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

University of Colorado Design Review Board
Amended Meeting Notes

Date:	Tuesday, November 15, 2022
Time:	8:30 a.m. – 2:45 p.m.
Location:	Bruce and Marcy Benson Conference Room, First Floor, 1800 Grant Street, Denver, Colorado, and via Zoom

DRB and Campus Members present:
Don Brandes, Jody Beck, Sarah Brown, Cheri Gerou, Tom Hootman, Mike Winters, d'Andre Willis, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Boulder campus ("CU Boulder"), and André Vite, campus DRB member for the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical campus ("CU Anschutz").

Others in attendance not otherwise noted:
Kori Donaldson, AVP for Budget, Planning, and Capital 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 8:57 a.m.

8:30 – 9:30 a.m. **Study Session – Board Only**

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

9:30 – 11:30 a.m. **Residence One – *CU Boulder***
Conceptual Design Workshop (Information/Direction)

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:
- Anderson Mason Dale Architects ("AMD")
- Bohlin Cywinski Jackson Architects
- James Corner Field Operations

Presenters:
- Daniel Lee, Bohlin Cywinski Jackson
- Sarah Astheimer, Field Operations

Others Present:
- Luc Bamberger, AMD
- Thomas Kirk, Bohlin Cywinski Jackson
- Andrew Nielsen, Anderson Mason Dale, via Zoom

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Dan Gette, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs, via Zoom
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect
Amy Kirkland, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning
Patricia McNally-Leef, Project Manager, Housing Facilities Services, via Zoom
Lindsay Schumacher, Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect

Description:
Conceptual Design ("CD") Work Shop submittal for Residence One project and site located within the North Boulder Creek neighborhood, including site analysis, context, concept design alternatives, and preferred design direction.

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

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- The consultant team provided a thoughtful and well documented pre-design and site analysis.
- The intent of providing two concept design workshops is to mutually test, explore, and discuss alternative site planning and architectural massing options – noting fundamental site, architectural and engineering constraints associated with each. The first concept workshop appears to have zeroed in on a preferred site plan with minor distinctions among the four conceptual concepts.
- Based on the November 15, 2022, workshop, the DRB encourages the consultant team to further explore various site planning and architectural massing concepts for the second December conceptual workshop. The hope is to arrive at a conceptual framework plan that achieves all of the goals and objectives outlined in the pre-design work session.
- The outcome of the November 15, 2022, workshop was very successful and provided for a thoughtful discussion at the next concept workshop. Below are general comments that were discussed for consideration:
    - The team has done an excellent job of documenting grading, drainage, and floodplain-related site constraints.
    - Based on the documented site constraints, there continues to be a lack of a cohesive and compelling "front door" or "gateway" to the project. Continue to explore how Residence One becomes a gateway feature for the students and visitors.
    - As one or two alternative concepts evolve - please share how each has specific constraints and opportunities so the DRB, University, and consultant team can mutually decide on the best approach leading to schematic design.
    - Continue to explore access to the site for delivery, maintenance, and emergency services. Is there an access and circulation alternative that will inform a different architectural massing?

        - As much as practical, the service corridor should be designed to have an urban context and scale – it will be used extensively for practical purposes, but it also bifurcates and divides the site as currently planned.
    - Continue to explore conceptual site planning alternatives that activate and complement the ground plane architecture and fenestration to the site, area, and Flatirons.
        - Are there various site planning and architectural configurations that maximize views to the Flatirons, while still providing efficient and safe vehicular access and circulation?
    - The conceptual "Pod" scheme may warrant additional consideration.
        - Clarify what opportunities students will have to use open space areas during different seasons to gather, study, provide for a level of informal recreation, eat, reflect, etc. Are there open space areas that are decidedly "active" and others that are clearly "natural?"
        - Working closely with the architects – determine the visual and physical relationship of the ground floor to the landscape improvements. It feels like the ground floor should be more "porous, open and welcoming" – both from an interior design and "outside looking in" perspective.
    - If possible, strive to keep the two existing trees identified in the site plan.
    - Are there any interim improvements on Athens? Can anything be done to help improve Athens between now and the time it becomes the primary corridor?
    - Locating the UPS facility at the bottom of the north building will help activate the neighborhood. The retail locations are more similar to a typical neighborhood.
        - It will be important to make the two retail locations—the UPS facility and a grab-and-go market—not feel like they are a regular dorm service facility.
    - Consider using the term "eddies" instead of scoops. Does the "eddy/scoop" landscape concept require a visual art/sculpture/lighting?

B. Architecture

- Beyond Residence One and Residence Two, determine the approximate timing of building the other residential buildings in the neighborhood.

- Looking at Residence One, identify what will make the students want to live there more than other residential halls. How will the North Wing be designed to be an equal living experience to the south wings?

- The preferred plan feels like one mega building. The driver is three buildings that need to work together while access, grading, circulation, drainage, etc. influence each differently.
    - Could the north building be made taller than the other two buildings?
    - Study and present a cost analysis of building sky bridges versus building elevator cores, how the circulation and security experiences are on the levels, and what the benefits of each are.
    - Complete the same analysis regarding adding an extra high-rise floor on the north building. Could it be justified by adding extra units?
    - How much more of an advantage is the connectivity for one level versus all six levels? Perhaps only the second level could be a transfer floor with elevator cores at each building.
    - If the three sets of sky bridges were eliminated, the cost savings might be enough to complete three elevator cores, one in each of the three independent buildings.
    - This would still accommodate the flood plain elevation changes.

- Determine how the scale of the building can be broken down to enhance the feeling of an urban neighborhood.
    - Is there a hierarchy in terms of the architectural massing?
    - Is there a way with articulation and materials to make the sky bridges look like their own buildings so the social spaces and sunlight can be retained?
    - The sky bridges force a continuity in terms of the heights and top floor levels.
    - A second floor-only transfer connection would provide an opportunity to vary the height of the pods, perhaps letting the topography drive the top floor of each building.
    - The alignment of the fenestration with this may also provide some variety.

- One constraint regarding the height is the desire to stay below the 75' limit. Staying within this limit, if a floor was eliminated from the two lower buildings, the building footprint would need to be expanded in order to meet the programming requirements.
    - In order to break up the massing, could the cost of going above the 75' limit be offset by increasing the proforma of the project, increasing the number of units?
    - How can a diversity in the height of the buildings be achieved?
    - Could the width for the first two or three floors be increased without impacting the amenities?
    - Could efficiencies of cost during construction provide opportunities?
    - Adding one or two more floors to the north building could help make it special and provide better access to the views.
    - Study if the hybrid CLT model could accommodate a higher structure if floors were added to the north building.

- The ground floor datum also needs to be broken up.

D. Energy and Sustainability

- Regarding the wind and sun studies, the building isn't very well oriented to the sun or the wind. The wind diagrams are showing a pretty good south-north direction.
    - South facing façades are the easiest to control for solar gain and getting daylight, but these are predominately west facing.
    - Are there schemes that are trying to optimize around the passive strategies versus trying to solve with shading structures or air conditioning?
    - The south façade is premium real estate for passive strategies, especially in this particular location.
    - It doesn't seem to be optimized. Are there tweaks that can be made?
    - As you think about the massing, can these strategies be layered into the design?

- Smaller building sizes with more cut-through breaks between the buildings and more opportunities for southern façades might provide a more efficient massing in terms of passive energy, fresh air ventilation, ground-level courtyards, etc.

- As the team works through the concept design and massing options, include drivers based on an analysis of locating solar, which massing is more energy efficient, which would allow better natural ventilation, etc., versus trying to solve a less optimal massing with a more expensive envelope and more expensive mechanical systems.
    - Also, related to embodied carbon, there was a hint toward potentially looking at a mass timber structure, is there a limit to massing widths, heights, etc.?

- It would be great if this building had a real sustainability story that wasn't an after thought but that was imbedded in the overall planning of the project. A simple, understandable story the resident students will take pride in telling and a reason for living there.
    - While the team is moving into CD for December, work on developing a clear sustainability story, not necessarily what Noresco brings which will be technical data, but think about the integration of the landscape and the building. Address carbon, water, wellness, the student experience. This is a clear story that is compelling and will show the concepts of how the team is getting to the end result, the high level moves that are driving the sustainability.
        - The sustainability team is often brought into a project design after the design has been started. If they were part of the project from the beginning, they can be more impactful in terms of sustainability.
    - At concept level, include more of these big moves that are architectural- and landscape-oriented that reinforce that sustainability story.
    - What is the real story of what can be achieved beyond LEED Gold or LEED Gold+?
    - The results of this building will be measured over the next few years to see if the cisterns, bioswales, etc., make sense in determining landscaping and building elements that should or should not be repeated in the future. We need to learn from this opportunity.

- From a carbon perspective, look at the International Living Future Institute Living Building Challenge (zero carbon and zero energy certifications) and their metrics on embodied carbon and operational carbon, depending upon how far you can develop the carbon story.

- We're limited in what we can do with water in Colorado, but looking at One Water as a concept similar to what is done in Denver and in San Francisco may provide good information.

- In terms of the preferred option shown in the submittal and the related sustainability package, the team hasn't quite developed full holistic views. Both still need some work.

DRB Action

The DRB thanked the consultant team for the workshop presentation, noting that much had been discussed and noted. The DRB is looking forward to the second conceptual design submittal presentation in December.

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

11:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Potts Field Concessions and Restrooms Building – *CU Boulder* Conceptual Design** (Action Requested)

Architects/Engineers/Consultants:
Populous

Presenters:
Ryan Sellinghausen, Populous
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect

Others Present:
Justin Cox, Populous, via Zoom

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Richelle Goedert, Facilities Planner/Landscape Architect
Orville Jennings, Associate Athletics Director, Athletics-Business Affairs, via Zoom
Amy Kirtland, Senior Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning, via Zoom
Ryan Moeller, Project Manager, Facilities Planning, Design and Construction

Description:
Conceptual Design submittal for a new 3,000 SF building adjacent to Potts Track & Field to house ADA restrooms, storage space, and concessions in preparation for the May 2024 PAC12 Track & Field Championships to be held at CU Boulder.

A/E Presentation

A representative of 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

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

- The updated site plan on page 17 reflects good solutions to some of the site issues.

- The intersection at the bottom of the track and field bleachers leading into a wall seems awkward. Study this to see if the following can be resolved or confirmed:
  - the dimensions of the bleachers;
  - the opening needed to install and remove the bleachers;
  - the alignment of the bleachers; and
  - possibly shifting the location of the bleachers to add a walkway around the edges.

B. Architecture

- The preferred massing option for two parapet roofs is a good solution.
- The updated building floor plan design, including the plan for the restrooms and the relocation of the janitors' closet, has improved since the Pre-Design submittal and is well done.
- Continue to study the fixed windows in the Ski Storage building to determine if more ventilation will be needed while the building is in use.
- The materiality samples shown in the exterior elevation reflect a true representation of the proposed materials, which was appreciated.
- Consider adding a break in the plane where the entrance to the restrooms is located so the roofline over the tunnel is slightly pushed back, creating three planes.
- Continue to study the needs and layout of the concessions building for full-service concessions.
- The canopy over the concessions building seems high. It may be tied into the structure, but if it were lowered a little, it would provide more shade for the concessions stand.
- The concept rendering shown in the submittal looks great.

C. Energy and Sustainability

No comments provided.

DRB Action

The DRB indicated that working closely with the University of Colorado Boulder Campus Landscape Architect, the Schematic Design submittal should include:

- A Site Improvement Plan submittal that incorporates existing conditions and further illustrates the following site improvements:
    - Utilities;
    - Grading and Drainage;
    - Pavements, walls, walks and steps;
    - Landscape improvements, irrigated or non-irrigated;
    - Fixtures, furnishings, etc.; and
    - Lighting, whether surface mounted or site lighting.
- Continue to develop and refine the architecture in terms of elevations, showing architectural details, cross sections of buildings, indentations, architectural features, etc.
- Provide building callouts showing the proposed materials.

Don Brandes made a motion to approve the Conceptual Design submittal for the Potts Field Concessions and Restroom Building, including the comments noted above. Sarah Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

12:00 – 12:30 p.m. **Continuing Education Shade Structure – *CU Boulder***
Design Development (Action Requested)

Architect:
PEH Architects

Presenters, via Zoom:
Chris Mirto, PEH Architects
Wayne Northcutt, CU Boulder

CU Boulder Campus Representatives Present:
Linda Starkey, Director of Operations, Continuing Education, via Zoom
d'Andre Willis, Director of Planning/Campus Architect, Planning, Design, and Construction

Description:
Design Development submittal for construction of new shade structure at third floor roof deck at the Continuing Education Building, 1505 University Avenue, to increase year-round use.

A/E Presentation

Campus staff and a representative of 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

A. Site & Landscape Architecture

No comments provided.

B. Architecture

- Regarding using the shades for wind protection during a wind storm, the DRB acknowledged that the standard screens are rated for sustained winds of 40-50 mph.

- The cover plate covering the tracks on the post may not be needed as the third floor deck is not as visible from the ground as what was anticipated earlier, especially given the trees that are growing in front of it.

C. Energy and Sustainability

No comments provided.

DRB Action

The DRB thanked the design team for their work on the presentation, noting that this shade structure may become a precedent for other areas on the campus.

Don Brandes made a motion to approve the Design Development submittal for the Continuing Education Shade Structure, including the comments noted above. Tom Hootman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2:15 – 3:15 p.m. **CU Anschutz Campus Master Plan Update – *CU Anschutz***
Additional Review (Information/Direction)

Architects/Engineers:
AECOM, Denver, Colorado

Presenters:
André Vite, AIA, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Facilities Planning and Design, CU Anschutz Campus
Deanna Weber, Principal, Buildings + Places, Rocky Mountain Cities Lead, AECOM

Others Present:
Pratiksha Achari, Architectural Designer, AECOM

Other CU Anschutz Campus Representatives Present:
Erik Baisley, AICP, LEED AP BD+C, Senior Planner, Archibus Coordinator

Description: Review of the CU Anschutz Master Plan 2022 Update, including the Physical Plan and Design and Development Guidelines revisions for comment.

A/E Presentation

Campus staff and a representative of the consultant 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

General Comments:

The DRB made suggestions about items to consider as part of the 2022/23 Master Plan, including:

- The DRB requested additional information regarding how pedestrian crossings at intersections on Montview are resolved. The design team will bring a larger plan view of these intersections to the next meeting.

- Along 17th Street, the DRB appreciates the proposed streetscape for future improvements when the street is expanded.

- The DRB expressed interest in learning about the Fitzsimons General Development Plan and its progress.

- Further study might be useful regarding how Scranton and Uvalda Streets are aligned as they go through Fitzsimons into the CU Anschutz Campus. This study will determine whether the terminuses at 19th Street can be improved.

- In creating the 2022/23 Master Plan, the consultants and staff have perfected the 2012 plan with a level of specificity in terms of consolidation and utilization, including:
    - Understanding the role of planning and design guidelines compared to subdivision standards;
    - Student wellness with a student union and gathering spots which will be a big move for the CU Anschutz Campus; and
    - Wayfinding and signage among the various buildings on campus which has come together better.

DRB Action

The DRB appreciated the presentation, noting that it was a comprehensive and timely update. The DRB noted that the updated Master Plan and Planning and Design Guidelines will provide an exceptional roadmap for future improvements on campus.

No formal action was required for this matter. The DRB looks forward to seeing the final 2022/23 Campus Master Plan document in early January 2023. The DRB will also review the design guidelines document provided at this meeting and will let staff know of any comments.

There being no further business, the public meeting of the Design Review Board was adjourned at 2:22 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.)