University of Colorado
Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Amended Meeting Notes

Date:	Tuesday, March 15, 2022
Time:	9:30 a.m. – 2:15 p.m.
Location:	Bruce and Marcy Benson Conference Room, First Floor, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, Colorado

DRB and Campus Members present:
Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Cheri Gerou, Tom Hootman, Chris Shears, Mike Winters, Carolyn Fox, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs campus ("UCCS"), and d'Andre Willis, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus ("CU Boulder").

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

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

9:30 – 10:15 a.m. **Study Session – Board Only**

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

10:15 – 11:30 a.m. **Conference Center and Hotel – *CU Boulder***
Work Session (Information/Direction)

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:
- WATG Architects
- Limelight Hotel Group
- Helsel Phelps, Contractor
- Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc.
- JVA, Inc., Engineering Consultants

Presenters:
- Monica Cuervo, Senior Vice President and Managing Principal, WATG Architects
- Daniel Patton, Senior Associate and Senior Project Manager, WATG Architects
- Hubert Nguyen, Architectural Designer, WATG Architects
- Lance Walker, ASLA, Director of Landscape, Vice President, WATG Landscape

Others Present:
From WATG Architects:
Ashlynn Braget, Architect, LEED AP BD+C, NCARB
Ali Suryoprabowo, Project Landscape Designer
Greg Villegas, AIA, NCARB Vice President, Director of Construction and Full Services
Mark Cermak, Vice President, JLL
Jean Coulter, Project Manager, Limelight Hotel Group
Cody Gratny, P.E., Vice President and Principal, JVA, Inc.
Kelsey Makan, Project Engineer, Hensel Phelps
Andy Reed, Vice President, Investments, Aspen Ski Company and The Little Nell Hotel Group
Joel Steinberg, MPM, LEED AP, Vice President, JLL

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Katherine Dunklau, Project Manager, Design and Construction
Thomas McGann, Director, Parking and Transportation Services
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect, Facilities Planning
Derek Silva, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Business Strategy
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect, Planning, Design, and Construction

Description: Work session to review/discuss potential modifications to the parking structure (the "structure") portion of the project being considered due to new information on site conditions and other budget impacts for P3 development of a conference center and hotel ("hotel") in the Grandview area.

A/E Presentation

A comprehensive presentation was made 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

The DRB thanked the design team for exploring various alternatives for the parking structure. Below is an abbreviated summary of some DRB suggestions and comments.

Building Footprint

Continue to study the floorplate, siting, and configuration of the parking structure.

- Look for ways to simplify the structure.
    - If the design is simplified, it may reduce overall construction costs, minimize the size of the footprint, and eliminate the sloped façade on one side of the structure.
    - The DRB prefers a design that does not include a sloped façade on all four faces of the building.

- Study whether a “jump ramp” could be placed inside the structure.
    - A “jump ramp” could possibly minimize the extent of the building footprint and potentially improve pedestrian connectivity to the hotel, as well as the connectivity to the bike path and arboretum, and the relationship of the structure to the high school stadium.
- While the relationship between the hotel and the parking structure should be complimentary – the parking structure could be “subservient” or less “detailed” than the Conference Center and Hotel.
    - This may result in a very simple but well designed structure that is obvious to Conference Center and Hotel guests, fits the site better, and accommodates the desired parking count.
    - If possible, the parking structure shouldn’t compete with the hotel from a visual perspective.
- The proposed structure is very visible and prominent (to Boulder residents) when viewed from the north. Explore opportunities to simplify the north side of the building, including eliminating the visible ramps.
- If it helps with the design and cost of the structure, the DRB supports adding height to the structure. The DRB believes that the height of the structure is not as important as the articulation of the footprint and its relationship to the hotel.
    - Research the number of additional levels required to simplify the design.
    - Height might be added without compromising views and without introducing too much of the building above grade.
        - The submittal packet evaluates views to the north. While views to the north should be taken into consideration, the DRB believes the more important views to protect are to the west and east. If the height of the parking structure is increased, but the footprint is reduced, it may balance the overall effect on views to the north.

Materiality

Determine whether the type and mix of materials for the parking structure could be simplified.

- Simplifying the garage structure would showcase the distinct design of the Conference Center and Hotel.
- The DRB is sensitive to the fact that the hotel guest experience should be welcoming and that the garage structure should relate to the Conference Center and Hotel. Study ways to simplify the materiality while maintaining this relationship.
    - The DRB believes the best option is to keep the material palette understated.
- It is not clear if the exposed sheer walls are pre-cast or cast-in-place concrete. If cast-in-place concrete, what is the finish and color?
    - Research whether the structure can be designed as a pre-cast building.
- All design options presented include tall, proportioned screens separated by reveals, relating to the proportionality and fenestration of the hotel.
    - In elevation, the proposed design of the screens seems to draw attention to the overall structure, perhaps more than necessary.
    - Try to move the sheer walls to an interior portion to the structure.
    - Study options to make the structure more open.
    - Obviously, the structure will be more pleasant if there are open vistas within the structure. Given the parking structure site and topography – it would be ideal if the structure was more “open and transparent.”

Stair Tower

Continue to study the design of the parking structure stair tower. The current design appears somewhat heavy and monolithic. While the pedestrian stair tower should be highly visible, safe, and transparent, explore the placement, scale, and materiality of the tower.

- Study switching the location of the elevator core and the stairs.
- At a minimum, the vertical stair elevator core should be transparent for safety reasons.
- Study glazing at the stair core.

Sustainability and Energy

- Have there been any discussions regarding PV on the roof? Explore this opportunity to design the structure to be PV ready.

DRB Action

The "Parking Structure Work Session" was very productive, collaborative, and encouraged strong inter-active communication with the University, Limelight, WATG, and the members of the DRB. The DRB continues to believe the Conference Center and Hotel will be a memorable and remarkable project and is looking forward to the ongoing review process. Based on the "Parking Structure Work Session" the DRB encourages additional study and would support another interim review session prior to a Schematic Design submittal.

No formal action was required. The DRB provided the comments as noted above.

11:30 – 11:45 a.m. **Lane Center West Signage – *UCCS***
Combined Conceptual/Schematic Design/Design Development
(Action Requested)

UCCS Campus Presenter:
Carolyn Fox, Executive Director, Planning, Design & Construction, and University Architect, Facilities Management

Description: Combined Conceptual/Schematic Design/Design Development submittal to review signage proposal for the west side of the Lane Center.

A/E Presentation

Staff presented an abbreviated submittal showing building-mounted signage for the west side of the Lane Center, a copy of which is available upon request through the contact information noted at the bottom of this document.

DRB Comments and Action

No specific comments or direction were provided by the DRB.

Staff indicated that the order of names shown in the submittal document will be reversed to read, "Margot and John Lane Academic Health Sciences Center."

The DRB noted that the proposed signage will improve the appearance of the building and that it conforms with the signage installed on the Hybl Building.

Don Brandes moved to approve the Design Development submittal for the Lane Center West Signage on the UCCS campus, with the amendment noted by staff. Mike Winters seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

12:30 – 2:00 p.m. **Anschutz Engineering Center – *UCCS***
Schematic Design (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.

UCCS Campus Presenter:
Carolyn Fox, Executive Director, Planning, Design & Construction, and University Architect, Facilities Management

Others Present:
Greg Hale, Project Designer, OZ Architecture
Kelsey Madden, Project Architect, OZ Architecture
Leah Mathers, OZ Architecture
Kelly Schwab, Wenk Associates, Inc.

Description: Schematic Design 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

A comprehensive presentation was made 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

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- Continue to study the grading, drainage, accessibility, and landscape treatment of the area between the University Center and the new building.
- Review the plan layout regarding the location of exterior building access to water service.
    - If possible, eliminate access from the terrace (and eliminate stairs to terrace).

- If a dark brick is selected to replace the phenolic wood panels in the building design, study whether the same dark brick can be incorporated into the site and landscape planter areas and building entryway.
- Study the patio between the lantern and the EAS building to determine whether additional terracing and landscaping can be incorporated.

B. Architecture

- Rather than match the brick color to existing campus buildings, the DRB prefers a design that changes the color of the brick to give the new building a separate identity.
- The proportions of the window frames and the verticality of the lantern are distinctive and pleasing.
    - The DRB prefers iron spot brick (v. phenolic wood paneling) for the infill panel at the base of the windows and the lantern.
    - The DRB prefers the lantern design shown on Page 48 of the submittal: vertical mullion pattern and no screen.
- The punched windows are preferred.
- Regarding the entry to the lab building, the preference is Option 1 on page 46, which shows the red brick brought down to ground level between the entry door and the lantern. This option:
    - is more static and more resolved;
    - makes the lantern appear stronger and more proportional; and
    - allows for more emphasis on the entry.
- Recessing the lantern element behind the brick accentuates the verticality of the element and is preferred.
- The signage on the freestanding canopy above the entry is preferred.
    - This provides a better indication of the entry and better scale.
    - Consider whether the canopy should span the entire side of the building.
- Study the design and location of the stairs:
    - Can the materiality and design of the north stair tower be simplified?
    - Option 2 on page 50 showing red and iron spot bricks for the north stair tower is preferred.
    - Can the top cap on the north stair tower can be eliminated by relocating roof access to the west stairs?
- Study the design of the shops building and the loading dock.
    - Could the existing loading dock be tied into the shops building, thus eliminating the need for a second loading dock?
    - Could the length of the ramp be reduced and moved to the side of the building instead of being placed on the face of the building?
- If the campus decides to build a pre-engineered shops building as a cost savings measure, the DRB understands the shops building may be combined with another project and completed in the future.

C. Sustainability and Energy

- The studies, goals, targets, and direction presented are all good.
- Work to tighten the EUI target through additional studies.
- A DOAS VRF mechanical system is preferable from both the health and energy perspectives. If possible, look forward toward future technology and design a more efficient system that uses outside air.

- Dedicate and design an area on the roof for future PV installation.
- A net-zero shops building is desirable. For a one-story building, 40kBtus should be simple to achieve with the installation of PV on the roof.
- Consider occupant comfort as an element of sustainability and include:
    - Natural ventilation
        - From a health perspective, LEED and WELL certifications are advocating higher ventilation rates.
    - Daylighting
        - This is important for health, the learning environment, and is on the LEED scorecard.
- The scoring on the LEED scorecard is a little tight for achieving LEED Gold – to provide a slight buffer, study the "maybe" listings and commit to the ones that might be possible during the design process.
- Glass stair towers act like "solar ovens" – study the design of the frit pattern as a means to drive the cooling load.

DRB Action

The DRB noted that the design of the project continues to improve since the first submittal was presented.

Chris Shears moved to approve the Schematic Design submittal for the Anschutz Engineering Center on the UCCS campus including the comments noted above. Don Brandes seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 2:10 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.)