



University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, November 14, 2019
Time: 9:00 – 1:30 p.m.
Location: First Floor Conference Room, 1800 Grant Street, Denver

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Victor Olgyay, Chris Shears, Mike Winters, and Bill Haverly, campus DRB member for the CU Boulder Campus (“CU Boulder”).

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

Cheri Gerou, State Architect, former Senior Director of Capital Assets and ex officio member of the DRB

Kori Donaldson, incoming 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 9:15 a.m.

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

The Board briefly discussed the items on the agenda and board scheduling matters.

10:00 – 11:30 a.m. Engineering Center – ECAE ECNT Renovations – CU Boulder Schematic Design (Action Required)

Architects/Engineers:

Anderson Mason Dale Architects, Denver, Colorado

Dig Studio, Inc., Denver, Colorado

Group 14 Engineering , Denver

Presenters:

Andrew Nielsen, FAIA- Principal, AndersonMasonDale

Gretchen Wilson, ASLA, PLA, LEED, AP, Principal
Partner, Dig Studio

Taylor Roberts, Group 14 Engineering

Others Present:

Chris Brueckner, ASLA PLA, Dig Studio

John Everin, AIA, AndersonMasonDale

Jennifer Lozano, Intern, AndersonMasonDale

Stephen Showalter, Architect, AndersonMasonDale

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Jan Becker, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager,
Facilities Planning
Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,
Design and Construction
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning

Description: Schematic Design submittal for a renovation of the former aerospace (ECAE) and north tower (ECNT) wings of the Engineering Center for the College of Engineering and Applied Science for research labs, offices, and student service spaces.

A/E Presentation:

A comprehensive presentation was made of the submittal package. Points discussed include:

- Potential add alternatives including:
 - Narrowing of sidewalk along north edge of Colorado Avenue in order to tie into parking lot modifications;
 - Landscaping along north edge of building along Colorado Avenue.
- Various sustainability analyses still outstanding including:
 - Materials charrette to review LEED materials points and embodied carbon impacts;
 - Energy charrette to review mechanical systems and energy points.
- An energy engineering consultant is working with design team to maximize sustainability and energy use.

DRB Comments:

- DRB stated that the submittal demonstrates a great improvement to the northeast corner edge of the campus and to the northeast corner of the building. It represents an excellent job in solving a difficult problem.

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Please coordinate the specific plant material specifications with input from CU Boulder staff.
- DRB expressed a preference for using lit bollards, based on campus standards, located between the bicycle and car lanes on the east side of the building.
- DRB stated that the use of concrete for the benches on the east side of the building is an appropriate, beautiful, and elegant solution to existing site conditions, and as a reference to the building. It expressed concern that while concrete benches are respectful of the architecture of

the building, they may also reinforce some of the negative aspects of the building where it is perceived as cold. DRB suggested that the design team contemplate the following in the final design:

- Investigate options for narrowing the dimensions of the concrete underneath the wooden seat bench so that the edges of the wood go beyond the edges of the concrete. DRB suggested that more texture be introduced to some of the benches shown in the precedent photographs;
 - For each set of tables and benches, explore aligning one concrete bench with specific, vertical architectural alignments on the building and the second bench in the set as a furniture piece in wood to soften the space.
- Determine whether seating along Colorado Avenue and the east entry plaza should be tied together to show that the building and the plaza are related.
 - DRB expressed concern that the status of the add alternates was not resolved in the Schematic Design submittal. Please provide an update about the status of the add alternates during the DD submittal. In particular, the DRB would like to know the status of sidewalk improvements along the edge of the parking lot bordering Colorado Avenue. It believes that narrowing the sidewalk is important to maintaining the continuity of the site design.
 - Further evaluate the drainage plan for the parking lot in order to determine whether low points need inlets.
 - Please detail and illustrate any proposed building or site signage and wayfinding. DRB and university staff both communicated a desire for no site or building signage.

B. Architecture:

- DRB expressed a preference for Roof Plan Option 2, which relies on low-profile ducts to obscure the view of new exhaust stacks, rather than a screen. DRB understands that the final number of exhaust stacks and the configuration of the ducts will be determined based on the final number and location of labs and the results of a wind study in progress.
- Ensure that a small window is included in northeast corner of the northeast entry plan as shown in perspective view:
 - Consider making space more connected to street activity by making the window larger and more celebratory.

C. Sustainability and Energy:

- Further examine the use of triple glazing in order to determine if it is cost-effective.
- Continue analysis of proposed materials, especially concerning the embodied carbon impacts of the insulation and of the concrete.

- Collaborate amongst design team, engineering consultant, and university staff to investigate ways to reduce demand response in energy and atmosphere at a building level during peak energy use times.

DRB Action:

Chris Shears moved to approve the Schematic Design submittal for the Engineering Center ECAE ECNT Renovations based on the comments noted above and to move the project forward to Design Development. Victor Olgay seconded the motion, which unanimously passed.

12:00 – 1:30 p.m.

**1135 Broadway Renovation – *CU Boulder*
Conceptual Design (Action Required)**

Architects:

OZ Architecture, Denver, Colorado
DLAND Studio, Brooklyn, New York

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

Jan Becker, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning

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

Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning

(Chris Shears was not present for this agenda item due to a scheduling conflict. Consulting architects were not expected for this presentation.)

Description: Conceptual Design submittal for a building and site improvements at 1135 Broadway, a recently acquired commercial building across the street from campus. The renovations will provide space for the Renee Crown Wellness Institute, an interdisciplinary research institute focused on promoting the mental health and wellness of children and the adults that support them.

A/E Presentation:

Goals:

- Make former retail building and site into a space that supports occupant wellness and visions of the institute itself;
- Rediscover original architecture;
- Improve site organization, safety, and condition.

Schedule and Budget:

- Construction start spring of 2020;
- Occupancy in February 2021;
- Budget is challenging — need to keep cost under \$6M;
- Professional fees include consultants and university staff construction management.

Building Improvements Reviewed/Noted:

- Removal of existing metal staircase on east side of building;
- Addition of balcony open to outside on west wide of building;
- Addition of internal inter-connecting stairway and elevator;
- Modification of back wall offices on second floor to enlarge windows.

Sustainability:

Existing conditions are still being studied. The east curtain wall windows are double glazed; an assessment of the curtain wall indicates that repairs are needed. Window replacement has been priced. Renovations are proposed under the new 4.1 LEED certification requirements. The university staff stated that the goal is to make as many improvements towards sustainability as possible within budgetary constraints.

Other Discussion Points Reviewed:

- Circulation from campus - most campus visitors will be on foot;
- Most visitors and clients will likely use surface parking lot to the north, with an access from 13th Street or Pennsylvania Avenue (rather than parking under building);
- Parking area underneath building nearest north wall of offices will be regraded;
- Final existing conditions survey not yet available;
- Area plan prepared by City of Boulder;
- Existing planting material;
- Landscape strategies and canopy wrap concepts;
- Site plan, including detail on potential landscape concepts for east and west sides, accessible routes, entryways;
- Budget and proposed renovations:
 - Budget may not allow completion of all design concepts;
 - Pricing process will explore all concepts in order to determine feasibility;
 - Facilities staff is hesitant to replace glazing in all windows because the university's desire is to not invest a lot of money into the building since the long-term use of the building is unclear.
- Courtyards, benches, and grade changes in front of and in back of the building.

DRB Comments:

- Based on the submittal package the DRB is struggling to move the Conceptual Design submittal forward to Schematic Design.
- The DRB commented that it is difficult to gauge the appropriate level of investment (in site development and energy efficiencies) without knowing what the long-term plan is for the site. Please further articulate the goals for the site.

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Examine the primary vehicle access for the parking area(s) for traffic coming from north:
 - The entrance(s) needs to be identified by signage, a pylon, or something else.
- Simplify front edge along Broadway. DRB commented that the simplicity shown in some of the historic photographs was appealing.
 - Reevaluate the grading in front of the primary entrance — should it be modified in order to make access easier?
- Make the front entrance more identifiable.
 - Show planned wayfinding and signage and how the accessible pathway will be identified;
 - Determine whether there is a better route from the handicapped parking stall to the building entry;
 - Analyze and consider reducing landscaping shown in conceptual drawings because it obscures the entrance.
- Provide more detail about the site and landscape architecture. DRB requested existing survey information and planned improvements related to:
 - courtyards;
 - walls/heights;
 - planters;
 - steps;
 - plant materials;
 - lighting;
 - seating;
 - materials for pavements;
 - green wall;
 - grading/drainage;
 - signage;
 - fixtures and furnishings.
- The proposed landscape plan is a wonderful gesture to the architecture, but if it needs to be eased for budgeting purposes, that would be acceptable to the DRB.

B. Architecture:

- The DRB is concerned with the proposed canopy concept:
 - Canopy may draw people toward the alley rather than to the primary entrance;
 - Consider using lighting or articulation, paving materials, etc., to let visitors find the route to the alley.
- Investigate using a system for the window blinds so the movement of the blinds up or down can be controlled and synchronized consistently between windows since blinds can be seen from the outside.

C. Sustainability and Energy:

- Determine whether LEED is the best metric to use or whether the WELL building standards might better serve the project and future occupants.

DRB Action:

Don Brandes moved approval of the Conceptual Design submittal for the 1135 Broadway Renovation contingent on holding a meeting or workshop to get more detail on the developed concept prior to Schematic Design submittal. Sarah Brown seconded the motion, which unanimously passed. Chris Shears was not present for this agenda item and did not vote on this motion.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 1:43 p.m.



University of Colorado Design Review Board Meeting Notes

Date: Friday, November 15, 2019
Time: 9:00 – 1:30 p.m.
Location: First Floor Conference Room, 1800 Grant Street, Denver

DRB members present: Don Brandes, Sarah Brown, Victor Olgay, Chris Shears, Mike Winters, and Bill Haverly, campus DRB member for the CU Boulder Campus (“CU Boulder”).

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:

Cheri Gerou, State Architect, former Senior Director of Capital Assets and ex officio member of the DRB

Kori Donaldson, incoming 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 9:05 a.m.

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

The Board briefly discussed the items on the agenda and administrative matters.

**10:00 – 11:30 a.m. Hotel and Conference Center – CU Boulder
Conceptual Design (Information/Direction Only)**

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:

4240 Architecture, Denver, Colorado

studioINSITE, Denver, Colorado

Barings LLC

Benchmark Global Hospitality, The Woodlands, Texas

Hensel Phelps Construction Co., Thornton, Colorado

HRV Hotel Partners, Santa Fe, New Mexico

Presenters:

Louis (“Lou”) Bieker, 4240 Architecture

Chris Sutterfield, Associate Principal of Design, PLA,
studioINSITE

Richard Holland, President & Managing Partner, HRV
Hotel Partners

CU Boulder Campus Presenter:

Bill Haverly, Campus Architect and Director of Planning,
Design and Construction

Others Present:

Thaddius ("TJ") Carvis, Principal, 4240 Architecture
Randy Gudavis, Hensel Phelps Construction
Chad Holland, Partner/Development Mgmt., HRV Hotel
Partners
Jason Wallack, Operations Manager, Hensel Phelps
Construction Co.

Other CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:

Katherine Dunklau, Project Mgmt. Supervisor, Design and
Construction
Tom Goodhew, Assistant Director and Planning Manager,
Facilities Planning
Josh Lindenstone, Communications Specialist, Strategic Internal
Relations
Richelle Reilly, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect,
Facilities Planning
Derek Silva, Executive Director, Real Estate Services

Description: Conceptual Design submittal for new P3 development of
hotel and conference center in the Grandview area.

A/E Presentation:

A/E team presented the submittal package including detailed discussions concerning:

Project vision:

- Sense of place, spirit of place;
- Empowerment of ordinary people, communal;
- Welcoming, grand, and familiar;
- Sense of tradition;
- Rooted, significant site work, variety of inviting outdoor spaces;
- Porosity, ground floor activated;
- Confluence, a unique and collaborative courtyard;
- A comfortable place to gather with friends, family, faculty, and colleagues, developing interior placemaking;
- Conference and event spaces to act as a bridge between social, corporate, civic, and university, and a center for celebration;
- Creating spaces to be regenerative, refreshing, and nurturing to the mind, body, and soul through spirit of place.

Site and landscape architecture:

- Site has four unique sides - concept developed to reflect all four sides;
 - University – campus oriented:
 - Big tree lawn;
 - Broadway – transit, city oriented:
 - Needs to be porous, welcoming;
 - Grandview – transit, service-oriented:
 - Sidewalks only on north side of Grandview;

- 13th Street – softer, connection to Andrews Arboretum, Varsity Lake.
- Conference center landscape area not yet defined;
- Significant grading challenges on north side;
- Concerns with how building engages the grade on the north side;
- Considering planting with evergreens to screen parking garage as much as possible;
- Landscape on the north side may be more native in its approach.

Circulation:

- Guest experience;
- Vehicular;
- Pedestrian;
- The intersection at Grandview Avenue and 13th Street presents challenges due to the asymmetrical street design;
- Conversations regarding traffic circulation with the City of Boulder occurred approximately three years ago including a full traffic analysis resulting in:
 - Current location of the front door of the hotel;
 - Levels of vehicular traffic movements acceptable to the City;
 - Circulation difficulties will occur when large events happen at the ballroom;
 - Stacking buses will be a challenge; this still needs to be resolved.

Programming:

- Restaurant functions;
- Marketplace;
- Think Tank space;
- Fitness space;
- Hotel Lobby;
- Restaurant/Rooftop Bar;
- Courtyard;
- Management of parking structures.

DRB Comments:

DRB thanked the team for their submittal and indicated that it was a great submittal package and was very thorough and complete.

DRB also requested that section drawings be included in the next submittal.

A. Site & Landscape Architecture:

- Please explore further if we can program and activate the 13th street edge of the conference center. Is the fitness center the best and highest use of the hotel edge fronting Broadway and along University?
- As site data becomes more available, study the site improvements along the northern edge of the project for site improvements, off-site views, and access.

- Continue to develop more detailed circulation plans for all modes of transportation along and through the hotel, conference center, and restaurant. For instance, show the circulation patterns for individuals who park in the hotel garage and walk to campus.
- Please further articulate the turn around at the hotel drop off point. Illustrate the anticipated traffic patterns.
- Illustrate connectivity and site lines for adjacent properties, bike paths, and major landmarks (e.g., the stadium).
- Conceptualize the gateway, site monumentation, and other signage and wayfinding:
 - Consider pedestrian and vehicular traffic patterns;
 - Include proposed signage for all project partners.
- Elaborate on seasonality of gathering spaces and plant materials. Contemplate the use of shading in all outdoor spaces to protect visitors from the intense Colorado sun.
- If possible, please continue to study the program and site planning uses, activities, and facilities by cross-section studies.

B. Architecture:

- Create a complimentary but iconic architecture for the restaurant. DRB suggested that the design team reference the site imagery precedent images on pages 31 and 32 in developing the fenestration and exploring the connectivity of the hotel to the restaurant.
- Formulate a name for the architecture to represent the design aesthetic.
- Investigate whether the vertical building edges can be lowered in order to bring daylight and sunshine into the courtyard and reduce shading during the winter months.
- Resolve proportionality of the upper level of the restaurant and bar (as shown on page 52).
- Explore how we might activate the hotel lobby with a retail business that sells beverages to create a more robust interior/exterior relationship.
- Review circulation between conference rooms in the hotel to improve wayfinding.
- Relocate conference center kitchen to the main level and relocate prefunction space to the south side of the building to improve user experience and functionality.

C. Energy and Sustainability:

No comments were made specifically regarding energy and sustainability.

DRB Action:

Mike Winters moved to approve the Conceptual Design submittal for the Hotel Conference Center and to move the project forward to Schematic Design. Don Brandes seconded the motion, which unanimously passed.

12:00 – 12:30 p.m.

**Hybl Building Signage – CU Colorado Springs
Schematic Design (Approval)**

Architect:

RTA Architects, Colorado Springs, Colorado

CU Colorado Springs Campus Presenter (by phone):

Carolyn Fox, Executive Director, Planning, Design &
Construction, and University Architect, Facilities
Management

Others Present (by phone):

Stuart Coppedge, Principal, RTA Architects

Description: Schematic Design submittal regarding exterior building-mounted signage for the new William J. Hybl Sports Medicine and Performance Center Building

A/E Presentation:

No formal presentation regarding this Schematic Design submittal for the exterior building-mounted signage for the new William J. Hybl Sports Medicine and Performance Center Building was made. Since the last meeting on October 25, 2019, one change was made to the submittal: a modification of the color of the Centura Health sign.

DRB Comments:

Don Brandes summarized recent actions taken concerning the Schematic Design submittal for the exterior building-mounted signage for the new William J. Hybl Sports Medicine and Performance Center Building. He told the group that he and Cheri Gerou met with President Kennedy to detail concerns raised by the DRB. President Kennedy indicated he would discuss the issue further with Chancellor Reddy.

Don Brandes also explained that the DRB Process and Procedures document grants the board the authority to review and approve site signage. Specifically, the scope of the DRB includes, "Campus site furnishings, lighting and signage design, location and quantity."

Carolyn Fox and Stuart Coppedge responded to comments from the DRB, indicating that several studies had been conducted showing alternative signage, but that these alternatives had not received approval at the campus level. They spoke to the signage review and approval process followed to date and stated that the campus brand board representative approved the project signage and indicated that it did not require approval from the full Brand Board.

The DRB identified its top three concerns with the submittal:

1. Holistic Design

The signage package needs to be holistic in its approach and include signage for both the building and site.

2. Quality of Materials

The quality of signage materials should be consistent with the quality of materials used on the building — plastic internally illuminated signage is not appropriate. Metallic halo illuminated signs may be more appropriate.

3. Design Options

The DRB would appreciate reviewing options for the branding and signage. The project architect has developed several studies showing alternative signage.

DRB Action:

The DRB tabled the Schematic Design submittal for the building signage at the new William J. Hybl Sports Medicine and Performance Center Building to provide an opportunity for President Kennedy and Chancellor Reddy to discuss project signage and to allow the Brand Board to review the submittal at its December 12 meeting.

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