is for general grading and infrastructure only, but that issues of integration with building, detailed site design, path design, landscaping, etc., will be presented to the board at a subsequent meeting.

Action: Motion for approval

Rick Epstein - moved to approve Design Development for grading, utilities, drainage and infrastructure specifically for the area defined as Phase 1A (the entry road off Nevada, the roundabout, the spine road, the eastern and southern parking lots).

Victor Olgyay seconded motion.

All in favor – Unanimous DD approval.

Attendees: Wayne Northcutt, CU-Boulder; Richelle Reilley, CU-Boulder; Tom Goodhew, CU-Boulder; Bill Haverly, CU-Boulder; Dave Danielson, CU-Boulder; Nicholas Fiore, CU-Boulder; Chris Ewing, CU-Boulder; Rob Dean; CU-Boulder; Amy Kirtland, CU-Boulder; Tina Bishop, Mundus Bishop; Kevin MacLennan; CU-Boulder; Anne Heinz; CU-Boulder; David Schafer, Oz Architecture; Ted Lasllo,GH Phipps; Michael Tingler, BOORA; James Lorde; Surface Design; Oscar Hernandez; Tom Bauer; Josh Brandt; Tim Kirby; Karl Burkhart, DRB note taker; Samuel Starr, DRB note taker.

10:30 – 2:00 CASE (Euclid) Schematic Design Presentation

Presenter(s): Wayne Northcutt
Architects: BOORA Architects / OZ Architecture + Surface Design Architecture
Description: Presentation of Schematic and Concept Design for approval.

A/E Presentation to the DRB:

General Updates

- Since last meeting the design team has worked on condensing and reprogramming goals.
  1. Gateway and front door to the university
  2. Student success and services
  3. Foster collaboration
  4. Easy access
  5. Flexible over time
- Transformation from urban campus to rolling landscape.
- Choreographing amazing views.
- Working with users and clients to engage and welcome incoming students during building “off hours” such as nights and weekends.
  - This is accomplished through central atrium that daylights the center of the building.
  - Shared study spaces and community spaces reinforce the idea of a place for gathering,
- In previous meetings the DRB asked what different user experiences are like.
  - Team has mapped circulation for the various use programs housed within the building.
  - Identified common themes of experience and points of convergence.
- Identified complex contextual relationships between visual arts building and UMC.
  - Music and Environmental Science are important contextually but these buildings are likely to change in the future.
  - Anticipating increased scale of future buildings.
  - Scale is similar to that of UMC.

Site

- The vicinity Micro-Master plan now includes the south side of the street.
  - Integrating desired lines from the south.
  - Integrating auto drop-offs and leaving a bus drop-off on Euclid.
- A “bike barn” integrated with pavilion provides about 228 bike spaces with about 48 spaces at the other corners.
  - Goal of about 350 bike parking spaces total.
  - This is far over what is required, but team anticipates the spaces will get used due to the nature of the campus.

Grading and Drainage

- Grading and managing drainage along 18th through terraced gardens.

- Still looking at a stormwater “soaking area” to the northeast.
- Stormwater is slowed and cleansed through swales, soakage, and movement.

Planting
- Plant selection is to be a mix of native and ornamental evergreens and deciduous trees.
  - Under-story planting will add color and interest.

Paving
- Standard concrete for main paths.
- Granite paver plaza and along the front of the building.

Sustainability
- Central atrium and subdividing the building, daylights center of the building.
- Designed to perform above national standards.
  - Required: 43KBTU, university goal: 34KBTU, preferred goal: 25KBTU
- Goal of LEED Gold Plus certification.
- Studies have identified that a significant portion of the building's energy consumption will go to heating.
  - Daylighting to improve passive heating.
  - Visually link interior to outdoors.
  - Fostering an active learning experience.

Architectural character
- Currently studying the character of bridge elements (transparent vs clad in stone).
  - Leaning towards a more transparent version.
  - Bridge to contrast the building.
- Introducing a signature rooftop terrace.
- Texturing the building facades.
- Studying a variety of fenestration options.
  - Adding vertical elements to what is a very horizontal building.
- Giving the ground floor lobby more presence.
- Introducing an arcade / loggia along Euclid.
  - Provides protection for pedestrians awaiting bus and auto pick-up.
  - Adds a pedestrian scale to three-story facade of building.
  - Shades south classrooms.

Materials
- The pass through changes materials, acknowledging compression between buildings and enhances transparency.
- Considering modular panelized sandstone walls.

Summary of DRB Questions/Clarifications:

Has the atrium fenestration been studied?
- The team is working that out now. Decided on atrium location.

Where are the building mechanical units located?
- All rooftop mechanical units including forced air are located to the east side of the building.
- Air is ducted through the bridge from west to east portion of building.

How many users can the auditorium hold?
- Auditorium is designed for 250 people.
- Combined with pre-function spaces and flexible spaces, this will likely become a premier auditorium space on campus.
- Seating is angled 30% as to avoid turning the audience's backs to the doors.

What are the dimensions of the arcade / loggia?

- 12 ft. from the face of the building or 10 ft. clear.
- Science discovery classrooms on the other side of the arcade / loggia wall.

What is the net gain / loss or parking spaces?

- Eliminating 40 spaces within the garage.
- Partially replacing the spaces by re-striping lot 204 with an additional 28 spaces.
- Looking at re-striping the existing parking garage to add more spaces.
    - Parking garage dedicated about ¼ of its spaces to permit parking and ¾ to "pay and display" hourly parking.

Concerned with the rain garden/detention in such a busy urban setting.

- Response: detention area is a cost-effective way to protect areas downhill.
- Would prefer an urbanized solution such as an underground cistern but expense limits this option.

How close is the cost estimate to the budget?

- Cost estimate is being revised now.
- The last estimate was completed in August at about 20% over budget.
- Anticipating similar cost now.
- The university is encouraging the building to be iconic and signature (100 year building)
- Encouraged to design something great and iconic and funding will come later.

Summary of DRB Comments and Recommendations:

DRB would like to see the following planning and design elements integrated into future submittals:

1. Process/Submittals
    - Please note that the current submittal is deficient for a SD submittal.
    - Encouraged team work with Boulder staff to get to SD detail.
    - Need to see site improvements, landscape, lighting, signage and materiality in plans at appropriate scale and detail.
    - Architecture needs higher levels of specificity.
    - Floor plans should show openings (windows and doors).
    - Elevations should detail materiality.
    - Encouraged the team to come back in December (workshop) for a DD submittal before the February DD submittal.
2. Site
    - Encouraged team to look at the grand stair and plaza space at the building as a "place" rather than a "pass through." Entice students to use the stair and not go around the building. The "pass through" may want to have more detail in terms of creating a greater sense of place and arrival rather than a "hallway or pass-through." Please consider a more detailed sequence and design from the UMC side that equals and complements the "Grand Staircase."
    - Provide ways to look into the building, perhaps through accessible porches.
    - Pay careful attention to the size of spaces and how people will use them and access them.
    - Embrace that this is a unique experience on campus.
    - Encouraged integrating grand elements of south stairs into informal stairs to the north.
    - These will likely get used more than the informal design can accommodate.
    - Not replicated but grand in a unique way that supports the design concept; constructed but informal.
    - Circulation to and from the CASE entry to both the UMC to the west and 18th on the east will not be informal.

- Path and stairs should be more architectural/built to accommodate the potentially high pedestrian traffic.
- Encouraged team work with CU staff to develop site plan and stormwater soakage area further.
- Suggested a study of low-impact development strategies.
- Oval drop-off in micro-master plan works really well for the campus and should be considered as a future improvement project.

3. Architecture
    - The building should be something truly special and iconic and not look just like other recent buildings. Architecture needs strength and clarity. Signature elements such as the bridges, stairs, porches and terrace are opportunities to be bold and unique.
    - Architecture should exemplify the CU brand; provide clarity as to the architectural idea that supports this.
    - Study what is Klauder-influenced and what is not (look at elements that make this unique – staircase.
    - Study ways to simplify the elevations, particularly east and west.
    - Clarify the articulation of material change from the outside to the space between the buildings. Suggested the pass through become the “non-Klauder” space with lighter limestone or sandstone walls and extensive glazing. Encouraged a range of colors similar to Norlin Library.
    - Embrace porches – make them livable; engage outdoor lobby, café should relate to outdoor space.
    - Terrace element outside of the main auditorium is a signature component requiring more development and integration with the overall architectural concept. If there is a trellis element, it should be architecturally significant and provide real shade; suggested shading options of about 80% shade for the trellis.
    - Suggested transparency at bridge terraces and stairs. Simplify and strengthen.
    - The atrium seems to want to be expressed and pulled out into the “pass through.”
    - Sustainability goals are good, especially the inspirational low EUI. Should work to achieve it. How might that affect building form, or mechanical strategy?
    - Encouraged team to study ways to take advantage of Boulder's 300-plus days of sunshine. How do you capture solar heat when you want it and shade solar rays when wanted? This could impact the development of the fenestrations. Design the atrium as a heating component as well as lighting component. This may suggest considering shaded vertical south glass to all of solar gain in the winter and shade direct solar heat gain in the summer. The atrium is also an opportunity for providing natural ventilation in the building. Encouraged to study how programmed spaces on the interior shape exterior fenestration and daylight.
    - Requested team provides a rooftop mechanical plan. How does wind and solar exposure relate to the performance of rooftop mechanical units? Is there the option for future photovoltaic solar? Expression of atrium as well as on the roof.
    - The lobby in the ground floor plan seems ambiguous. The space can benefit from architecturally standing out and having a unique identity, both internally and externally. How does the lobby relate to the arcade / loggia? There is opportunity for upper levels to be open and overlook the “pass through.” Suggested less narrow windows and more glazing on the side facing the “pass through.”

Action: Motion for Approval

Rick Epstein - moved to approve Schematic Design under the central condition the team take into consideration comments as reflected in the 11-13-14 DRB Meeting Notes.

Don Brandes - seconded motion.

All in favor – unanimous approval.

Public meeting adjourned.