



University of Colorado Design Review Board Amended Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, January 18, 2023
Time: 9:30 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.
Location: Via Zoom

DRB and Campus Members present:

Don Brandes, Jody Beck, Sarah Brown, Cheri Gerou, Tom Hootman, Mike Winters, 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 note taker

Don Brandes, Chair, determined a quorum and called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 9:30 a.m.

9:30 – 10:30 a.m. Study Session – Board Only

The DRB reviewed the items on the agenda prior to convening the public portion of the meeting.

10:45 – 11:45 a.m. Old Main Structural Repairs – CU Boulder Pre-Design (Information/Direction)

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:

CSHQA

Wenk Associates Landscape Architects

Presenters:

Danielle Weaver, CSHQA

Greg Dorolek, Wenk Associates, Inc.

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect

d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect

Others Present:

John Maulin, CSHQA

Lily Valentine, CSHQA

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

David Bryne, Jr., Facilities Planning

Wayne Northcutt, Facilities Planning

Description:

Pre-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, a copy of which is available upon request through the contact information noted at the bottom of this document.

DRB Comments

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- Work with Facilities Planning to develop a vision of planned improvements to Pleasant Street for review at Conceptual Design (“CD”) and Schematic Design (“SD”).
 - If possible, please outline what improvements will be made to Pleasant Street as a part of this project and other potential future phases.
 - What is the vision for Pleasant Street from Broadway through the campus?
 - Ideally, if money is available, the connection to Broadway Avenue to the west could be a significant portion of any improvements made to Pleasant Street and connecting to Old Main.

B. Architecture

- What is the impact of replacing the stairs on the west and south sides with regard to cost, code, and footprint?
 - These entry points into the building are clearly not historic, so it would be good to replace them.

C. Energy and Sustainability

No comments provided.

DRB Action

The DRB thanked the design team for their good work, time, and effort, and for the great presentation, noting that it was very informative and well done. The summary of the assessment was excellent. It is an honor to be part of this great, historical project, and the DRB appreciates an opportunity to learn so much about the restoration process.

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

**12:30 – 2:30 p.m. Hellems Arts & Sciences and Mary Rippon Outdoor Theatre
Renovation – CU Boulder**

Schematic Design (Action Requested)

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:

Hacker Architects, Colorado
Handprint Architecture, Colorado
Wenk Associates, Inc., Landscape Architecture, Colorado
Ambient Energy, Colorado

Presenters:

Tania Salgado, Handprint Architects
David Keltner, Hacker Architects
Greg Dorolek, Wenk Associates, Inc.
Linda Morrison, Ambient Energy

CU Boulder Campus Presenters:

Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning
d’Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect

Others Present:

Kaitlin Bernal, Wenk Associates
Jessica Tippens, Hacker Architects

CU Boulder Campus Facilities Planning Representatives Present:

Jan Becker
Blake Guyer
Dena Heisner
Marni Wheaton

Description:

Schematic Design (“SD”) submittal for a complete renovation of Hellems, site work at building entries, and a limited scope renovation of the Mary Rippon Theatre.

A/E Presentation

The design team gave a comprehensive presentation of the submittal package, a copy of which is available upon request through the contact information noted at the bottom of this document.

DRB Comments and Action

The DRB complimented the design team for a well-prepared packet for Schematic Design (“SD”). It addressed many of the issues raised during Conceptual Design (“CD”).

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- Regarding potential add alternates:
 - The first add alternate on the north side of the building creates the entry plaza medallion.
 - Even though an “add alternate,” this becomes a wonderful entry into the building and further enhances the design the project is trying to achieve.
 - The material change bifurcates the east-west walkway.

- Please share your thoughts on the status of this add alternate in the Design Development (“DD”) submittal.
- The second add alternate involves ADA access at the south end of the theatre.
 - The DRB hopes both add alternates can be included in the project, if possible, or perhaps could be completed at a later phase/date.
 - If the add alternates can’t be included, at a minimum, the existing octagonal benches on the north side should be removed. If left in place, they will detract from the improvements made by the project.
- At DD, include images of unmown bluegrass (existing campus locations) in the plant materials palette.
- The reconfiguration of the courtyards works really well. It creates a nice entry on the east side and is a big improvement from the CD submittal.
- The plan for the theatre area works well.
 - This includes the preservation of the window wells on the west side, including guard rails at the window wells, and the drainage and accessibility plans.
 - The elm trees are the right trees for the locations.
- At DD, include a section of the curb-height retaining wall with the cast-in-place concrete and sandstone cap in order to show the detail.
- The delineation and diagrams of the walls included in the submittal were appreciated.
- Review the storage of the independent lighting, towers, trusses, stage platforms, etc. to ensure it is sufficient.
- On the north side of the building, the cap lighting shown on page 58 for the low-lying walls is a contemporary solution that may look out of place with the historic building.
 - Study the specifications of the fixture selected.
 - The photometrics regarding the ambient lighting, the brightness of the lighting, and how it washes the stone of the wall will make a big difference in the appearance.
 - To reduce light pollution, determine if not using the cap lighting on the far side of the low walls closest to the Norlin Quadrangle will be acceptable according to ADA requirements.
 - On page 58, the bollard lighting option is preferred over the handrail lighting option.
 - Strategy 2 lighting preference, including the bollard and pole lighting options shown on page 59, is acceptable.

B. Architecture

- For the doors at the southeast and northeast entrances, Option 3, shown on page 70, is preferred, unless the design team determines a better option.
 - Option 3 is more consistent in terms of the expression from the top to the bottom and matches the doors on the nodes on the courtyard side.
 - Visually, it seems a little less awkward with the weight of the doors versus the transom, the proportions and scale are a better fit.
- For the doors at the node in the courtyard, the offset double doors in the preferred Option 2 are fine. Option 2 provides a wider opening when needed.

- The new elevator extension on the east wing is a good solution.
 - Although identical to the west wing extension, because of the perspective and depth of vision in the foreground, it will be more visible and the most noticeable intervention to the building.
 - Since it will be new construction, ensure the materials match the rest of the building.
- The preferred solution for the venting on the roof is acceptable. The patina on the copper hoods will turn dark over time and be less visible.

C. Energy and Sustainability

- It was noted that the plan to use all inclusive restrooms was appreciated, even though it reduced the LEED score for the water use reduction line item.
- A pathway to LEED Platinum is not necessarily important.
 - The requirements of the project should be satisfied.
 - Highlight social equity and embodied carbon as the story of the project. This will be compelling for students learning about the sustainability features of the building.
- The energy modeling is showing great progress.
 - Even though some better mechanical systems were being considered earlier, the team has done a good job moving forward to capture savings in this area.
 - The additional detail on the energy model assumptions and results is appreciated.
 - Continue work to maintain or improve in the current results of 35 kBtu/sf/year.
- Regarding obtaining a continuous air barrier discussed at previous meetings, ensure the details of the transitions from one type of insulation to the next are addressed in the future to make sure the air barrier isn't jeopardized.
- At the next submittal, include a comparison regarding the window glass/glazing of this project versus the Ketchum Building, which had a similar new aluminum window, and what has been used with other new buildings on campus.
 - The objective is to have the window as clear as possible.
 - The triple pane will be visually distinctive. At the DD submittal, provide samples.

DRB Action

DRB thanked the design team for coordinating closely with Boulder Facilities staff. The work completed by Ambient Energy to address sustainability and energy was especially appreciated.

Don Brandes moved to approve the Schematic Design submittal for the Hellems Arts & Sciences and Mary Rippon Outdoor Theatre Renovation, including the comments noted above. Cheri Gerou seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board adjourned at 2:26 p.m.

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