



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023
Time: 8:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.
Location: Bruce and Marcy Benson Conference Room, First Floor, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, Colorado

DRB and Campus Members present:

Don Brandes, Jody Beck, Sarah Brown, Tom Hootman, Mike Winters, André Vite, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical campus (“Anschutz”), and d’Andre Willis, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder (“CU Boulder”). Cheri Gerou was unable to attend the meeting due to a scheduling conflict.

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

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

Don Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 8:40 a.m.

8:30 – 9:30 a.m. Study Session – Board Only

The DRB reviewed the items on the agenda and discussed administrative matters prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

9:30 – 11:00 a.m. CU Anschutz Campus Master Plan Update – CU Anschutz Final Review (Information/Direction)

Architects/Engineers:
AECOM, Denver, Colorado

CU Anschutz Campus Presenters:
André Vite, AIA, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Facilities Planning and Design
Erik Balsley, AICP, LEED AP BD+C, Senior Planner, Archibus Coordinator

Description:
Final review of the CU Anschutz Facilities Master Plan and Design and Development Guidelines.

A/E Presentation

Campus staff gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, which can be found in [Attachment 1 – CU Anschutz Campus Master Plan \(CMP\)](#) on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*.

DRB Comments and Action

General Comments about the CMP:

- The DRB praised the comprehensive nature of the CMP and encouraged the University to further emphasize the fact that the CMP is, in part, an update of the 2012 Master Plan. The CMP encourages strong relationships and context between buildings, but there is less emphasis on zoned buildings and land usage. The CMP could also note that in the past several years, the process of consolidating various academic and administrative functions has dramatically reduced the need to design and build as many stand-alone buildings throughout the campus.
- Consider the following in the future design and siting of a Student Union Building:
 - The proposed location is the heart of the campus.
 - Ensure that whatever is built on this site is a comprehensive program that, to some extent, will be a long-term student gathering place.
 - From an urban design and planning standpoint, the student union building, whether it is built now or later, needs to be a special building with a strong vision.
 - Consider including food service within the building programming.
- When planning for the Phase II Ancillary CUP Facility and related parking, study the location in order to determine the best layout for the site. Try to avoid placing a CUP facility directly against the edge of Montview Blvd.
- As much as possible, work with the City of Aurora and the Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority regarding the future design of Scranton Street.
 - The proposed space between the two sides of Scranton could be more pedestrian-friendly and activated.
 - The proposed space between the through-ways doesn't seem to serve any function.
- If appropriate, the DRB offered to participate in the development of the campus energy master plan and climate action plan
 - Ensure that the climate action plan includes a greenhouse gas emissions inventory.
- Since the energy master plan and climate action plan will be completed after the CMP is finalized, add cross-references in the CMP to these future plans. The CMP can set the expectation of where to look for certain information once the other documents are completed. Also, make sure that the sustainability goals are relevant for the entire 10-year master plan period.

General Comments about the Design Guidelines:

- Generally speaking, the DRB thought the site and landscape design guidelines may be too prescriptive in places and the direction provided with regard to the architecture of the character districts was not prescriptive enough.
- Consider adding flexibility to some of the “standards and guidelines for the site and landscape improvements,” such as:
 - For example, the requirement to plant trees in groups of three may not always fit the desired experience. The rhythm of walking down the sidewalk may be more varied, more desirable if the trees weren’t always planted in groups of three, if the bushes weren’t always planted ten feet apart, etc.
 - Due to the level of specificity provided in the site and landscape guidelines, provide a means to update periodically.
- Once completed, add the climate action plan and energy master plan to the CMP as amendments.
- Within the character building design goals, the architectural character of each district is briefly discussed. The open-ended guidelines are good in that they afford design flexibility; however, in the opinion of the DRB, the document does not offer sufficient design guidance.
 - For example, the guidelines mention the use of high quality materials, glazing, and fenestration, but don’t list any specific direction. Consider adding more specificity to some of these areas.
- Anschutz staff noted that the design guidelines are written so they represent fixed versus flexible guidelines.
 - The fixed guidelines include the streetscapes which are very prescriptive regarding streetscapes, utilities, open spaces, etc.
 - The building design guidelines are much more open ended in order to allow flexibility. They are more about the relationships of the buildings with each other within each character district and with the streetscape included in the character district guidelines.
- The DRB noted that the updated CMP will be an exceptional guideline for its review of future projects.

DRB Action

No formal action was required for this matter. The DRB provided the comments and direction noted above.

11:00 – 11:30 a.m. Potts Field Concessions and Restrooms Building – CU Boulder Design Development Follow Up (Information Only)

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:
Populous

Presenter:

Amy Kirtland, Facilities Planning, CU Boulder (via Zoom)

CU Boulder Campus Representative Present:

d'Andre Willis, Campus Architect (via Zoom)

Description:

Follow up from December 2022 Schematic Design ("SD")/Design Development ("DD") submittal for a new 3,000 SF building adjacent to Potts Track & Field to house ADA restrooms, storage space, and concessions in preparation for the May 2024 PAC12 Track & Field Championships to be held at CU Boulder.

A/E Presentation

Staff gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, which can be found in [Attachment 2 – CU Boulder Potts Field Concessions, Restrooms](#) on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*.

DRB Comments

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- The reduction in the amount of paving was appreciated.
- Investigate alternatives to sealing the concrete. ProTex sealer discolors concrete for a few years after application. If possible, the DRB prefers that a different sealer be used.
- A cross-slope drainage of 2% across the concrete was suggested by the DRB and will be further confirmed by the Campus Architect to achieve positive drainage.
- Investigate if cylindrical sconce lighting could be used around the building in lieu of the proposed "Wedge" lighting. The Wedge light feels more industrial and utilitarian, and a cylindrical light would more closely match the proposed round outdoor ceiling lights.

B. Architecture

- The DRB appreciated the changes to the roof which eliminated the access ladder previously presented in the SD/DD submittal.

C. Energy and Sustainability

No comments provided.

DRB Action

No formal action was required for this matter. The DRB provided the comments and direction noted above and thanked the staff for the follow up after SD/DD review.

12:00 – 1:30 p.m.

**Old Main Structural Repairs – CU Boulder
Conceptual Design (Action Requested)**

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:

CSHQA

Wenk Associates Landscape Architects

Robert Silman Associates Structural Engineers, DPC

Atkinson-Noland & Associates, Inc.

Presenters:

Greg Dorolek, Landscape Architect, Wenk Associates, Inc.

John Maulin, Architect, CSHQA

Danielle Weaver, Architect, CSHQA

David Woodham, Consulting Engineer, Atkinson-Noland &
Associates, Inc.

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect
(via Zoom)

Others Present:

Kaitlin Bernal, Wenk Associates, Inc.

Katie Butler, CSHQA (via Zoom)

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

David Bryne, Jr., Facilities Planning (via Zoom)

Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planning

Description:

Conceptual Design submittal for project at Old Main including structural masonry repairs, foundation repairs and drainage, window repairs, and site improvements in/along Pleasant Street.

A/E Presentation

The presenters gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, which can be found in [Attachment 3 – CU Boulder Old Main Structural Repairs](#) on the DRB website, *Meeting Dates, Agendas and Minutes*.

DRB Comments

The DRB thanked the design team for the Conceptual Design (“CD”) submittal packet, noting that the board would like to use the packet as an example of a great CD submittal.

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- The DRB prefers landscape Concept One (page 58). The DRB appreciates:
 - The medallion and new sentinel tree, which provide symmetry at the entrance. This planting concept helps address the lack of symmetry created by the loss of an evergreen tree.

- The sandstone planter ring with a mulch base is historical and makes sense at Old Main.
 - The seating area on the south building edge is welcome and provides an opportunity for pedestrian gatherings.
 - The mixture of the four plant materials for the deciduous trees reflects the heritage of Old Main.
- The DRB prefers the 24' cross section of Pleasant Street shown at the bottom of page 70 with the bioswale and landscaped edge. This option allows for flexibility in developing the adjacent landscaped edge for drainage and a landscape buffer.
 - For SD, continue to study the medallions and pavement selection in terms of the material, coloration, placement, and continuity along Pleasant Street.
 - Do the pavers need to be permeable?
 - If concrete is used for the paving material, perhaps it could be colored to match the color of the medallions and provide a more uniform appearance. Consider using sandstone for the medallions and sand-finished (not colored) concrete.
 - The ultimate solution should be simple while keeping in mind budgetary limitations, underground drainage improvements, and above ground drainage requirements.

B. Architecture

- Determine if it is possible to modify the newer, concrete stringer walls at the west stair by adding a stone veneer or another treatment to the concrete to make the stringer walls appear more like the original stone or the south stair stringer walls.

Regarding the existing fire escapes and windows on the east side of the building:

- The DRB prefers the option of removing the two smaller spiral staircases and replacing and replicating windows to match the historic triple-hung window at the auditorium.
- For the existing, taller spiral exit staircase, the DRB recognizes that due to code constraints: 1) there may not be many options for a replacement exit stair, 2) the staircase would need significant restoration to make it structurally sound for use as an emergency exit, and 3) the staircase, once repaired, would not be code compliant.
 - Continue to research options regarding the taller spiral exit staircase and provide a sketch showing potential repair scenarios.
- Ideally, the window replacement sashes would have clear coating on both sides.
 - Review what is being done with replacement windows at Hellems.
- For doors other than the large door on the north side, consider integrating the historic top and bottom paneled door style, but replace the upper panels with glass to retain visibility.
- The DRB agreed with the recommendation to repair and restore the replicated metal railings on the north and south towers and not to replace any of the original spires.

C. Energy and Sustainability

- The DRB appreciates the team's approach to finding opportunities to enhance sustainability and energy performance within the structural restoration scope. The idea of adding another

100 – 150 years to the life of the building while improving the energy efficiency of glazing and new LED lighting is a compelling sustainability story.

DRB Action

The DRB noted the quality of the submittal, specifically the way it was organized to highlight the various issues under review by the design team.

Don Brandes moved to approve the Conceptual Design submittal for the Old Main Structural Repairs, including the comments noted above. Sarah Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. As noted earlier, Cheri Gerou was not present for this motion. Also, due to his teaching schedule, Jody Beck was not present for this motion.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the DRB was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

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