

**University of Colorado Design Review Board
Meeting Notes**

Date: Friday, August 9, 2019
Time: 8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Location: Benson Board Room, CU Anschutz Health and Wellness Center, Aurora, CO

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Victor Olgyay, Chris Shears, Mike Winters, Cheri Gerou (ex officio), Bill Haverly, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus (“CU Boulder”), and André Vite, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Denver campus (“CU Denver”) and the CU Anschutz Medical Campus (“CU Anschutz”).

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB note taker.

Don Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 9:20 a.m.

9:00 – 10:00 a.m. Work Session – Board Only

The DRB indicated that at Pre Design review, the DRB is hoping that the submittals will address:

- expectations
- relationships
- context issues
- access
- service
- connections
- pedestrian concerns
- explicit goals
- tangible direction

The DRB plans to visit Boulder campus to tour the Engineering Center & Hotel/Conference Center site - comments from the DRB after the visit will be collectively incorporated into the meeting notes for this meeting.

10:00 – 11:15 a.m. Engineering Center – ECAE ECNT Renovations – CU Boulder Pre-Design (Information/Direction Only)

Architects:

Anderson Mason Dale Architects, Denver, Colorado
Dig Studio, Inc., Denver, Colorado

Presenter(s):

John Everin, AIA, AndersonMasonDale
Andrew Nielsen, FAIA- Principal, AndersonMasonDale
Gretchen Wilson, ASLA, PLA, LEED, AP, Principal
Partner, Dig Studio

CU Boulder Campus Presenter(s):
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,
Design and Construction
Jan Becker, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning

Others Present:
Chris Brueckner, ASLA PLA, Dig Studio
Jennifer Lozano, Intern, AndersonMasonDale

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager,
Facilities Planning
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning
Cherie Summers, Assistant Dean of Administration, College
of Engineering and Applied Science

Description: Introduction of a renovation of the former aerospace (ECAE) and north tower (ECNT) wings of the Engineering Center for the College of Engineering and Applied Science for research labs, offices, and student service spaces.

A/E Presentation:

- Bill Haverly introduced the submittal:
 - It is an infill project of space recently vacated by Aerospace Engineering when they moved to their new building on East Campus.
- Jan Becker and Cherie Summers discussed the scope of the project.
- Richelle Reilly and Gretchen Wilson reviewed the site and landscape considerations.

John Everin and Andrew Nielsen presented the project's:

- Goals
- Objectives
- Lessons learned in other Engineering Center renovations
- Program
- Schedule
- Budget
- Site and campus context
- Existing conditions

Conceptual Design submittal may come back to the DRB in September.

DRB Comments:

In response to DRB's inquiry of correlation of project with campus master planning efforts:

- The next renovation project would likely be the main office tower, likely be all interior renovations.
- The potential plan would fit well into visioning recommendations.

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Emphasis on creating a “front-door” to the Engineering Center.
- Need to work closely with Architects on the north-facing building and the potential to include natural light into the building.

B. Architecture:

- Investigate options to add, expand windows to add natural lighting where possible while enhancing the architectural design without impacting structural integrity or applicable building codes.
- Consider removing both overhead doors.

DRB Action/Comments in Lieu of Action:

DRB requested:

- The design team should inform DRB of areas in which to focus during forthcoming site visit.
- DRB will contextually return ideas and comments to the design team after such visit.
- DRB is looking forward to Conceptual Design submittal. It will be a collaboration between DRB and design team in terms of overcoming issues from design perspective, etc.

11:30 a.m. – 12:45 p.m.

**Hotel and Conference Center – CU Boulder
Pre-Design (Information/Direction Only)**

Architects/Engineers:

4240 Architecture, Denver, Colorado
studioINSITE, Denver, Colorado
Hensel Phelps Construction Co., Thornton, Colorado

Presenter(s):

Louis (“Lou”) Bieker, 4240 Architecture
Dennis Rubba, FASLA, Founding Partner, studioINSITE
Jason Wallack, Operations Manager, Hensel Phelps
Construction Co.
Thaddius (“TJ”) Carvis, Principal, 4240 Architecture

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager,
Facilities Planning
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,
Design and Construction
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning
Jan Becker, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning

Description: Introduction of P3 development of hotel and conference center in the Grandview area.

A/E Presentation:

Bill Haverly briefly introduced the submittal:

- It is a P3 project

Lou Bieker, Jason Wallack, TJ Carvis discussed:

- History of the project
- Role of the developers
- The program parameters

The level of communication/relationship with the City of Boulder has included:

- Size of conference ballroom and facility vs. size needed to fulfill academic needs vs. needs of classic convention center, negotiated between City and CU.
- Transit and traffic, level of service impacts on the roadways study which would be revisited in order to update study results.
- Height, bulk, and mass relative to underlying zoning if it was a City-owned parcel.
- No City review would be required.
- Fire code inspections and permitting would be managed by the campus.
- Site development plan and surrounding utilities (infrastructure) would be coordinated with the City.

Programmatically, the project as proposed currently includes:

- Overall, 217,000 SF enclosed space not including parking.
- 250 guest rooms.
- 36,000 SF of total function/meeting space, including 15,000 SF ballroom.
- 18,000 SF exterior event/plaza space.
- 6,000 SF restaurant with approx. 120- to 140- seat capacity.
- 477 seats for Food and Beverage.
- 320 designated parking spaces for CU, overall 530 total structured parking spaces, with shared parking arrangements to be coordinated with Campus Parking and Transportation, configuration of parking structure(s) and designations to be determined.
- CU parking incorporates loss of 125 surface lot spaces and waiting list for faculty and staff of approximately 1,300 spaces.
- No stacked or tandem parking, but could include valet parking.

Estimated schedule includes:

- 12 months to complete design and permitting phases to get to breaking ground.
- 26 to 30 months to build and open project.
- Fully operational by August 1, 2022.

Further items presented:

- Site analysis, zoning
- Existing conditions
- Various connections
- Surrounding character

- Site flows including solar, wind, and water
- Views, sections, and context
- Utilities, infrastructure
- Site topography
- Vehicular, bus, pedestrian traffic access and circulation
- Development drivers
- Preliminary programming

DRB Comments:

DRB thanked the team for their presentation and noted that the intent of this Pre-Design submittal is very informal and collaborative. Discussion items to be considered through the DRB review process:

- Sharing with the DRB project related issues and concerns throughout the planning and design process.
- Items the A/E team may be looking forward to in terms of site, context, and relationships.
- Issues the A/E team may be questioning in terms of relationship issues--height, distance, proximity, etc.

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Explore options regarding planning for loading and unloading taller vehicles, when this may be required for special events for not only the hotel site but also for the conference site, and the best way to accommodate them.
- Celebrate the University Avenue aspect of this building and reinforce the prominence of this street and the connection to the university campus whereas Broadway Avenue is more related to circulation.
- Analyze maintaining a soft, green edge along Broadway Avenue so it isn't an urban, hard-built edge in order to break down the scale and massing of the building along Broadway.
- Contemplate the green corridor coming up along 13th Street terminating at Boulder Creek, the northwest corner of 13th Street and Grandview becomes an important corner—consider moving the pre-function space so it overlooks into the green or make the pre-function space a U along 13th Street and Boulder Creek instead of along Grandview Avenue looking at the back of the hotel.
- Study the East-West access which provides a much easier access to control the sun and would provide more opportunity for west-facing rooms, so it might be nice to explore rotating the taller section of the hotel.

C. Energy and Sustainability:

- Continue to evaluate transportation and access to the site.

DRB Action:

DRB expressed appreciation for the presentation and indicated that it looked forward to making a site tour. Thoughts from the DRB as a result of the tour would be incorporated into the meeting notes.

DRB commented that the project has the potential to become “the” place to go for the whole cross-section of the Boulder community and will be a huge benefit to the University.

1:15 – 2:45 p.m.

**Branding and Wayfinding Signage – *CU Anschutz Medical Campus*
Conceptual Design (Approval)**

Architects/Consultants:

ArtHouse Design, Denver, Colorado
Karsh Hagan, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

Martin Gregg, Principal, ArtHouse Design
Anaïs Mares, Senior Designer, ArtHouse Design

CU Anschutz Campus Presenter:

André Vite, AIA, Campus Architect, Office of Institutional
Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz

Others Present:

Lauren Berlamino, Account Director, Karsh Hagan

Other Campus Representative Present:

Jennifer Merchant, Creative Brand Manager, Communications,
CU Anschutz Medical Campus

Description:

Conceptual Design submittal regarding initial signage designs
for the CU Anschutz Medical Campus

A/E Presentation:

- André Vite introduced the submittal, providing a history of the branding and wayfinding signage for the CU Anschutz Medical Campus.
- Marty Gregg and Anaïs Mares reviewed:
 - Goals
 - Existing conditions
 - Proposed signage recommendations including:
 - materials and color palette
 - typefaces
 - symbols

- Proposed monument signs including the following were reviewed:
 - Primary blade gateway at Montview/Quentin
 - Primary curved gateway with vertical tower feature at Colfax/Wheeling and Colfax/Quentin
- Proposed directional wayfinding signage for all entities was also reviewed. All wayfinding signs would include:
 - Consistent sandstone base
 - Consistent shape and size
 - Consistent brushed aluminum cap
 - Consistent typeface
 - Consistent logos and coloring according to organizational entity
- UC Health signs have already been placed but would fall into the proposed design as their signs are replaced.
- Proposed signage for primary parking ID areas and building ID would follow similar, consistent designs, text, and logos as above for each sign type.
- Different sign type was proposed for map/directory/informational kiosks, and consistent pole-mounted wayfinding banners were also proposed.
- Proposal shown for the installation of new and replacement signs would be implemented in phases. All installations are included as Phase I except the installation of sign type E, pole-mounted wayfinding banners. Total number of signs to be fabricated for Phase I is 65.
- Approval of the proposal is the approval of a signage standard to be followed.

DRB Comments:

- For the next submittal level, please include:
 - Pagination throughout the submittal.
 - References on each individual sign type page references to where those signs will be located and which sign type they represent.
- For Building ID sign type D, consider left justifying the building information rather than center justifying.
- From wayfinding standpoint, the family of wayfinding signs is really handsome and looks really good.
 - The continuity element of sandstone base and the blade on the top, making them more rectilinear, helps unifies them.
 - There is a high level of resolution for the wayfinding.
- Consider left justification of the text, when appropriate--there seems to be an order to that throughout the campus--that would be helpful.
- Project submittal approval to be considered for design on wayfinding with monumental signage approval to be considered separately.

- For the monumental signage, introducing a vertical element of the blade doesn't seem to be sympathetic to all the other monumental signage that has happened on this campus.
 - The solution in terms of the monumentality should have a more horizontal relationship to it. It could be landscape, an arc, or a small, horizontal element, but the vertical blade seems out of context and seems more like an appendage that seems hard to relate to the campus overall.
 - The detail should also be detached.
 - Multiple options for the monumental signage should be presented when heard next.
 - Consider lighting only the informational portion of the monumental signs with linear lighting rather than spot lighting the entire sign.

DRB Action:

Don Brandes moved:

- To approve the wayfinding signage, Sign Type B, primary directional signs, through Sign Type F, map/kiosk directory signs, and to move these sign types forward to the next level of review, that review being Schematic Design and Design Development combined. The monumental signs, Sign Types A and A-1, specifically, pages 5, 8, 11, 12, and 13, will be tabled for further review for Conceptual Design.

Victor Olgay seconded the motion, which unanimously passed.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 2:29 p.m. after which the Board toured the HUB space at the CU Anschutz Medical Campus.