



## University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, December 11, 2024  
Time: 12:30 – 3:30 p.m.  
Location: Fifth Floor Conference Room, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, Colorado

### **DRB and Campus Members present:**

Mike Winters, Jody Beck, Sarah Brown, Tom Hootman, Laurel Raines, Chris Shears, and d'Andre Willis, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus (CU Boulder).

### **Others in attendance not otherwise noted:**

Kori Donaldson, AVP of Budget, Finance, and Capital and ex officio member of the DRB  
Linda Money, CU Real Estate Services, CU System employee / DRB notetaker  
Emily Parker, Sr. Budget, Planning, and Policy Analyst, Office of the VP for Budget & Finance

Mike Winters, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 12:30 p.m.

**12:30 – 1:15 p.m. Study Session/Lunch – Board Only**

**1:15 – 1:30 p.m. Break/Set Up**

**1:30 – 3:00 p.m. Farrand Hall Renovation – CU Boulder  
Conceptual Design Workshop (Information/Direction)**

#### Architects/Consultants:

Anderson Mason Dale (AMD)  
Swinerton  
Wenk Associates  
Group 14 Engineering

#### Presenters:

Maria Blair, Swinerton  
Greg Dorolek, Wenk Associates  
Andy Nielsen, AMD

#### CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

d'Andre Willis, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning  
& Design, Campus Architect, Facilities Planning  
Lindsay Schumacher, Planner, Planning, Design and  
Construction, Facilities Planning

#### Others Present:

Lauren McNeill, Group 14 Engineering  
Katie Spicer, AMD

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:  
Dan Gette, AVC of Student Affairs  
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning  
Ed von Bleichert, Environmental Operations Manager

Description:  
Conceptual Design Workshop submittal for Farrand Hall renovations.

## **A/E Presentation**

The design team gave a comprehensive presentation of the preliminary concept design, a copy of which is available upon request.

## **DRB Comments**

The DRB appreciated the comprehensive presentation and the interactive model.

### **A. Energy and Sustainability**

No comments.

### **B. Site & Landscape Architecture**

The DRB feedback is organized by courtyard / building entries.

#### *West Courtyard and Entry:*

- Adding an entrance to the first level below the main staircase makes the building more functional.
- Of the two ramping options presented, the DRB prefers the single curved ramp. This option is less complex and more accessible. Additionally, it could allow for water retention to be added on the west side of the building.
  - Study whether the break in the low wall can be further widened or if there is another way to reduce the presence of the wall.
  - The alternate ramping solution feels more segregated than the preferred single curved ramp. It creates a number of small, segregated spaces.
- In the future, consider a micro master plan for the area between the entrance to Farrand Field and the west entry to the Farrand Residence Hall.

#### *South Courtyard and Entry:*

- The DRB supports creating an accessible south entrance to the courtyard and building.
- Of the proposed solutions, the DRB prefers the basic diagram showing a single long ramp terminating near the southeast entrance to the building.
- Explore beginning the ramp and courtyard even farther south than what is shown in the conceptual drawings – perhaps even pushing into the sidewalk. This will allow the ramp to terminate farther from the building.
  - Study different ways to step the grade down into the south courtyard. Consider, for instance, terraces or amphitheater-style steps.

*East Courtyard and Entry:*

- The board did not prefer the option with the circular walkway because it did not maximize flexibility of use. The board recommended formalizing the other option, possibly extending the paving throughout the courtyard with planting cut outs around the existing trees. This would make the entire courtyard more programmable and circulation more flexible.
- Explore ways to change the low wall near the entry of the courtyard to make it less of a barrier. Can it be lowered or eliminated? Could the entry be made wider or could there be multiple openings in the wall?

*North Courtyard and Entry:*

- The DRB agrees with the direction the design team is taking to screen part of the north courtyard, to the extent allowed by the existing service bins and required access.

**C. Architecture**

- Consider whether the ground floor windows can be made larger – especially on the east side of the building.

**DRB Action**

No formal action was required. The DRB provided the comments noted above.

**3:00 – 3:30 p.m.**

**Loading Dock at University Memorial Center – CU Boulder  
Update/Discussion** (Information/Direction)

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

d'Andre Willis, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning  
& Design, Campus Architect, Facilities Planning

Description:

Update regarding a University Memorial Center (UMC)  
loading dock sandstone screening wall previously  
approved by the DRB.

**Discussion**

Campus staff presented some proposed changes to a loading dock at the UMC. The DRB asked some questions. The proposal does not require formal DRB review or approval. The DRB thanked the campus for the update.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

*(For assistance with the attachments referenced within this document, please contact Linda Money at (303) 860-6110 or [linda.money@cu.edu](mailto:linda.money@cu.edu).)*