

Date: August 8, 2011

From: Wilde Lake Architectural Advisory Panel

To: The Architectural Committee Liaison

The Architectural Advisory Panel (AAP) has reviewed Kimko's submission dated July 8, 2011 and recommends approval of the application with modifications. The modifications are as follows:

PLANS

1. Two-story buildings that form the Village Green (courtyard) must be retained in their entirety to maintain the integrity of this much admired and acclaimed public space. *Advocated in the Wilde Lake Village Board Statement Regarding the Proposed Village Center Redevelopment Plan dated October 18, 2010. Page 4 paragraph 2.2.2 Also, advocated in the Wilde Lake Community Plan page 4 and page 6 paragraph 9(a).*

The Wilde Lake Community Plan document was prepared by the Village Board and represented the Community's opinion at that time. In particular, note that out of 45 write-in comments received following Kimko's May 10th presentation, 32 disapproved of opening up the Village Green courtyard by demolishing the West Wing.

2. Renovate the West Wing with new Storefronts, this two-story wing is a better draw to shop the Village Green than the one-story pavilion proposed. See West Elevation Improvements drawing attached. *Also advocated in the Wilde Lake Community Plan page 4 and page 6 paragraph 9(a).*

3. The location of the New Retail is not contiguous with the Village Green Shops, therefore will not improve the viability of merchants in existing retail space. A solution would be to flip the New Retail so the pharmacy entrance and the small shops face the Village Green. See Plan Scheme B attached. *Advocated in the Wilde Lake Village Board Statement Regarding the Proposed Village Center Redevelopment Plan dated October 18, 2010. Page 3 paragraph 2.2.1.*

4. Residential setbacks along Cross Fox Lane, Lynx Lane, and the proposed new road are insufficient to accommodate street trees and planting to buffer the parking garage facades. Increase the set back to 20 feet from curb to buildings. *Also required by Wilde Lake Guidelines for Non-Residential Properties pages 2 and 9*

Similarly, the residential setback from Cross Fox Condominium's lot line is insufficient. Increase to 12 feet consistent with the setback established by the existing retail buildings and to provide space for some planting to buffer the anticipated parking structure from Cross Fox residents' views. Note also that the setback to the proposed building must be sufficient to permit windows by Codes in all portions of the west-facing apartment facades

5. The apartment building shown on the primary residential site is 280 feet long. At five stories the continuous North façade will be out of scale, overwhelming the rest of the Village Center and surrounding properties. It will also cast the Commons (parking lot) in deep shade adversely affecting the success of the amenities proposed here: particularly in Winter. A partial solution would be to set back the center section between East and West wings 25 feet.

6. Increase the walkway on the South side of the Pharmacy to 20 feet to accommodate planters between the curb and the arcade columns. Landscaping this edge of the Commons is imperative to making this major pedestrian link between new and existing retail a pleasant experience: not just a

walk passed parked cars and a blank pharmacy wall. To accommodate this, omission of the sidewalk adjacent to the bio-swale is recommended since it is unlikely to be used.

7. The Pharmacy trash enclosure opposite The Melting Pot is too prominent and an adverse impact on the entrance to the Village Center. Relocate to the Northeast façade.
8. The trash enclosure placed at the access to the Family Life Center and the Village Green beyond will have an adverse impact on both. Relocate to the Northeast corner of the parking lot.
9. Move the proposed office access tower so as not to conceal Bagel Bins storefront.
10. The location for the transformers (2) and the trash enclosure on the south side of the Village Green buildings displaced by the proposed office entrance elevator needs to be shown.
11. The Landscaping Plan lacks an overall concept that should unify the separate buildings and reinforce the identity of the Village Center as a special place. *Also required by Wilde Lake Guidelines for Non-Residential Properties. Page 11 paragraph 2*
12. The street trees shown along Lynx Lane and the new road are to be regularly spaced and of a consistent species.
13. The Village Green courtyard planting similarly lacks a concept and features arbitrary shapes unrelated to the architecture. The existing planting character should be maintained. The existing fountain should be refurbished not eliminated. Like the trees, it is a much-loved public amenity. *Also advocated in the Wilde Lake Community Plan page 4.*
14. The paving propose should use fewer materials more consistently. Omit stamped concrete because it is easily damaged and impossible to repair to match the original paving.
15. Two bus stops are unnecessary and the lay-bys interrupt the streetscape adversely and should be eliminated.
16. The lighting levels are insufficient in the Village Green courtyard and at the Lynx Lane office entrance and along the northeast façade of the Village Green building facing Twin Rivers.
17. Consolidate the Bio-swale to a rectangular shape instead of a strip to provide a landscaped amenity as a central feature of the plan instead of a typical parking lot. The adverse visual impact of parked cars will be substantially reduced. The parking is more convenient to the buildings that it serves and there is no reduction in the parking count.
18. Fixture cuts are required for review. *Required by Wilde Lake Guidelines for Non-Residential Properties page 4.*

ELEVATIONS

19. Add awnings to the Village Green storefronts facing Twin Rivers to enhance the retail image.
20. Roof repairs are to be clay tile to match the existing or replace in asphalt shingle the entire roof.

21. The new tenant signs shown mounted on the Village Green Arcade roof edge are not permitted. Hang these signs from the arcade roof overhang soffit. *Required by the Wilde Lake Guidelines for Non-Residential Properties page 14, penultimate paragraph*

22. Roofs on the proposed two-story market and office building should have the same four-foot, flat roof overhang that is a signature feature of the existing Village Center.

MATERIALS SAMPLE BOARD

23. Omit the red brick since it does not blend with the light, earth-tone bricks on the Village Center and adjacent residential development. The stone sample is too rustic. Provide a sample of ashlar stone as illustrated on the Architectural elevations.

DESIGN CRITERIA

Revise per plan comments above plus:

24. Page 6 - The primary façade material for new buildings on the Twin River's frontage shall be limited to brick and or stone to maintain the quality level of the existing Village Green building. No painted wood balconies. (page 8 also)

25. Page 7 - Substitute horizontal sliding windows for double hung sash that are synonymous with traditional style architecture and therefore inappropriate for this village center which is contemporary in style. Omit reference to slate roofing since existing roofs are clay tile and new roofs are shown as shingle. (page 8 also)

26. Page 8 –Add to last paragraph: Wall openings must be filled with architectural screens eg. ornamental ironwork or cast-stone filigree to obscure the visibility to the cars parked inside. Free-standing parking structures are not permitted.

27. Page 10 – Add that single-occupancy building name signs can have up to 24-inch high letters. *Required by Wilde Lake Guidelines For Non-Residential Properties page 15*

28. Page 15 – Substitute the words “tiled-mansard” for the word “parapet” to match the architecture proposed. Increase the height to 6 feet to conceal rooftop equipment. Add that this is not applicable to arcade flat roofs.

GROUNDS FOR MODIFICATIONS

As required under the covenants, the grounds for the Architectural Advisory Panel's *“Recommendation to approve with modifications”* are as follows:

Covenant Section

7.03 (c) Objection to the exterior design, appearance or materials to any proposed Structure.
See Modifications 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26

7.03 (d) Incompatibility of any proposed Structure or use with existing Structures or uses upon other Lots in the vicinity. *See Modifications 1, 2, 7, 8*

7.03 (e) Objection to the location of any proposed Structure on any Lot or with reference to other Lots in the vicinity. *See Modifications 3, 4, 6, 10*

7.03 (g) Objection to the color scheme, finish, proportions style of architecture, height, bulk or appropriateness of any proposed Structure. *See Modifications 5, 9, 28*

7.03 (h) Objection to parking areas proposed for any lot on the grounds of (1) incompatibility to proposed uses and structures on such lot or (2) the insufficiency of the size of parking areas in relation to the proposed use of the lot. *See Modifications 15, 17*

7.03 (i) Any other matter which, in the judgment of the Architectural Committee would render the proposed Structure, Structures or uses inharmonious with the general plan of improvement of the Property or with Structures or uses located upon other Lots in the vicinity. *See Modifications 3, 14, 15, 16*

Respectfully Submitted:

Jervis H. Dorton
Architectural Advisory Panel
Chairperson