



University of Colorado Design Review Board Amended Meeting Notes

Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 5:15 p.m.
Location: CU Boulder Campus, Norlin Library, British and Irish Studies Room M549,
1720 Pleasant Street, Boulder, Colorado

DRB and Campus Members present:

Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Tom Hootman, Mike Winters, and d'Andre Willis, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus ("CU Boulder"). Cheri Gerou and Chris Shears were not present for this meeting due to scheduling conflicts.

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

Kori Donaldson, Senior Director of Capital Assets 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 1:00 p.m.

9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. Walking Tour of Boulder campus and Lunch – *Board only*

12:30 – 1:00 p.m. Onsite Visit with Design Team at Hellems

**1:00 – 3:00 p.m. Hellems Arts & Sciences and Mary Rippon Outdoor Theatre
Renovation – *CU Boulder*
Conceptual Design (Information/Direction)**

Engineers/Consultants:

Hacker Architects, Colorado
Handprint Architecture, Colorado
WENK Associates, Inc., Landscape Architecture, Colorado

Presenters:

Tania Salgado, Project Manager, Handprint Architects
David Keltner, Design Principal, Hacker Architects
Greg Dorolek, Landscape Architect, WENK Associates, Inc.

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Jan Becker, Architect, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning
Blake Guyer, Project Manager, Planning, Design, and
Construction
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect,
Planning, Design, and Construction

Description: Conceptual Design 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

Board comments and direction included the following:

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

For the north side entry:

- Comments about proposed “universal access” scheme:
 - Any equity and symmetry in ADA access is perceived and not actual due to the difference in elevation between the east and west sides.
 - Achieving the proposed dual access would eliminate a lot of landscaping ground.
 - As presented, the proportions of the historic building are foreshortened on the edges.

- Comments about ramping:
 - Consider a blend of the two options proposed: Raise the uppermost terrace to the height of the entrance, lower the terraces on either side, and add ramps from the lower terraces to the upper terrace. This would maintain the proportion of the sill and the terraces.
 - The west side ramp includes a simpler, modified ADA access turnabout.
 - Analyze ramp placement options:
 - Consider adding a ramp adjacent to the edge of the plaza wall, rather than next to the building. The ramp could run parallel to the building and be more rectilinear rather than angled.
 - Alternately, to retain the linden tree, consider adding a diagonal ramp, with the understanding that working around the existing landscaping would reduce the visual impact of a diagonal ramp.

- Comments about an upper landing/plaza:
 - Creating a landing at the height of the entryway has a lot of advantages:
 - It makes it easier to navigate entry to the building;
 - It makes the entry fully accessible; and
 - It creates a gathering place.
 - Explore creating a single plaza floorplate honoring the three original steps.
 - Make a bigger landing and include final three steps farther away from door;
 - Consider creating a reference in the paving pattern to the final, curved steps, in order to complete the composition of the door after the original, physical steps.
 - Include either one or two sets of steps, incorporating planters to create a strong entry.
 - The inclusion of two vs. three sets of steps is not as important as the layout of the plaza.

- Keep the floor of the plaza below the height of the window sills.
- With the modifications suggested, the minimal impact concept is preferred.
- As much as possible, save all of the existing trees.
- If possible and helpful, eliminate the octagons in order to extend the front entry.

For the east entries (also see Architecture below):

- The floorplate relates more to the building in first proposed scheme (courtyards concept).
- Shape the ancillary edges to make it more welcoming.
- Preserve the trees as much as possible.
- Removing the stone walkway to the north is acceptable.

For the Theatre:

- The terraced scheme is preferred.
 - It is more referential to the theatre itself and separates the edges between the theatre and the building.
 - It unifies the architecture of the building and celebrates the theatre.
- Consider speaking to an ADA consultant regarding universal access requirements.
- Study opening up different/additional entries into the space, rather than having all of the circulation coming around the edges.
 - This improves the arrival sequence for the theatre.
- Retaining the trees and green space against the edge of the building is preferred.
- Taking into consideration the grading issues, if possible, look into adding privets along both sides.

B. Architecture:

- Regarding the east side (also see Site and Landscape above):
 - Opening up the east side entrances to the basement level is a great idea.
 - The south entry is the preferred main entrance.
 - Make the north entry a smaller scale, secondary entrance.
 - Installing a new door is acceptable.
 - Conceptually, option C is preferable.
 - Extend the frames and bump them out a little to become a plinth, making the transition in the frame as needed.
 - The size of the trees helps with the scale of option C.
 - Study the spandrel details.
 - Determine whether there will be complications associated with exposing previously buried foundation walls.

C. Energy and Sustainability:

- Continue to work with staff and Ambient Energy to determine the LEED project boundary in order to maximize returns and prepare and review an energy model.
- The concept design submittal should document what is driving the selection of the preferred mechanical systems.
 - Include the criteria used to make the system selection. What are the system specifications? How does the building envelope affect the selection? Was the building use/programming taken into consideration?
 - Provide a comparison of the various systems considered.
- Continue to reference the new energy master plan while making decisions about energy and sustainability.

- Evaluate whether the maintenance staff needs to be trained to operate new systems or whether maintenance work should be outsourced.
- Continue to study strategies for improving the thermal performance of the windows and other related building modifications.

DRB Action

The DRB appreciated the site walk with the team prior to the meeting.

Given the alternatives and direction discussed during the meeting, Don Brandes moved to table the vote on the Conceptual Design submittal to a future meeting to allow the University and the consultants to incorporate and consider the above referenced comments and suggestions into an amended or revised Conceptual Design submittal. Sarah Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Anschutz Engineering Center – UCCS Design Development (Action Requested)

Architects/Engineers:

OZ Architecture, Denver, Colorado
Wenk Associates, Inc., Denver, Colorado

Presenters:

David Schafer, Principal, LEED-AP, NCARB, OZ Architecture
Greg Dorolek, PLA, ASLA, Principal, Co-President,
Wenk Associates, Inc.
Kelli Schwab, Wenk Associates, Inc.

UCCS Campus Representatives Present:

Mariness Falcon, Project Manager, Construction Facilities
Services, via Zoom

Others Present:

Kelsey Madden, Project Architect, OZ Architecture, via Zoom

Description: Design Development submittal regarding a new three-story, 24,000 SF annex to the existing UCCS Engineering Building, the Anschutz Engineering Center, for the purpose of increasing academic programs in astronautical engineering.

A/E Presentation

The design team gave an abbreviated presentation of the submittal package and project, 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 said it has appreciated the design team's patience, cooperation, and responsiveness throughout the review process in working through a number of difficult issues on the project.

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- Study integrating the proposed bike storage area, the adjoining stairs, and railings into the overall design. In general, the covered bike storage is distracting in the proposed location.
 - It disrupts the entryway.
 - Study how to simplify (or relocate) the structure:
 - Use a cantilever design without a trellis or post; or
 - Reduce the width of the cover along the back so it fits into the composition of the hillside.
 - The remaining bike storage area is acceptable.
- Examine the railing along the stairs and along the top of the patio:
 - The railing looks like an "off-the-shelf" product.
 - Is there a campus railing standard?
 - Can the color or material be lightened so the railing doesn't appear solid black?
 - As drawn, the darkness of the railing will draw too much attention.
 - There may be too many pickets in the design.
 - Consider creating an asymmetrical element at the stairs by replacing the railing with board form concrete on one side (to guard rail height).
 - The concrete wall may reinforce the bike shelter.
- On the patio, think about creating a base wall of iron spot brick with a smaller, lighter railing on top of the brick.

B. Architecture:

- The massing of the vertical element and entry is appreciated.
 - Eliminating the brick at the entry is a good change.
 - Consider painting the bulkhead near the windows dark to more closely match the bottom of the window frames and to avoid the appearance of a white line at the top of each window.
- Incorporating the back stair into the rooftop mechanical element helped simplify the building massing and is an improvement.
- At the Shops building, the updated ramp design and loading area is an improvement.

C. Energy and Sustainability:

- Rerun the energy model with updated information about the equipment selected for the building and compare the results to the current baseline..
- Review and verify LEED scorecard calculations for:
 - Renewable energy. Confirm if all five points shown can be achieved through RECs.
 - Innovation credits, none are specified; two credits will need to be solidified.
- Reconsider the selected HVAC system.
 - Determine the preferred option based on selection criteria: life cycle/cost or life cycle/maintenance.
 - Evaluate whether the maintenance staff needs to be trained to operate new systems or whether maintenance work should be outsourced.
 - Connect UCCS and CU Boulder facilities staff to discuss lessons learned from the HVAC system installed at the Renee Crown building.

- Compare the cost of PV installation, including through a power purchase agreement, to the planned RECs purchase and consider whether it is feasible to install solar at the time of construction.
- Return an updated sustainability report to the DRB after additional research has been completed.
 - Include what has been decided about the preferred HVAC system;
 - Explain the final decision regarding PV installation; and
 - Provide updated LEED calculations.

DRB Action

Mike Winters moved to approve the Design Development submittal for the Anschutz Engineering Center on the UCCS campus, including the comments noted above, with the understanding that the design team will provide an update to the DRB concerning the:

- sustainability/energy report;
- covered bike parking; and
- the concerns raised about the railing.

Tom Hootman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

(For assistance obtaining any copies of the submittal documents referenced within these meeting notes, please contact Linda Money at (303) 860-6110 or linda.money@cu.edu.)