

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

Date: Friday, February 15, 2019
Time: 8:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Location: Fifth Floor Conference Rooms, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, CO

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Chris Shears, Victor Olgyay, Mike Winters, Cheri Gerou (ex officio), 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 8:10 a.m. Due to a scheduling conflict, Sarah Brown joined the meeting late.

8:00 – 9:30 a.m. Work Session/Lunch – Board Only

The Board met to briefly to discuss various administrative items and the items on the agenda for this date prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

9:30 – 11:00 a.m. UHealth University of Colorado Hospital – Anschutz Inpatient Pavilion Tower 3 Expansion – CU Anschutz Medical Campus Schematic Design for Site and Landscape Architecture (Action Required)

Architects/Engineers:

Pact Studios, Denver, Colorado, architecture and landscape architecture

Kimley-Horn, Denver, Colorado; landscape architecture

EYP Architecture & Engineering, Denver, Colorado; lead exterior design, programming & planning, standards expert

Affiliated Engineers, Inc., Denver, Colorado; MEP design, low voltage, lighting design

Martin & Martin, Lakewood, Colorado; civil and structural engineering

Presenters:

Chris Barnwell, AIA, Pact Studios

Sheila Elijah-Barnwell, Ph.D., AIA, Pact Studios

Jeremy Powell, PLA, Landscape Architect, Kimley-Horn

Others Present:

Greg Foster, LEED AP, NCARB, Senior Project Manager, EYP
Chris Hice, PLA, Kimley-Horn

CU Anschutz Campus Presenter:

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

Description:

Schematic Design (“SD”) for site and landscape architecture
for new UCHHealth University of Colorado Hospital expansion
project consisting primarily of a new inpatient bed tower and
associated amenities to support planned inpatient services
growth

A/E Presentation:

Schematic Design presentation was presented to the Board. The DRB requested that the landscape and site design consultants return with a revised submittal for a GoTo Meeting—see notes below.

DRB Comments:

- Please better define the project “limits of construction.”
- Using as a general guide the project examples provided to you in hard copy – provide a more enhanced level of planning and design for the SD and DD submittals. Please provide greater detail and site planning for the following areas:
 - 1) Garage to Tower 3 Crossing
 - 2) Pedestrian Crossing Plaza
 - 3) Median Improvements
 - 4) Entry Garden
 - 5) North/South Corridor
 - 6) 17th Avenue Intersection

Pre-submittal for Tower III Site and Landscape Architecture Schematic Design

Resubmittal

Go To Meeting – February 22, 2019

DRB members present:

Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Victor Olgay, and Cheri Gerou.

Presenters:

Greg Foster, LEED AP, NCARB, Senior Project Manager, EYP
Jeremy Powell, PLA, Landscape Architect, Kimley-Horn
Chris Hice, PLA, Kimley-Horn

A/E Presentation:

Presentation of progress on Site, Landscape and Exterior Lighting for Tower III with Drawings addressing the six areas identified at February 15th meeting:

- 1) Garage to Tower 3 Crossing
- 2) Pedestrian Crossing Plaza
- 3) Median
- 4) Entry Garden
- 5) North/South Corridor
- 6) 17th Avenue Intersection

DRB Comments:

- Lighting in the north/south direction at the emergency vehicle drive should be further examined given the changes in the revised site plan.
- For covered or shaded areas carefully select shade-tolerant plant materials.
- Explore moving the ADA parking to parking lot location directly in front of the raised pedestrian crosswalk.
- Verify the tree canopy for visual connections to the Hospital and the emergency signage.
- University Architect cautioned the design team that the transition at entrance crosswalk be appropriate for its usage.
- Verify exiting at Emergency signage under canopy.
- Please paginate submittal for Schematic Design resubmittal.
- Deliberate different trees at crosswalk – recognizing the goal of having the tree canopy to be above the head height of those crossing.
- Examine the bench locations for adequate clearance at corner at elevator and stairwell. Perhaps a simplification of the landscape and bench placement, should be reconsidered. The benches under the trees may want to be removed to visually open the space at the crosswalk.
- Analyze the scoring of the crosswalk to eliminate the “fussiness” of the angles – it does not appear that the design intent will be successful.
- North/South Corridor: Reconsider introduction of new boulders into the landscape of this area; the “moonscape boulders” do not appear to connect to landscape design.
- Prior to the next DRB meeting, landscape consultants will meet with Hospital groundskeeper “Steve” to discuss his selections of plant materials and further discuss the desired outcome of the plant materials.
- Please furnish lighting plan for covered emergency area.

- Additionally, prior to resubmittal:
 - As much as possible, differentiate between existing and proposed so that the DRB has a better understanding of intent.
 - Engage in providing clear identification of scoring and edging and heights of curbs, edges, etc.
 - Begin to articulate the verticality in terms of the constructability of walls, walks, steps, etc.
 - Recognize that any material call-out provided assists the DRB in understanding design intent.
 - Cross-sections are always helpful in interpreting the project. Please include buildings behind cross sections to help understand how the landscape registers against the building. This will help to provide context to illustrations.

In general, this submittal was a marked improvement – great job!

DRB Action:

The Board tabled action on the site and landscape architecture Schematic Design submittal with direction as provided within the comments noted above for the February 15 and the February 22 meetings.

**11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Business and Engineering Schools Expansion – *CU Boulder*
Design Development for Site and Landscape Architecture
(Action Required)**

Architects:

AndersonMasonDale Architects, Denver, Colorado
Civitas Architects, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

Andrew Nielsen, FAIA- Principal, AndersonMasonDale
John Everin, AIA, AndersonMasonDale
Craig Vickers, RLA, Civitas

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Jan Becker, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning

Others Present:

Kyle Hopkins, Civitas

Description: Design Development for Site and Landscape Architecture submittal for an addition and renovation to the Koelbel Building and the Engineering Center for the Leeds School of Business and the College of Engineering and Applied Science

A/E Presentation:

Civitas and AMD presented the changes to the site and landscape design. Campus staff addressed specific project, site, and campus questions.

DRB Comments:

- Explore the signage and wayfinding for the two schools at this combined entrance.
- Consider recessing door into Engineering side of tunnel, or changing the glazing on the glass at the door, adding a bit of color, or changing the floor pattern in front of the entrance door.
- Contemplate asking the builder of the iconic bench on the west side of the project to build the benches for the underpass.
- Investigate more lighting at bench area other than the in-bench lighting.
- Engage in designing the skylights such that the classrooms below grade on the west side of the Business School are able to see the light.
- Explore changing the lighting pattern in the ceiling of the underpass to give more play and variation to space. Consider using a like pattern in the paving pattern as well to help articulate that entry area.
- DRB cautioned the consultants from using two different lighting levels in the fixtures in the underpass, the concern is that it may look haphazard and like a mistake.

DRB Action:

Don Brandes moved to approve the Design Development submittal for site and landscape architecture with the comments noted above. Sarah Brown seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

12:00 – 1:00 p.m.

**30th Street & Colorado Avenue Underpass – CU Boulder
Project Update (No Action Required)**

Architects/Engineers:

Loris and Associates, Inc./Otak, Superior, Colorado,
engineering consultant
MIG, Denver, Colorado, landscape architect and civil
engineering consultant

Presenters:

Kevin Dooley, PE, ENV SP, Associate, Loris and Associates, Inc.
Jason Feld, Transportation Project Manager, City of Boulder
Paul Kuhn, RLA, Senior Project Manager, MIG

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Jan Becker, Facilities Planner/Architect, Facilities Planning

Description:
Pedestrian and bicycle underpass at the intersection of 30th
Street and Colorado Avenue

A/E Presentation:

Representatives from the City of Boulder, Loris/Otak and MIG presented the 30th Street and Colorado Avenue underpass project to the DRB. Campus staff addressed questions concerning the project and its relationships with the University of Colorado. The DRB thanked the presenters.

DRB Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- Slide 3 – What happens with CU where the City of Boulder begins and where City of Boulder ends? Is there a plan at the transition as they approach the intersection from main campus? CU commented that the travel experience in front of some of the properties is unpleasant, but there is not an immediate solution. The City of Boulder is embarking on a 30th Street corridor study to come up with alternate transportation modes (bike, pedestrian, etc.). This project is the first implementation of that study. City of Boulder reported that the connectivity to the university is on everybody's radar. The City has plans to secure an easement somewhere through this corridor, but the alternatives and scenarios have not been fully vetted. That will be submitted in the context of the larger build out of the corridor (it is not coupled with this project).
- DRB encouraged the inclusion of some type of CU emblem at the plaza.
- City of Boulder suggested that they may be able to reference the university in the art work that will be created for the underground passageway.

B. Architecture:

No comment.

C. Energy and Sustainability:

- Please provide environmental product declarations on concrete so that the embodied energy and greenhouse gas emissions associated with different mixes are revealed.

DRB requested that as the project progresses, the city of Boulder may be able to take the CDOT standard and improve on some of those mixes for a lower environmental impact to be in concert with the City's goals.

DRB Action:

DRB congratulated the City of Boulder, the Boulder campus, and the consultants on a great job. This item was for information only and required no action at this time.

1:30 - 3:00 p.m.

CU Denver Business School Infill Phase II - CU Denver Design Development Follow Up (Information Only/Direction) and **Alley Signage Introduction** (Action Required/Direction)

Architects:

Stantec, Inc., Architects, Denver, Colorado

CU Denver Campus Presenter:

Cary Weatherford, Office of Institutional Planning,
CU Denver Campus

Description:

Follow up on Design Development ("DD") approval granted for the Business School Phase II Renovation (Infill) project including the construction of a new, three-story structure where the existing courtyard is currently located and discussion of pedestrian level signage for alley entrance to the project

A/E Presentation:

Cary Weatherford presented an update to the Board based on the DRB comments from the DD approval and discussed with the Board potential options regarding pedestrian level alley signage for the project.

DRB Comments:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Lighting in alleyway:
 - DRB interprets the washing of the wall in the alley with light to be a good move.
 - The vertical light element will not be as effective.
- Artwork in alleyway:
 - Artwork is a monumental idea. It should be lit with some sort of lighting, perhaps from across the alley.
 - DRB suggested the artwork could turn around the corner and lead down the alley. Perhaps something that begins two-dimensionally and morphs into a three-dimensional art piece.

- Signage:
 - DRB expressed a blade sign or banner (with a strong use of color) mounted above the truck heights would be a great option to project out from the building at the alley entrance, such that it could be visible from 15th. The sign can be more artful rather than informative. It can be understated but it needs to be visible.
 - DRB suggested the corner wrapped signage is not a good option. It will not hold up and may be easily vandalized.
 - DRB endorsed the use of horizontal signage at alley entrance/exit in a less expensive format.

B. Architecture:

- Detail of back entrance: take ramp distance down all the way and make it a lesser slope.

C. Energy and Sustainability:

No comment.

DRB Action:

Although no formal action was required for this matter, the Board provided direction as noted above.

3:00 - 3:30 p.m.

Parking Lot Reconfiguration - CU South Denver Introduction (No Action Required)

Architects:

S.A. Miro, Inc., Denver, Colorado, structural and civil
engineering consultant

Oxbow Design Collaborative, Denver, Colorado, landscape
architecture consultant

CU Denver Campus Presenter:

Cary Weatherford, Office of Institutional Planning,
CU Denver Campus

Description:

Introduction and description of scope of work regarding
restriping and potential landscape changes to existing parking
lot to increase number of spaces in order to address parking
capacity issues

A/E Presentation:

Cary Weatherford provided an introduction and provided background to the Board regarding the proposed reconfiguration of the parking lot at the CU South Denver campus. The point of the project is to try to increase the amount of parking for the facility.

DRB Comments:

DRB expressed concern regarding the lack of direct exiting in the proposed parking layout.

DRB Action:

This item was for information only and required no action at this time.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.