

As usual no one at Lockwood agrees, bankers accountants and business types are all worried about the budgets, income and pay backs. This individual is concerned about what we are buying in our rush to improve. Now that the Golf Community has approved the land transfer for the new Community Center, my concerns about the building's design become of more concern. The LFCC vote did not indicate approval of this building and design. The Community Center as designed has many things to question. Nowhere has it been said that the design will be critiqued and/or changes made to address suggestions which could make this design more appropriate for Lockwood.

I realize that the LFCC meetings about the planned clubhouse were intended for discussion about the development process and signing over LFCC-owned land, however, as an architect, I could not help evaluating the preliminary design proposed by TMC.

My initial reaction was that the building elevations (front, back, side Views) are very residential in scale/detailing and a totally symmetric structure with little potential to enjoy the views. Treating all the spaces which have different uses with the same importance in windowing is boring and redundant. The view from certain areas like the dining, meeting and restaurant functions should have greater exposure and importance to the outside as well as view potential. The access to the outside should be made open and inviting to those wonderful views of the waterway and vistas beyond that we all speak of. A large raised terrace, part covered and part not covered, would be expected. Although an exotic design is not required, I think the new building should fit in with the existing POA clubhouse and carry forward the "Low Country" look that many consider to be signature Lockwood. I believe that if the current design is built, the resulting exteriors and interior function will be a disappointment to many.

My biggest issue is that the back of the building overlooking the water is very closed with small windows and

very little interaction with the waterway. It does not draw the attention to the dramatic vistas of the river/waterway or invite people inside to look out or step out and appreciate the view as the existing POA Clubhouse does.

The "Big Ass Fan" takes up a huge (a Big Ass) amount of square footage and I question designing the lower and upper floors around the fan. Those floors have an area of 3400 Sq. ft. a lot of wasted open space. It is possible to have an open design upstairs but with better use of the available space design for open area which is topped by the "BAF".

I don't think the second floor deck will be used. An elevated veranda on the ground floor would be much more effective and used daily.

I don't believe that resting the building on a flat pad 6" above grade really affords the best possible way to:

- . Drain water away from the building
- . Provide good views of the water
- . Facilitate the overall attractiveness of the building

I'm sure people will say that my issues are due to "not invented here" or sour grapes. Sure, I would have liked to have done the design. However, the decision has been made and I'm ok with it. I am giving you the benefit of my professional opinion. I have to live with and help pay for the design just like you. Is this really the best we can get for 2.5 million?

Richard W Pearce
Architect