

**UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER
BOULDER CAMPUS PLANNING COMMISSION**

Minutes of the Meeting of April 13, 2000

The Boulder Campus Planning Commission met on Thursday, April 13, 2000, in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Regent 302.

Members present were: Jim Baily, Al Bartlett, Tom Carson, John Crittenden, Noel Cummings, Adrian Del Caro, Archie Demarest, Bill Deno, Larry Drees, Bill Herbstreit, Bill Kaempfer, Dianna Keeler, Stephen Lester, Michael Lightner, Jeff Lipton, Uriel Nauenberg, Robin Newsome-Suitts, Dale Oesterle, and William Arndt. Members absent were: Anne Costain, Steve Jones, Dan Pabon, and Brook Stableford.

Guests present were: John Prosser, University Design Review Board; Phil Simpson, Facilities Planning; Michele Van Pelt, Financial and Business Services; and Susan Walsh, Facilities Planning.

1. **MINUTES** -- Minutes of the meeting of March 9, 2000, were unanimously approved, with "Newsome-Suitts" replacing "Nauenberg" in various references.
2. **CHAIR'S REPORT** -- Oesterle reported that the Chancellor's Executive Committee (CEC) had approved the Center for the Visual Arts Program Plan on March 22 and the Science Library Program Plan on April 5. Bartlett, noting recent publicity about reductions in journal subscriptions for the libraries, asked how a new building could be justified in light of this budget crunch. Kaempfer said that very question had been discussed at CEC; library officials contend that the electronic technology featured in the proposed new building will compensate for the lack of hard copy, especially in the scientific journals.
3. **CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION REQUESTS FOR FY 2001-02** -- Referring to the handout included in the mailing, Simpson noted that funding for ATLAS and Business is assumed for 2000-01, and that negotiations continue on the Law School funding. If Law is funded, the current request would be for the second phase of the project. Simpson noted that there were two new projects: Center for Visual Arts and Science Library, contingent upon approval of the program plans by the Regents and the CCHE.

Nauenberg asked if the dollar amounts were realistic; Simpson said they were taken from the program plans, but will be adjusted for inflation prior to submittal to the state. Kaempfer noted that there were no continuing projects on this list. He asked when construction might start. Deno said the earliest would be summer of 2002. Demolition of the Hunter Building might occur before that, if the Museum Collections Building project proceeds on schedule. Lipton noted that the Law project is further along in its private fundraising efforts than the Business project, and that some funds have been raised for the Center for Visual Arts while the Science Library fundraising is still in very early stages. He therefore moved that the prioritized order of the requests be changed to (1) ATLAS, (2) New Law School, (3) Busi-

ness Renovation and Addition, (4) Center for Visual Arts, and (5) Science Library. The motion was unanimously approved, and this will be forwarded as the BCPC recommendation.

4. **PROPOSED BCPC BY-LAWS REVISIONS: FIRST READING** -- Oesterle asked for comments and suggestions based on the draft revision of the BCPC By-Laws, which had been distributed to members. Arndt noted that one of the current positions (Director of Financial and Business Services) had been inadvertently omitted from the draft. Lipton suggested that the new Director of Planning (who will begin work in June) be a non-voting member. The proposed reinstatement of a CU Foundation representative was changed to non-voting as well. Bartlett submitted a sheet with proposed changes and correction. There was a discussion of the role of the Boulder Faculty Assembly and other groups in determining the membership make-up of the commission. Lipton said that he felt the By-Laws should avoid too much detail; Lightner, on the other hand, felt that some of the actions of the BCPC should be more institutionalized. Arndt will prepare a new draft of the proposed changes incorporating the sections that were discussed and the written proposals from Bartlett.

5. **DISCUSSION OF ROLE AND MISSION OF B C P C AND THE UNIVERSITY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (D R B)** -- John Prosser, current DRB Chair, said that the DRB is the second oldest in the country, dating to the Quigg Newton administration in 1960-61. Early members included Hideo Sasaki and Pietro Belluschi, who had been planning consultants to the university. In 1980 the DRB's purview was expanded to include all four campuses. The Board consists of four members: Prosser represents the CU College of Architecture and Planning; Cab Childress represents the Denver area architecture community; Jerry Seracuse represents the Colorado Springs area; and Eldon Beck, a California landscape architect and CU alumnus, is a landscape designer with a national reputation.

Prosser discussed the DRB's relationship to the BCPC in the review of proposed designs. He noted that while architects once used hand-drawn sketches, most work is now done by computer. This means that preliminary, conceptual sketches often look "finished" and give the impression that the design process is further along than it is. This has sometimes caused confusion over what the DRB has "approved." He felt that the current order of review is appropriate, in that the DRB and project architects participate in "peer review" before passing the project to the "community review" provided by the BCPC. He noted that this process is used as a model by other institutions, and has functioned successfully for nearly 40 years. The active and open exchange of ideas is effective, as there are no formal design guidelines for the Boulder Campus. The Research Park, Prosser noted, has detailed designed guidelines, which he felt was "overkill."

In their deliberations, the DRB looks at three major factors: (1) the open space between the buildings, (2) the buildings themselves, and (3) the parking, service, and circulation systems to make it all work. The DRB has in fact made significant

changes in the building or site when they felt that a design was seriously headed in the wrong direction. Most notable was the Euclid Avenue Autopark, which was originally planned for the site east of the University Club, but moved to the current location which is a more functional site. Prosser added that the three criteria were used in the DRB's assessment of the Science Library conceptual planning. The site is constrained on three sides. The fourth side is against open space. As campuses across the country move to underground construction, however, this possibility exists for future expansion of the facility.

Crittenden asked what criteria the DRB uses, in lieu of formal design guidelines. Prosser said that they consider consistency of materials, appropriateness of scale, the Klauder precedents, the 1962 Sasaki Master Plan, and the current Campus Master Plan. For each project "story boards" are prepared, which indicate the palette of materials and the relationship of walls and openings. In some cases, like Benson and MCDB, the scale was pushed to the limit. Nauenberg asked about faculty participation. Prosser said that the faculty is heavily involved in the preparation of the program plan, and the building committee for each project is involved from beginning to end. The DRB is not intended to be a campus representative board, such as the BCPC.

Lipton said he was concerned about changes in cost as a result of conflicts between DRB and BCPC. Prosser said the Board recognizes this, and understands the need to recognize irreducible minimums early in the process. He noted that budgets have always been tight, even in Klauder's time; as a result, most Klauder buildings have rather plain interiors. Lightner said that his experience in attending DRB meetings made clear to him that the DRB reviews *design* while the BCPC's role is to review *program*.

Bartlett noted that most projects in the last 40 years have been done without long-range consideration. Prosser agreed, saying that every new facility should be planned so as to be able to have an addition in the future.

Oesterle thanked Prosser for coming to the meeting and discussing the Design Review Board. Arndt said that he would add Prosser to the mailing list to receive all BCPC minutes.

6. **OTHER ITEMS FROM MEMBERS** -- Oesterle noted that the BCPC needs to be better informed about some of the controversial planning issues concerning the Campus. These include Grandview, CU-Boulder South, and Long-Range Planning. Lipton said that he would be willing to do a presentation on Grandview and CU-Boulder South at an autumn meeting this year. Volunteers were solicited to serve on a sub-committee to look into long-range planning. They were: Baily, Deno, Bartlett, Demarest, and Lightner, plus a student member to be determined.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned. Minutes submitted by William Arndt.