

Castle Cove Special Board Meeting

April 25, 2011, 6:00 p.m.

Lawrence North High School, Room 195

The meeting was called to order at 6:07 pm

Attendees:

Board Members: Marie Wright, Jay Bobian, Tom Stephenson, Frank Borelli, Jessica Gallagher, Rich Havlin, Maury Lathrop, Ron Sans (Absent: Tim Scofield)

Residents: Linda Dernier, Lana & Larry Jordan, Sherry Havlin, Greg Bond, Ken Massey, Jim Lindgren, Ruth Ann Stephenson

This special meeting was called so the Board could thoroughly discuss the tennis court, review options, costs, financing and logic, and make an appropriate decision whether to replace the current two courts with two courts or only one court.

Tennis Committee Presentation:

Maury Lathrop presented hand-outs to the Board that explained the requirements and preparation necessary for building one single court and also building a double court. These specifications were used in obtaining bids to ensure quotes were for the same work. He thanked Larry Jordan for his work in meeting with contractors.

Four quotes were obtained. The bids recommended by the Tennis Committee are:

<u>Single court</u>			
Prep and drainage	Frady & Sons		\$29,588
Asphalt, finish paint & fencing	Leslie Coating, Inc.		<u>\$35,490</u>
	TOTAL		\$65,078
<u>Double court</u>			
Prep & drainage	Frady & Sons		\$23,376
Asphalt, finish paint & fencing	Dellello & Sons		<u>\$49,500</u>
	TOTAL		\$72,876

The plan would be to begin removal and construction sometime around mid August after school has started. This would give residents use of the courts for most of the summer. Construction would be complete before the weather gets cold. The asphalt would cure over the winter and finish work including painting the stripes would be completed in the spring.

Maury read the Tennis Committee's reasons for recommending two courts. The main points are:

- The tennis courts are a major asset to the community and add value to our homes. They are as important to the community as the lake, the pool, and the shelter house. Most of us bought homes here with the understanding that these assets would be maintained not minimized.
- The cost of replacing two tennis courts vs. replacing one tennis court is only \$7,798 difference, making it an affordable, sensible investment.
- Some feel the need for more green space for other activities such as volley ball, picnic tables, etc. There is unused green space to the south and west of the pool as well as the hill to the north of the Clubhouse that can support these activities.
- We have enough demand for court time to warrant keeping two tennis courts. We have morning groups, pickle ball groups etc. all playing together at the same time.
- Funds have already been set aside over the past few years specifically to replace both courts.
- New courts will be relatively maintenance free for a number of years.
- Most neighborhood communities on a par with Castle Cove have two tennis courts.
- All of these assets make our neighborhood a better place to live and add value to our homes and the neighborhood.

- The Revitalization Committee can still do some improvements this year as respondents to the survey have suggested – some of these improvements are: add picnic tables, lake benches and mulch the playground and plan for some larger projects at a later time.

A thorough discussion followed. Residents who can see the courts from their home report daily usage. Other residents say when they have guests, they use both courts. Two courts allow more people to use them at the same time. A suggestion was made to be sure the gate posts are reinforced.

Revitalization Committee Presentation:

Frank Borelli presented the recommendation of the Revitalization Committee which is to replace only one tennis court. This is based on:

- The survey that was taken last year indicated respondents preferred replacing one court; some did not want any tennis courts.
- Wasn't enough usage to warrant two courts.
- The survey respondents suggested other amenities be added to the common area, such as: picnic tables, benches, asphalt path to playground & additional cover/permanent roof for shade in pool area. The committee estimates approximately \$10K for this.
- The committee members don't think all the money should be put into the tennis courts

Discussion followed and a question was asked, if only one court is replaced and grass is put in between the shelter and the court for a Multi purpose area, what would it be used for? The answer is to leave it open for whatever anyone wants to use it for, such as volleyball, soccer, etc.

Another question raised was if we only replace one court and then realize we made a mistake and want 2 courts, what then? The cost to add a second court later would be more than \$65,000 vs. \$7798 now!

A suggestion was made to add a contingency amount of money for unforeseen expenses in this project no matter whether we replace one or two courts. These expenses could include; repair of any soft spots found under the court during prep work or if damage is done to the parking lot and/or sidewalk.

More discussion followed concerning many aspects of the project including the survey (its validity and worth), future repairs of new courts (typical expectations), cost (finances saved and value of replacing both courts for less than 9% more), another survey, Board responsibility to maintain amenities, etc.

Frank Borelli made a motion to install one court at a cost of \$65,078 using Frady & Sons and Leslie Coating. No second was made, and after further discussion, the motion died.

Additional discussion involved:

- A question of contractor preference by the tennis committee and needing a paper bid from Rick's (only verbal so far).
- Getting so much more for the money with 2 courts: \$72,876 vs \$65,078 (only \$7,798 difference, which is just under 9%).
- At the time of the survey, the cost proposals were not accurate as to current cost.
- All costs will not be incurred this year (2011). Final work will be done in spring of 2012 when we will have additional income from 2012 dues. There is definitely enough funding for the project without depleting the contingency fund.

A motion was made for a secret ballot to vote for either 1 or 2 courts, motion carried. The vote taken resulted in a tie, 4 to 4. One Board member was absent and his vote will be obtained at the May meeting and used as the tie breaker. The Board will then proceed with the tennis court project.

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 pm. The next regular Board Meetings: May 9, Jul 11, Sep 12

Respectfully submitted,
Tom Stephenson, Secretary/Treasurer