



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board

Date: Thursday, February 8, 2018
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Location: First Floor Conference Room, 1800 Grant Street, Denver

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

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

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

Mr. Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 9:10 a.m.

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

The Board met to briefly review administrative and legislative items with Ms. Gerou after which the Board briefly discussed the items on the agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

Due to a scheduling conflict, it was noted that the March 8, 2018, regular Board meeting would be moved to March 7, 2018.

10:15 – 11:15 a.m. CU City Center – CU Denver Pre-Design Submittal

Architects: Architectural Workshop

Presenters: Mark Bowers, Architectural Workshop

CU Denver Campus Presenter:

Nolbert Chavez, Chief of External Issues/Chief Strategy
Officer, CU Denver

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

Others Present:

Erik Balsley, AICP LEED AP, Senior Planner, Institutional
Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz

Kimberly Griffin, Project Manager, Civil Engineering, Facilities
Projects, CU Denver/CU Anschutz

Holly Hall, Architectural Workshop, Denver
Cary Weatherford, Associate Director, Office of Institutional
Planning, CU Denver/CU Anschutz

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

The Board briefly explained the review process for the Design Review Board after which introductions were made.

Mr. Chavez began the presentation by providing a brief history of the project. The City of Denver and the CU Denver campus wished to build a stronger and more visible relationship between the the City and the university. Discussions regarding how to build this relationship began approximately one year ago and led to the establishment of the City Center and the identification of an initial location at the CU Denver Dravo Building.

He discussed the partnership with the City, potential funding of the program and renovation of the space, and the initial budget for the project.

Mr. Bowers reviewed the submittal package for the project including the project requirements/ stakeholder goals, the program plan, a potential floor plan, a partial site plan, the existing neighborhood, the overall master plan for the Downtown area, exterior photos of the subject space, and the proposed renovations.

Mr. Vite discussed the site selection criteria.

B. DRB Comments:

No formal action was required regarding this matter. The Board shared the following direction and comments:

Site and Landscape:

- Recognize that this is a significant corner from urban design standpoint; it needs to be light, visual, and transparent from both pedestrian and vehicular perspectives, unlike the existing building.
- Consider that this space needs to become an iconic and welcoming place of its own and should speak to the relationship between the City Center and the University, which should be reflected in the transparency, glazing, lighting, signage, wayfinding, etc.
- Embrace existing vernacular of surrounding streetscapes including landscaping, lighting, plant materials, etc.
- Contemplate creating a micro-master plan to consider broader boundaries and whether or not this application is a one-off or could be part of a larger idea. The Board noted that this project budget will not support the expense of a micro-master planning process.

Architecture:

- Review the proposed interior layout and its relationship to the main entry off 14th Street and related circulation patterns in order to take advantage of the available space and create as many usable, flexible and technology-enabled options as possible.
- Reassess signage and entry ways, consider ways to eliminate confusion with university signage and entry ways, and determine if having the entry way and new signage in the same location where the existing building has been scarred from former signage is appropriate.
- Consider relocating the entry door to the corner of the room, integrating a set-back, and articulating the column in the corner, including potential signage or recladding and opportunities.

General:

- Examine the goals, vision, and length of occupancy; determine what is realistic, what can be done to make this project stand out, and how can the desired elements be accomplished.
- Review the budget and how it aligns with the current program and project goals, explain proportional relationship of budget to exterior and interior spaces, determine in detail what can realistically be accomplished with available funding, align programmatic goals and aspirations, consider reducing the scope of the project to fit within the budget.
- Recognize that accomplishing the proposed project may require creative options such as re-using resources or temporary alternatives in order to resolve budget, schedule, and program challenges and create a successful and remarkable outcome.
- Consider if other funding options, such as P3 relationships, sponsorships, additional funding from the City, etc., are available.
- Consider outreach autonomy and if the site can be shared with other programs in the Dravo Building, such as the College of Architectural and Planning.

**11:15 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. Aerospace – North Wing Addition, College of Engineering –
CU Boulder
Schematic Design**

Architects:

Hord Coplan Macht, Inc., Denver, Colorado, architects
RATIO Architects, Indianapolis, Indiana
PLOT Project, LLC, Denver, Colorado, landscape architects

Presenters:

Chris Boardman, AIA, LEED AP, Principal/STEM, RATIO
Architects

Jennifer Cordes, AIA, LEEP AP, Principal, CPSO, Hord
Coplan Macht
Kent Freed, Principal, PLOT Project, LLC
Anthony Mazzeo, Principal, PLOT Project, LLC

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities
Management
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning

Others Present:

Cade Hammers, Designer II, Hord Coplan Macht

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

Description:

Continuation of Schematic Design submittal regarding site
and landscape and building update only for expansion of
recently approved building for the Aerospace Engineering
Program currently under construction

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

Mr. Freed reviewed updated site and landscaping plans for the Building Addition to the north end of the Aerospace Engineering Building submitted in response to the conditional Schematic Design approval granted by the Board at its meeting on January 11, 2018. Included within this review were updates to the promenade walk and courtyard areas to the east of the Building Addition. Updated paving, planting, platform and bench seating, lighting, and PLD plans for landscaping on the east side were also reviewed. Mr. Freed indicated that details regarding potential wayfinding signage and furnishings and fixtures for the courtyard area will be included in the Design Development ("DD") submittal.

Mr. Boardman presented a SketchUp model of an updated plan for the covered bike shelter and the east entry to the Building Addition.

B. DRB Comments/Action:

The Board provided the following direction and/or comments:

Site and Landscape:

- Review with staff optimum maintenance dimensions and preventive requirements regarding platform seating, especially concerning potential rodent damage.
- Ensure that the lip provided for the LED strip lights is appropriate and that platform dimensions and placement of the strip lights provide optimum distribution of light.
- Review the planting plan to ensure that each species of tree is represented by an individual symbol and bring updated plan to DD.
- Preference from Board is to not attach the bike shelter to the building.
- Review width of paved pathway in front of bike shelter to clarify hierarchy between the pathways; determine if width could be reduced to 12' without impacting the bike turning radius into the pathway.

Architecture:

- Bike Storage: Review footing details to ensure dimensions and connections match the rest of the building and are clean and small connections while still allowing for snow and snow removal conditions.
- East Entry: Review the slope on the canopy to ensure that it matches the rest of the building and the height and design of the metal panel above the canopy.

General:

- For DD, in addition to items noted above, include samples of material palettes and details regarding furnishings/fixtures (trash containers) and locations.

Mr. Epstein moved to approve the Schematic Design submittal for the east site, landscape, and entry elements, noting that the shorter bike shelter and the entry element Option C, with the bay window and canopy wrapping around the corner, were preferred by the Board. Ms. Brown seconded the motion which unanimously passed.

12:30 – 12:45 p.m.

**23rd Street Bridge, North of Boulder Creek – CU Boulder
Discussion Regarding Schematic Design Submittal Package
(item added to the agenda)**

Architects/Engineers:

Loris and Associates, Inc., Engineering Consultant,
Superior, Colorado

BHA Design, Inc., Landscape Architects, Fort Collins,
Colorado

Icon Engineering, Inc., Civil Engineering, Centennial,
Colorado

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
Wayne Northcutt, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities
Management
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning

Description:
Discussion of Final Schematic Design ("SD") submittal
regarding bridge crossing over Boulder Creek in response
to conditional SD approval by Board

Presentation to the Board/Discussion:

A. Background Context:

In response to the conditional SD approval provided at the January 11, 2018, Board meeting, the consultants submitted updated SD documents for review by the Board. The Board discussed these updated documents with staff.

B. DRB Comments/Action:

During the discussion, the Board shared the following comments:

Site and Landscape:

- Once engaged, work with lighting engineer to ensure that lighting at landings and on the crossing is appropriate with minimal luminescence and glow and is not disruptive to the night sky; bring back to the Board for DD. Provide cut sheet and detail of how the light fixture works with the railing structure.
- Review site detailing, pavement and medallion patterns, scoring and expansion joints, to ensure they are appropriate.
- Review tree planter at west side of south plaza; unresolved, determine if it could be more similar to the east side of the south plaza.
- Include at DD site furnishings (trash containers) options, details, and locations.
- Review and include at DD details regarding signage (wayfinding, dismount, map/location, etc.) options, details, and locations.

Architecture:

- Further review structural cross sections of cement platforms above piers to determine if connections to 60' spans can be made more slender and graceful, less vertical, more similar to connections to 30' spans.
- Bring back at DD a samples of galvanized handrail, cabeling, and steel materials in the approved design finish.
- Review design of the kick plate tube regarding maintenance and drainage requirements; i.e., should it be raised slightly, be made of a flat sheet of steel rather than a tube, include scuppers, etc.
- Request of consultants for the DD presentation a 3D computer model of the structural cross sections, and if possible, a 3D mock-up or printed model of the handrail system.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.