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

University of Colorado
Design Review Board
Minutes

Minutes of the Meeting of October 8, 2014

The University Design Review Board met on Wednesday, October 8, 2014, at 1800 Grant Street, 1st floor conference room.

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

8:00 – 9:30 **Study Session – *CU-Boulder***
East Campus Wind Tunnel north of MacAllister review, Euclid Autopark Update, and Athletics Complex & Grounds Intermediate Processing Facility update.

9:30 – 10:00 **Update with President Benson *(DRB only)***

10:00 – 11:00 **Williams Village Dining and Community Center**
Presenter(s): Tom Goodhew
Architects: KSQ Architects
Description: Introduction to Village Center Dining and Community Center. Replacement of the Darley Commons building to provide dining, conference and community services to the Williams Village campus.

Present:
Greg Dorolek, Wenk Associates;Tom Goodhew, CU-Boulder; Bill Haverly, CU-Boulder; Curt Huetson, CU-Boulder; Nick Fiore, CU-Boulder; Mona Milius, Baker Group; David Short, KSQ Architects; Shannon Meyer, KSQ Architects; Jamie Cali, KSQ Architects; Chester Ehriq, KSQ Architects; Justin Cooper, GE Johnson; Stella Hodgkins, GE Johnson; Josh Ward, GE Johnson; Phillip Blakeman, GE Johnson;Richelle Reilly; CU-Boulder; John Fox, CU-Boulder.

A/E Presentation to the DRB

Exploring Williams Village project in terms of:

- Realizing the village concept through a sense of “coming home.”
- Promoting sustainability.
- Promoting recreation.
- Highlighting the site's unique architecture.

Social focus to become a destination for all of CU-Boulder.

- Keeping Williams Village culture as something different from main campus.
- 42% of campus residents live in Williams Village and this number will grow.

Transportation: most students experience Williams Village by bike or bus.

- Studies show that 78% of students travel along 36th and Baseline Rd.

Drainage: planning for three basins.

- Retention happens to the north.
- Idea is to bring the Bear Creek character into the site.

Utilities exist along the east edge of the site and along the north edge of the Bear Creek Apartments.
Sustainability: goal of LEED Platinum through the LEED Renovation Checklist.

- Closed loop ecosystem mimics nature in architecture.
- Greenhouse allows greens to be produced on site for dining hall program.

Thinking 20 to 30 years in advance; anticipating growth.

Summary of DRB Comments and Recommendations

1. Establish and refine measurable goals and objectives. What is missing today and what can be provided through successful completion of the Williams Village Dining and Community Center project.
2. Consider pushing sustainability beyond LEED to Net Zero energy. How would that change the character and massing? Could an integrate energy approach reduce CapEx as well as OpEx?
3. Articulate indoor/outdoor relationships throughout all seasons.
4. Study campus & micro-master plan for Williams Village.
5. Explore architectural massing concepts that reflect project goals, i.e., Iconic vs. Quiet. What should the architectural relationship be to the existing buildings from both a massing and material approach?
6. Establish more definitive site and architectural approaches that are state-of-the-art and truly innovative.
7. Develop the idea of "coming home" to Williams Village as a "destination."
8. Revisit the dining hall location – views vs. creating a sense of community/"coming home." Look at whether a second floor dining is desirable and whether options for a ground floor dining may be preferable.
9. Further explore how to better unify Williams Village – for the short term and the long term.
10. Explore conceptual site and architectural alternatives for the DRB to review and discuss that embrace and further illustrate how the project goal and objectives can be achieved.
11. Continue to work closely with CU Facilities and campus staff on how improvements beyond the Williams Village Dining and Community Center will create a remarkable place. This includes the development of a micro-master plan to better understand future potential changes such as the recreation center, growth, change, access, etc.

No action requested or taken by the DRB.

11:00 – 12:00 **Euclid Autopark Addition Review**

Presenter(s):	Wayne Northcutt
Architects:	BOORA Architects / OZ Architecture + Surface Design Architecture
Description:	Progress Review check-in with the DRB to verify team is on the right track for Schematic and Concept Design approval.

Present:
Wayne Northcutt, CU-Boulder; Rob Dean, CU-Boulder; Rick Petersen, Oz Architecture; David Schafer, Oz Architecture; Anne Heinz, CU-Boulder; Kevin Maclennan, CU-Boulder; Michael Tingley, BOORA; Josh Brandt, BOORA; Tom Bauer, BOORA; Tina Bishop, Mundus Bishop; James Lorde, Surface Design; Ted Lasllo, GH Phipps.

A/E Presentation to the DRB

Team has been focusing on issues discussed at the last meeting.

- Facing challenges on the arrival side to the south.
- Traffic patterns are dominated by pedestrian, bike and skateboard.
- Identified constraints: grade changes and utilities.
- Mapped service routes through the service yard.
- Mapped bike routes and parking.
- Identified 220 existing bike parking spots; proposed an additional 120.
- Bike parking is distributed around the entire building.

Situated an oval-quad drop off area to the south.

- Drop off to be 24' wide with a curbed edge.
- Also serve as a bus area and underground parking area.

Negotiating with RTD. buses may not actually enter Euclid now.
Two options for the south side of the building.

- Option 1 is harder, option 2 is softer.

Three options for the building. Articulating the sense of arrival through center stairs as more revealing.

- Option 1: a recessed south face reveals the stairs. The auditorium mass is to the west with terraced balconies.
    - Terrace takes advantage of views to the Flatirons.
    - Windows take advantage of views over campus.
    - Scale steps down from west to east.
- Option 2: The auditorium spans the gap between east and west buildings.
    - Experience is “carved” into the building.
    - Scale is concentrated in the center.
    - Stairs are pulled further south.
    - Pass-through is more covered, feels like entering the building.
- Option 3: Moves the auditorium to the eastern half of the massing.
    - Scaled back the massing around the stairs.
    - Groups the auditorium and conference together.
    - Stair becomes more of a signature element.

Summary of DRB Comments and Recommendations

1. Project Goals and Objectives
    - Continue to review and refine the measurable project goals and objectives.
    - Share with the DRB your conceptual process and exploration of various site and architectural alternatives.
    - Explore more definitive “sustainability and energy” opportunities early in the planning and design process that you want to test and refine. Integrate sustainability approaches deeply into the concept of the building.
    - Continue to illustrate the potential “larger context of the project improvements” beyond the current project limit lines.

2. Massing Studies
    - The portal concept (option B) seems too restrictive.
    - Explore the possibility of stepping-down the massing next to the UMC to feel more comfortable as is shown in Option C.
    - Massing needs to be further explored along 18th Street. As is typical on 18th, and throughout the campus, the scale should step down on this edge.
    - The best views from the deck at the auditorium seem to be reflected in Option 1. The team should explore whether the views from the deck in Option 3 are blocked by tress or existing buildings.
    - Having the auditorium be seen as an independent mass is a good feature of Option 1. The overall massing in Option 3 seems better, especially as it brings more sun into the portal. The preferred option seems to be a combination of some aspects of Options 1 and 3.
    - Consider quantity of roof area and slope available for possible PV installation.
3. Building
    - Intrigued by tower element.
    - Further explore the north elevation.
    - This is a deep floor plate; perhaps look at a thinner building for daylighting purposes. Interior courtyards or exterior articulation of the massing could create opportunities for letting light in and natural ventilation.
    - Explore the penetration of sun into the portal in the various options.
4. Auditorium Location
    - Location in Options 1 and 3 seems reasonable
    - Explore the possibility of moving the auditorium down one floor.
5. Site
    - Service area seems modest. How will this area expand over time?
    - Consider further screening/buffering for the utility and service area.
    - Explore the relationship of urban pedestrian passageways, short-term and longer-term/protected seating, landscape improvements, landmarks, information areas, etc., for the entry plaza area.
    - The oval drop-off is a strong concept and should be retained.
6. Stairs
    - Explore how the stairway can be an urban design feature – creating a strong sense of place. The “softer” stair may not work as well in this regard.
    - Suggest combining Option 1 stair with terraces.
    - Explore the possibility of more than one terrace area and evaluate the terrace space, enclosure and views.
    - Insure that street level entrance is appropriately articulated.
7. Landscape
    - Consider seasonality.
    - Develop more detail in seating edges and effective planting areas.
    - Hardscape option vs. softer/landscape treatment options needs more study.
    - Terrace(s) can potentially create visual cues and add interest from Broadway.

Action: No Action requested or taken by the DRB.

12:30 – 1:30 **Jennie Smoly Caruthers Systems Biotechnology Academic 5th Wing Addition**

Presenter(s): Wayne Northcutt
Architects: HDR Architecture
Description: Introduction to the new 5th wing for academics at JSCSB.

Present:
Tom Whetstone, HDR; Christopher Horr, HDR; Kaia Nesbitt, HDR; John Salisbury, HDR

A/E Presentation to the DRB

General

- Team is exploring "complete the thought" approach.
- Active learning focus / integrated learning focus.
- Going through the LEED process.
- Site aspects are important to the building.
- The foundation already exists.
- Systems Biotech building sets up the entire architectural language for east campus.
- Design is based on the 2011 Campus Master Plan.

Site and building

- 12' grade change to the west.
- Building entry grades vary greatly.
- Utilities are clustered to the north of the proposed wing.
- Foundations are already in place.
- Evolution of an east-west connection in the future.
- Embracing the idea of a permeable building to address all edges.
- Courtyards address the idea of creative collision.
  - To the south is an entry and dining component.
  - To the east is event space and services.
  - To the west is creative collision.
  - To the north is the proposed building and streetscape.
- Materials and DNA sequence pattern make a cohesive landscape.
- Building main entry to the south, business in the center of building and permeable edges.

Summary of DRB Comments and Recommendations

1. Better articulate what works well in the existing facility and how it could be improved with the new addition. The new addition needs to fit the current building, but also improve on the existing.
2. The preliminary plan seems like a structure with academic bookends at either end with research in the middle. The massing, though, does not reflect this. The design could explore the differences in the program and use of the building, especially as it relates to entries, access, and use of courtyards, etc.
3. Explore stepping the massing of the building.
4. Better articulate how the new courtyards and outdoor spaces will better serve the faculty, students and visitors.
5. Help explain the current use of the building and how future generations of users may want to use the interior and exterior spaces.
6. Please provide exterior elevation studies of the expansion in context with the existing building.

Action: No Action requested or taken by the DRB.

1:45 – 2:30 **Study Session – *UCCS***

2:30 – 6:00 **Visual and Performing Arts Complex (VaPA)/North Nevada Infrastructure**

Presenter(s): Chris Wineman – Semple Brown, Geoffrey Lynch – H3, Priscilla Marbaker – Tappis, Lynne Moore – Davis Partnership, Todd Cartwright – nv5
Architect(s): Semple Brown Design, H3 Collaboration Architects
Description: Schematic Design presentation.

Present:
Chris Wineman, Semple Brown Architects; Geoffrey Lynch, H3; Lynne Moore, Davis Partnership; David Land, Davis Partnership; Tod Cartwright, nv5

Presentation by the A/E firm to the DRB

General Updates

- Working on a grading and infrastructure plan for November.
- Big idea is to be expressive of campus but somehow unique.
- Defining the north campus edge as a big, bold statement.
- Highlighting as a vehicular gateway with opportunities of entry, gateway and threshold.
- The site is very much a public destination, making it very different from the rest of campus.
- The landscape should be bold and memorable in its own right.
- Design concept of “ribbon-like” movement and flow with sinuous ties.
- Integrating pedestrian circulation by sifting pedestrian traffic to the west side of the street.
    - This is achieved through a sloping walkway that never exceeds 5%.
- Integrating gracious bikeways with wider lanes, wider turns and additional bike parking.
- Integrating an internal bus drop off.
- The road system is designed to serve multiple modes of transit.
- Detailing fire and emergency circulation. The entry plaza is designed to handle fire truck access. This still requires detailing.
- The angled service and delivery drive now competes less with the building entry.

Landscape

- Arrival plaza paving and planter geometries facilitate gathering and allows for fire truck access.
- The artwalk has two paths, one accessible for pedestrians and bikes, the other steeper with stairs.
- The design diversifies grades, paths and shortcuts.

Grading

- Grading plan extends the natural ridge.
- Bermed the northwest side of the building.
- Sustainable earthwork results in no excess cut/fill.
- Raised the building's Finish Floor Elevation 2.5 feet.
    - This helps with the sustainable grading plan.
    - Allows for parking of about 3%.
    - Parking lot driveways negotiate grade change with parking rows stepped to contours.

Drainage

- Drainage plan follows the natural and historic drainage paths on site.
- Integrating as much surface drainage and water quality as possible.
- Moving the bioswale to the southern edge of the project and integrating a detention pond.
- Piping drainage away from the building to protect foundation.
- Integrating drainage structures as bridges of the parking lot bioswale, improving pedestrian circulation.

- The project is seeking LEED points for water quality.

Site Sections

- Landscape and grading plan have improved visibility and access greatly.
- Developing retaining walls as low as possible.

Architecture

- The big picture concept is “art connected by light.”
- Inspired by nature but not trying to mimic nature.
    - Inspiration of form from the lenticular cloud.

Main Level

- East entry has two doors with two separate vestibules.
- West entry is for quick access related to parking across the street.
- South entry is directly related to the VaPA gardens.
- Acoustic hallways separate rooms and performing spaces.
- Integrating curtain wall with storefront windows.
    - 12' high is the “magic number” for storefront.

Second Level

- Eliminating daylighting in performance and arts venues per request of programmatic users.

Cladding

- Banner system fixed to a frame (one for the building, four for events and shows).
- Building is wrapped in light, soft, matte-silver aluminum panels.
- The idea is to highlight the building's curves with light and shadow, emphasizing form.
    - Darker options will likely fade; lighter options will be too shiny.
- Window frames and louvers will be the same as the cladding.
- Undulating roof appears thin but actually houses a truss to cantilever the roof mass.

VaPA Garden

- The sweeping nature of the site and building terminate at the garden circle.
- The design accommodates flexibility for events and uses (designed around 40'x60' tent parameter).
- Creating a uniform edge around curtain wall with ornamental grasses.
- Creating a sunken outdoor room.
- The garden overlooks the site and views south to Pikes Peak.
- The groundcover of the garden circle may change but most programmatic users prefer green lawn.
- A social hub hosting a cafe is tucked into the “elbow” of the building.
- The garden will serve as a sun-sink in the wintertime.

Sustainability

- Currently the project is just above the threshold for LEED Gold.
- Separating the stage and audience utilities (heat and air) to turn audience utilities on/off as performances demand.

Summary DRB Comments and Recommendations

Schematic Design – Site Improvements

1. Explore the sinuous nature of entry paving and landscape language at the main entry. The entry plaza, drop-off area and design must accommodate intense levels of activity as a destination. The current design supports the idea of movement but does not have strong gathering places at drop-off and entry.
2. Examine a stronger pedestrian connection of the south parking lot with the site plan.
3. Examine the bus parking area to create a stronger integration and a sense of entry.

4. Further define and program the VaPA Garden Area in relationship to the overall site grading and landscape improvements, off-site and internal views, building to exterior relationships and the VaPA Garden as a "destination." The geometry of the garden should be better integrated with the design of the building and the overall landscape.
5. Consider the landscape area to the south in stronger relationship to the interior lobby.
6. Consider if the southwest retaining walls can be reduced in size, perhaps through adjustment in the horizontal location of pedestrian circulation.

Schematic Design – Architectural Improvements

1. The A/E team has created an incredible story about the place but appears to have lost the beauty of the concept in the schematic design phase.
2. Explore the opportunity to expand the lobby space to the landscape – physically and visually.
3. Explore how the "lenticular and ribbon" concept can be further pronounced in elevation through the glass openings.
4. Study views along Nevada and I-25 to better determine views of the site and building throughout the day/night and season. This is an iconic building, and the design of the roof will be highly visible. It should support the lenticular form idea, and the concept of Art connected by light.
5. Explore how the interior lobby stairs might become more integrate with the building and visual opportunities.
6. Show how the technical studies of energy use have been integrated and assisted with design decisions.
7. Examine the use of different architectural materials for the building and the natural outcroppings on campus that may be incorporated. Perhaps looking more at what Richard Serra has studied for color spectrums and the use of various building materials.
8. Explore how the roof structures/mechanical penthouses may be more integrated or screened within the overall design.
9. Look at how the secondary windows (smaller-strip windows on the south and east) can be more strongly integrated with the overall design.
10. Explore how the entry Signage Banners can be better incorporated with the building elevations.
11. Provide the drawings required for a schematic design submission, including floor plans and wall sections. Show the first floor plan integrated with the site plan.

Action: Motion to Approve Schematic Design for "Site Improvements" based on DRB Site Comments and Recommendations noted above.

Unanimously Approved.

No motion was made or action taken to approve Architectural Improvements at this time. The DRB suggested a "Special Study Session" be planned to review the Schematic Design for the VaPA Building based on the Comments and Recommendations noted above.

Adjournment: Design Review Board meeting of October 8, 2014, adjourned at 5:45 p.m.