

**KTC Executive Meeting  
August 29, 2018 @ 7:00pm  
Queen's ARC**

In attendance: Viki Andrevska, Mike Bartlett, Doug Bowie, Bob Goddard, Paula Loh, Taco Meuter, Nerissa Mulligan, Bud Nelson, David Stocks, Gill Turnbull, Chloe Wilson

Absent: None

**1. Review/approve minutes of meeting from July 25, 2018  
Minutes approved as amended.**

**2. Hiring/Staffing update**

- a. Fall Lessons? (Nerissa)

Dana Tremblay will start as a new steward on Thursday, August 30<sup>th</sup>. The board agreed that we can have stewards over the weekends with the new hiring. Some of the camp staff also expressed an interest to work as steward. It was suggested that hours should be displayed on the door so members know when to expect stewards on duty. Mike resigned from steward supervisor and Dave will take this role from now on.

Fall Lessons – Isaac will be available for private/semiprivate/group lessons.

**3. September Social (Gill)**

Next social to be held on Saturday, September 15<sup>th</sup>. Tennis will start at 3:30pm to follow by a potluck at 5:30pm. It will be no cost to attend the social.

There will also be a get together for the US Open Finals (both Mens and Womens) at Don Cherry's Sports Grill at 692 Princess st on Saturday (Womens) and Sunday (Mens) at around 4pm. Gill should be contacted if people plan to attend.

**4. Set Date for AGM (Chloe)**

- a. Proposed date: Tuesday, November 13

10 to 50 days notice to the members. We agreed on Tuesday, Nov 13.

**1. Survey for City of Kingston Recreation Master Plan (Dave)**

Dave and Chloe had a phone meeting with the Ron Hack from Sierra Planning. They are the consultants for the City of Kingston Leisure and Recreation Master Plan. We need to do a survey

and the survey has to be submitted very quickly. The purpose of this survey is to inform the City of Kingston about the KTC. Also this can be a positive experience in exploring the possibilities of mutual collaboration between KTC and City of Kingston. Dave suggested to meet at his house to do the survey in the next week. Doug, Bud, Paula and Dave will meet next week Tuesday, September 4 at 2pm to do the survey.

**5. Doug Prinsen Invoice (Taco)**

- a. There is some question about whether or not a recent invoice from Doug Prinsen was for approved work. This needs clearing up before the invoice is paid.

**Motion: Paula moved Bud seconded that we pay the invoice immediately from July 28 in amount of \$5,953.54 Carried.**

**6. Treasurer's Report – Appendix A**

Tom Thayer will be asked to attend the Finance committee and then to attend Board Meeting to provide his opinion on risk tolerance according to the numbers we have in the moment. The Finance committee was asked to prepare figures that reflect a range of risk tolerance.

Doug will get a quote for repair of the roof.

**7. Finance committee update – Appendix B**

**8. Club maintenance update**

Suggestion: hire a professional to do the weeding and lawn maintenance. We all agree to do this one time as a trial. Doug will take care of this.

**9. Capital Project Committee update and President's report – Appendix C and Appendix D**

We began the discussion about the Capital Project and President's report but run out of time. We will discuss them at the special meeting to be hold on September 10<sup>th</sup>.

**10. Set next meeting Date: Monday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 7pm at the KTC**

**11. Adjournment at 10:04pm**

Appendix A

**Treasurer’s Report August 29, 2018**

**Operating Budget** (Statements on pages 6-8.)

**Up to Date Info:**

2018 Collection of **Revenues** (Jan 1- August 25): \$226,850 (2017: \$239,042). Revenues are down mainly because of lower full time camp revenues, and lesson revenues.

**Cash Position:** As of August 25: RBC: \$17,655 (June 20: \$13,286); Tangerine: \$72,548 (\$92,444) ; DS: \$390,304 (\$300,265)

**Members:** Total 477: Adult 172, Student&Jr 28, Couple 134, Family 143. New Membership Revenues to August 25 are \$115,108 (on track to meet the budget: \$119,500; same date 2017: \$114,825).

<b>Camps:</b>	“Final”	Last month
Week 1	F22MFA7	F22MFA7
Week 2	F22M16A8	F23MFA8
Week 3	FFMFA8	FFMFA8
Week 4	F20MFA7	F20MFA5
Week 5	F11MFA13	F11MFA8
Week 6	FFMFA7	F20MFA3
Week 7	F17M14A1	F11M15A3
Week 8	F18MFA6	F15MFA4
Week 9	F12M14A6	F7M11A3

(Maximum spots: Full 24, Morning 16, Afternoon 16.)

The Tennis Camps will bring in about \$71K (2017: \$84,960). The decline may be partly due to the indirect effects of the increase in minimum wages on family budgets. It is also clear that the afternoon camps continue to be a drag on income. There are a few more pay periods for camp staff to be paid August & September, so that’s another \$20K off net income. Expected net revenue in the low to mid thirties.

**Lessons:** Revenue from lessons lag last year’s: \$16,676 vs \$22,794.

**MPAC:** I am awaiting a report from MPAC comparing assessment values before and after improvements are done. As the KTC property will continue to be assessed on its cost basis, I’ve given them cost estimates so we’ll be able to determine how assessment values change as cost estimates change. In any case, there will be a significant difference in assessment value, largely determined by the building cost. They also indicated that this difference would be much less for a renovation. The

assessment value determines the increase in property tax, a major component of the estimated increase in operating costs after a capital project.

**Review of Borrowing Capacity:** Most of us indicated that we approve of getting our accountants (Wilkinson) to do an independent review of our borrowing capacity. Once officially approved, this will be a short but thorough review (cost: \$600 to \$1,000) that looks at all factors that affect our business model.

Issues: *Risk tolerance*. The Finance Committee (FC: more correctly and in fact previously called the “Risk and Finance” Committee) has not made big assumptions regarding risk tolerance. Risk tolerance is an indication of where we feel we can place the KTC on the spectrum of lender-allowed borrowing. The main determinants of our borrowing capacity are the Debt to Equity ratio and the Debt Service Coverage Ratio, as required by the lender. They both limit the potential loan to less than is needed for a \$1.5M+ project. The FC recommended a point between the amounts indicated by the two ratios, that was to the high end of that spectrum of \$350-\$430K ==> we recommended borrowing up to \$400K. Given \$490K in estimated accumulated usable savings and a loan of \$400K, there is a \$630K shortfall, which is unlikely to be met by donations. Anything over \$430K is simply not possible, given the DSCR of 1.3. And IO has indicated that a good DSCR is 1.3-1.4, so we’re even at the low end of that.

In an early analysis I had not yet included any *capital reserve* in calculating the cash flow buffer. Yet, even there, the maximum possible loan would only reach about \$730K, with annual debt repayments of \$46K, a buffer not even large enough to maintain the courts, and a shortfall of \$300K.

The FC analysis assumes a maximum *down payment* of available savings. The *operating reserve* of \$100,000 is required to meet both loan repayment obligations and unexpected costs. These payments continue in the off season, when no money is coming in. It would not be wise to end any season without adequate reserves, especially the season after such a large and messy project, when so many unexpected costs are still likely.

We have seen the negative effect of increasing membership rates on membership numbers, and eventually on membership revenues (e.g., last year). Keeping rates the same this year is likely to result in a slight bump. But in any case, for borrowing purposes, we are not allowed to make the *assumption* that an increase in rates will raise revenues. That's why we are using a three year historical average of revenues. For the same reason we are not allowed to make the *assumption* that increasing the number of courts will increase revenues. Wilkinson necessarily will have to follow the same rules.

Any lender, including Infrastructure Ontario, has as its first priority to not lose its capital investment. When it comes down to it, they will protect themselves first, so if we can't service their loan, they are still covered, but we are likely to lose control of the KTC. Are they a *disinterested party*? Of course not. Do they understand our business as well as our auditors? Wilkinson is much the more objective observer, only interested in retaining us as a client.

Wilkinson may very well say that we do not need to set aside as much as 1% for capital reserves (\$6-7K p.a.); however, it is not likely that our annual capital and maintenance costs for the building will stay under the average of \$2,000 over the past three years of neglect (and much of that was just for regular seasonal plumbing jobs); they will also comment on whether we can continue to have only one *steward on duty* if the building is moved to the lawn (and we have seen the difficulties we face now, with just one steward scheduled); what happens when *interest rates* continue to move up; whether it is reasonable to assume that over the next 25 years no *other tennis club* will set up shop in Kingston, even though the city itself a few years ago already contemplated a community based tennis club in the Bayridge area by 2024 (This city plan will be updated in Kingston's new Master Plan). It should be noted that the last time the KTC faced competition from another tennis club, our membership was stuck in the high 300's to low 400's, mostly from the immediate neighbourhood. New competition will also affect *camps and lessons*.

So to circle back, the FC is tasked to look at the risks: what can go wrong and how we can survive under the worst case scenarios. The facts tell us that this project is not possible, even before we look at our risk tolerance, or real risk factors such as new competition, interest rates and operational issues.

The FC has already done a thorough job analyzing KTC's prudent borrowing capacity given the available information, so in that sense, I don't believe we really need much further input. However, in the interest of moving forward, **I recommend that we give Wilkinson the go-ahead to do their independent review.**

**Roof:** I contacted our insurance agent about the leaky roof, and he essentially says that any damage we encounter while the roof is deficient is likely to be judged wear and tear, rather than property damage, so we'd have to pay for it ourselves.

**I recommend that we fix the roof, properly and soon.**

- **Wear & tear:** Say your business has a roof that's 15-years-old, but you've never had any work done to it. However, the roof has deteriorated and starts leaking onto your computer equipment. Because the damage is the result of your failure to maintain the roof, your claim will likely be determined to be a wear-and-tear issue. Property Insurance usually doesn't cover that.

- **Property damage:** You still have that 15-year-old roof, but in this scenario, you hired a roofing company to perform routine maintenance. Smart! Then one day a windstorm strikes, damaging your roof and destroying some of your business equipment. In this case, you can prove you maintained your roof and the damage is a direct result of a covered weather event. Property Insurance usually covers this claim.

**Forefront Invoice:** In November 2017 we received an invoice from Forefront for about \$1500 for “site plan work” done in 2017. This work had not been approved by either the previous board or this board. This board approved it retroactively as Forefront seemed to have done the work in good faith, but we determined that future jobs would need explicit prior board approval. In the same vein, we did not give the CPC any blanket spending authority, and we limited the next job we gave Forefront to \$2,500. At the July board meeting the board bypassed the required preliminary review by the FC and approved up to \$12,500 to Forefront for what the CPC chair indicated to be (unspecified) additional future work. Two days after the board meeting we received what we presumed to be the invoice for the \$2,500 job; however, the invoice was in fact for \$5,300 (plus HST), and apparently included work performed after the \$2,500 job, that the board had again not approved. Forefront explained it thus: “*Our budget estimate component of \$2,500 considered the advance work completed through to and including the City meeting.*” They appear not to have been properly instructed by the CPC chair as to what the board had indicated they be asked to do (a “preliminary sub-drainage design”), and seem to have been under the impression that they could simply continue after the city rejected that proposal at the pre-consultation meeting. So now we have a second problematic invoice that would need to be approved retroactively. This is not proper procedure, and will be a sticking point for our auditors.

**I have no choice but to propose that the unauthorized excess of \$2,800 plus HST be taken out of the \$12,500 room for future work as approved in July.**

In addition, the board should be provided a clearly written scope of work for the new job, and KTC officers should from now on receive regular updates by Forefront, including invoicing that clearly references the scope of work performed. Hopefully that will avoid future misunderstandings with Forefront, and serve as a blueprint for dealing with other contractors as well.

## Kingston Tennis Club

### 2018 OPERATING BUDGET

	YTD Actual Oct-Jul 2018	2018 Budget	2017 Actual	2016 Actual
<b>MEMBERS &amp; GENERAL REVENUES</b>				
Fees	116,116	119,500	117,841	121,229
Lessons - net	7,550	7,000	7,858	7,609
Guest fees	1,065	3,300	3,610	3,023
Donations	3,159	2,200	2,956	1,603
Clubhouse Sales - net	(559)	300	(98)	1,032
Socials and Tournaments - net	2,398	200	68	198
Parking revenue - net	39	0	(304)	296
HST	(8,721)	(12,000)	(11,697)	(12,289)
<b>CONTRIBUTION, MEMBERS &amp; GENERAL</b>	<b>121,047</b>	<b>120,500</b>	<b>120,234</b>	<b>122,701</b>
<b>JUNIOR CAMPS</b>				
Revenue	67,922	85,900	84,980	79,774
Supplies	(3,992)	(5,200)	(3,519)	(6,379)
Try, Learn, Play (2017 Wages)	0			
Wages	(14,877)	(40,100)	(32,575)	(32,419)
<b>CONTRIBUTION, JUNIOR CAMPS</b>	<b>49,053</b>	<b>40,600</b>	<b>48,887</b>	<b>40,976</b>
<b>SHARED COSTS</b>				
Advertising	(860)	(700)	(865)	(545)
Amortization	0	(2,900)	(2,515)	(2,763)
Bank Charges	(1,284)	(1,300)	(1,296)	(6,096)
Bookkeeper	(4,075)	(5,100)	(4,425)	0
Insurance	(1,556)	(1,800)	(2,024)	(2,264)
Interest Income	4,335	4,800	3,596	1,066
Office Supplies	(1,053)	(1,500)	(1,304)	(1,938)
OTA Fees	(1,545)	(1,500)	(1,545)	(1,545)
Professional Fees	(3,310)	(3,500)	(3,192)	(5,180)
Property Tax	(15,905)	(12,400)	(11,542)	(9,716)
Repairs & Maintenance	(4,572)	(5,000)	(4,491)	(11,418)
Software expense	(2,146)	(4,300)	(4,047)	(4,521)
Steward Wages	(16,841)	(27,400)	(28,021)	(29,153)
Transportation	(226)	(200)	(188)	(223)
Utilities & Communication	(2,588)	(4,200)	(4,214)	(4,051)
<b>TOTAL, SHARED COSTS</b>	<b>(51,626)</b>	<b>(67,000)</b>	<b>(66,072)</b>	<b>(78,347)</b>
<b>REVENUE less EXPENDITURES - RECURRING</b>	<b>118,474</b>	<b>94,100</b>	<b>103,049</b>	<b>85,330</b>
HST Recovery - non recurring	0	0	0	32,097
<b>REVENUE less EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>118,474</b>	<b>94,100</b>	<b>103,049</b>	<b>117,427</b>
ADD: Amortization	0	2,900	2,515	2,763
<b>EBITDA</b>	<b>118,474</b>	<b>97,000</b>	<b>105,564</b>	<b>120,190</b>
LESS: Capital Spending	(4,374)	(15,300)		(14,573)
Increase in Working Capital	(6,353)	0		(5,523)
<b>Cash Flow after Working Capital Changes</b>	<b>107,747</b>	<b>81,700</b>	<b>105,564</b>	<b>100,094</b>
<b>CASH:</b>				
Beginning, Total cash and cash equivalents	389,073	389,073	283,509	183,392
Ending, Total cash and cash equivalents	496,820	470,773	389,073	283,509

Capital Spending		
Bathroom Renovation		
Wayne Patry - bathroom repairs - May 2018		671
New Building		
Forefront Engineering - Oct 2017		1,288
Wayne Patry - water fountain - May 2018		840
		2,128
Court 1		
Oosterhoff Electrical - Nov 2017		1,575
		4,374



<b>Kingston Tennis Club</b>		
<b>Profit and Loss</b>		
<b>October 2017 - Jul 2018</b>		
	<b>Oct-Jul 18</b>	<b>Prior Year Oct-Sep17</b>
<b>Income</b>		
5010 Donations		
5010-02 Donations from Memberships	3,149.00	2,936.00
5010-03 Other Donations	10.00	20.00
<b>Total 5010 Donations</b>	<b>\$ 3,159.00</b>	<b>\$ 2,956.00</b>
5020 Guest Fees		180.00
5020-01 Court Rental	660.00	3,070.00
5020-04 Ball Machine Rental	405.00	360.00
<b>Total 5020 Guest Fees</b>	<b>\$ 1,065.00</b>	<b>\$ 3,610.00</b>
5030 Interest Income	4,334.53	3,595.96
5040 Junior Camp		940.00
5040-01 Full Day Camp	34,843.00	44,090.00
5040-03 Half Day Tennis Camp	1,025.00	39,125.00
5040-20 Morning Tennis Camp	24,878.00	
5040-21 Afternoon Tennis Camp	6,365.00	
5040-04 Camp Lunch	-739.17	-1,459.28
5040-50 AM Supervision	550.00	
5040-51 PM Supervision	261.00	
5040-05 Supervision		1,765.00
<b>Total 5040 Junior Camp</b>	<b>\$ 67,182.83</b>	<b>\$ 84,460.72</b>
5060 Lessons		964.00
5060-01 Group	4,988.00	9,199.00
5060-02 Private/Semi Private	4,424.00	10,471.67
5060-20 Lesson Private/Semi A	368.33	
5060-04 Junior Group Lessons	5,540.00	3,960.00
5060-05 Shot of the Week	465.00	40.00
5060-06 Weekly Junior Tournament		-84.10
<b>Total 5060 Lessons</b>	<b>\$ 15,785.33</b>	<b>\$ 24,550.57</b>
5061 Lesson Reimbursements		
5061-01 Group	-\$ 123.33	-\$ 180.00
5070 Membership Dues		342.00
5070-01 Adult Membership	56,390.00	54,800.79
5070-02 Couples Membership	32,980.00	33,777.00
5070-03 Family Membership	20,950.00	19,305.00
5070-04 Junior Membership	1,477.00	1,574.00
5070-05 Student Membership	4,319.00	8,042.00
<b>Total 5070 Membership Dues</b>	<b>\$ 116,116.00</b>	<b>\$ 117,840.79</b>
5090 Sales		
5090-01 Clothing		215.00
5090-02 Drinks	370.00	425.00
5090-03 Food	53.25	174.27
5090-40 Tennis Balls NEW	2,494.00	2,221.50
5090-04 Tennis Balls USED	10.00	
5090-06 Parking revenue	2,125.00	2,325.00
<b>Total 5090 Sales</b>	<b>\$ 5,052.25</b>	<b>\$ 5,360.77</b>
5095 Misc revenue		77.00
5100 Social Events	1,107.00	1,225.00
5100-01 Rogers Cup	1,375.00	435.70
<b>Total 5100 Social Events</b>	<b>\$ 2,482.00</b>	<b>\$ 1,660.70</b>
5110 Tournaments	2,380.00	2,817.00
<b>HST Refund</b>		
Uncategorized Income		
Uncategorized Income	0.00	0.00
<b>Total Uncategorized Income</b>	<b>\$ 0.00</b>	<b>\$ 0.00</b>
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>\$ 217,433.61</b>	<b>\$ 246,749.51</b>
<b>Expenses</b>		
7000 Advertising/Publicity	859.77	865.26
7020 Canteen Expenses		
7020-01 Drinks Purchased	130.24	101.20
7020-02 Food Purchased	58.72	90.52
7020-04 Tennis Balls Purchased	3,037.44	2,761.42
7020-05 Clothing	259.54	257.97
<b>Total 7020 Canteen Expenses</b>	<b>\$ 3,485.94</b>	<b>\$ 3,211.11</b>
7040 Depreciation		\$ 2,515.00
7040 Insurance	1,555.71	2,023.53
7050 HST/GST Expense	8,720.66	11,696.50
7070 Court Supplies - Teaching	338.89	
7070 Junior Camp Expenses	3,253.21	3,138.95
7070-01 Tennis Balls - Junior Camp		379.68
7075 Bad Debt		
7090 Office Supplies	722.81	1,176.46
7094 Bookkeeping	4,075.00	4,425.00
7095 Legal and Accounting	2,825.00	3,191.85
7100 OTA fees	1,545.00	1,545.00
7105 Parking expenses	2,085.85	2,628.83
7110 Property Tax	15,904.86	11,541.55
7120 Repairs & Maintenance	4,572.37	4,491.47
7125 Infrastructure Project	485.00	
7130 Social Expenses		50.00
7130-01 Socials	1,771.42	2,420.94
7130-02 Tournaments	664.14	1,100.00
7130-03 Tennis Balls-Socials/Tournaments		309.12
<b>Total 7130 Social Expenses</b>	<b>\$ 2,435.56</b>	<b>\$ 3,880.06</b>
7140 Telephone	990.87	991.25
7160 Tournament Expenses	28.61	529.43
7170 Utilities	1,597.50	3,222.40
7190 Transportation	226.10	187.54
7200 Payroll Expenses		89.11
7200-01 Junior Camp	14,876.95	31,714.66
7200-05 Tennis Ball		-600.00

## Appendix B

### Finance Committee Report – August 2018

At the most recent KTC Board meeting on July 25th, the Finance Committee (Club President Chloe Wilson, Mike Bartlett, Dave Reid and Taco Meuter) submitted its report on KTC's potential borrowing capacity. The report is, Taco Meuter believes, the most thorough study undertaken on our Club's borrowing capacity since the 2012 membership vote on the capital project. We took into consideration current costs and figures as much as possible, including Ontario's increase in the minimum wage, as well as increases in property taxes after a big project, and annual reserve requirements to maintain the property at a level to sustain KTC's historical and tennis-playing attractiveness in the face of both a fickle demand and competing public courts. We determined that the KTC should at this point limit itself to borrowing a maximum of \$400,000.

This contrasts with last year's recommendation of \$700,000 by our then treasurer; however, that earlier estimate did not include several of the factors mentioned above. It did recommend that we maintain a large cash flow buffer, which is comparable to our reserve requirements. Given that the project presented at last year's AGM (demolish clubhouse, build new clubhouse on the lawn and an 8th court) is now estimated to cost in excess of \$1.5m as costs have gone up, e.g. as the City is requiring the Club to build a costly drainage system as part of the lawn option, the FC recommendation calls into question the feasibility of that project in the absence of sizeable donations or grants: A funding shortfall of \$630,000 would need to be covered, somehow. In addition, we also consider the odds to be high of a new club starting up within the near future (< 15 years), a club that will be public or private, and likely feature indoor courts. Furthermore, we judged that changing our setup to what was proposed will negatively affect our operating cost structure. However, as we did not quantify these factors in the analysis, they present a further potential reduction in our prudent borrowing room.

As the FC recommendation has proven disappointing to some of the "clubhouse on the lawn/8th court" project's proponents, we will, if necessary, seek an independent, professional review by the Club's accounting firm's business consulting specialists to review the accuracy and reasonableness of our analysis. Depending on the outcome of the business consultants' review, the Club could be required to seriously scale back its capital improvement goals for strictly financial considerations.

Fortunately, the KTC does have other options: For instance, there is a definite and sustained enthusiasm amongst the membership for retaining KTC's current setup around our historical clubhouse. This confirms the results of the 2016 survey of our membership. In fact, several informal expressions of interest have been volunteered to support this enthusiasm with actual donations. In addition, based on preliminary quotes, the overall cost of renovating appears to compare very favourably with the lawn plans. By spending a relatively modest amount to renovate our existing clubhouse, the Club would be able to devote considerably more of its financial resources to improving its courts and court lighting. We will also be in a stronger position to take a leading role in any tennis bubble/indoor court partnership opportunities that may arise.

The Finance Committee,  
Kingston Tennis Club

## Appendix C

### Report by the Capital Project (CP) Committee to the KTC Board

August 29, 2018

Members: Paula Loh (Chair), Scott McNeely, Mark Nelligan, Dora Nomikos, Chloe Wilson

July 24, 2018 – Four members of the committee (Scott McNeely, Mark Nelligan, Paula Loh, Chloe Wilson) met to discuss site plan and drainage aspects. The committee began discussing the option of installing a basement (possibly full-height) since we now plan to have site drainage.

August 21, 2018 - Three members of the committee (Scott McNeely, Dora Nomikos, Paula Loh) met to review clubhouse design aspects.

### Executive Summary

Work continues on the review of infrastructure and clubhouse design aspects towards the goal of receiving up-to-date project pricing and the presentation of the project to the membership to launch fundraising. The capital project, approved by the general membership November 2017 and approved by the Board March 2018, is on schedule to begin construction in the Fall of 2019.

Mike Preston requires a retainer of \$5,000 to proceed with consultation on the clubhouse design. Total design work is quoted at \$19,000. Structural, mechanical and electrical drawings to be done by others at an additional cost. Motions will be proposed at the board meeting of August 29, 2018.

- **Proposed Use of Club Space**  
Club entry, service counter, junior camps – use of covered patio & lawn, social events, tennis lessons
  - **Items re. Clubhouse Design for discussion with Mike Preston**
- **Project Details**
  - **Site Drainage** – remove concrete pads & install sub and surface drainage
  - **Stormwater Management** – Doug Prinsen’s comments
  - **Basement** – for storage, mechanical, and/or junior camps? Feedback from Doug Prinsen on the topic of drainage and a full-height basement; Feedback from Mike Preston on basement access – staircases and elevator
  - **Court Improvements** – surface drainage, lighting, maintenance, tree growth, benches, electrical outlets
  - **Court Dividers**
  - **City of Kingston**
  - **Geo Tech Study**
- **Trillium Grant**

Due date extended to September 19

## **Proposed Use of Club Space**

The CP committee is reviewing the proposed drawings to ensure the design meets our needs. It is considering the inclusion of a basement, should it make economic sense. Committee members have spoken with the camp director to determine that the revised space will work for the junior camps.

Entry to the club to be through the clubhouse main entrance during hours when a staff member is on duty, with all doors propped open for air circulation. After-hours entry is via the gate to the south of the clubhouse, accessed by members via keypad/keycard. Bicycle racks will be available outside the clubhouse.

The service counter will be secured to enable the staff member to work elsewhere on the property as required. A metal gate/curtain that easily and quickly rolls down or across the counter would be ideal. Valuable items to be contained within the secure service counter/office area.

Junior tennis camps operate for 8-9 weeks during the summer. Parents drop off children starting at 8:00am, with the majority arriving between 9:00-9:30am. Foot traffic to flow from the main entrance to the south door, with the covered patio area to the south serving as camp headquarters. The covered patio will be extended eastwards to the full depth of the clubhouse, making it larger than the current room upstairs in the clubhouse.

We require hooks/cubbies in this area to store backpacks/lunch bags for 40 campers. We need versatile seating that accommodates campers for snacks (up to 40), lunch (up to 24), and for rainy day activities.

There will be some noise between 9:00-9:30am, which will impact players on Court 3 prior to the campers moving onto Courts 2 & 3 at 9:30am. Members are able to gather during camp hours either inside the lounge or on the 12'-wide section of the patio that runs along the full length of the east side of the clubhouse.

Feedback from the 2018 camp director is that he loves the shaded patio location for the camps. He prefers to keep the kids outside but sheltered from the sun/rain, features that they do not have now. The kids will no longer have to walk back and forth to the old clubhouse between members sitting on the current deck, as they will always be next to the courts. After a rainfall, they can conveniently play some games on the lawn while waiting for the courts to dry. The camp director is aware that the lawn will be 32' x 47', which is 1/4 of the current lawn, but a size equal to the area currently utilized for camp activities.

Social events occur twice a month during the outdoor tennis season (round robins, tournament BBQs). Dining will occur primarily in the covered patio area, using rectangular/square tables that can be joined together as desired. Attendance ranges from 20 to 60 people. Two BBQs will be set

up on the lawn adjacent to this area and returned to the storage area when not in use. Overflow seating can be set up on the lawn or on the east patio.

Tennis lessons will be taught on two of the three north courts. The courts will be separated by court dividers (curtains) that can be drawn closed during lessons to prevent balls leaving the lesson court. Court supplies (ball hoppers, ball carts, ball machine, camp court supplies) to be stored near this general area for easy access.

### **Items re. Clubhouse Design for discussion with Mike Preston**

- ensure foundation can support the option of a future two-storey building
- include unfinished basement (full-height, where possible) with sump pump – relocate mechanical and some storage from ground floor
- include stairs to basement – if inside, preferably in area next to double doors on east side to facilitate movement of bulky exterior items, such as furniture, for storage over winter as necessary
- reallocate main floor space formerly used for Utility room to changeroom/bathroom space - this could allow universal W/C to move to the north and create space for basement stairs
- minimize floor space used for circulation. Two suggestions: (1) Replace double door on south wall with a single door (to increase lounge space); (2) Reduce the 'dead' corridor space that leads to the changeroom area (move walls of current Utility room to the south) - this will also help with changeroom space re-allocation and creating space for basement stairs
- if possible, relocate exterior storage area for court supplies from east side next to the ramp to an alternate main level outdoor area (where?) to reclaim that area for seating/patio space.
- include electrical outlets in exterior storage areas
- 4-foot-wide empty space between north wall and fence of Court 7 can be partly used for fixed bench space (viewing area toward the three courts to the north). Possibility of small storage area under fixed benches in that location. Alternately, building could be moved adjacent to Court 7 and this space be removed. However, the roof overhang may interfere with play on the court. This space could be utilized for an external staircase to a basement instead of using interior floor space.
- storage area currently located south of covered patio to be used for BBQs (two), lawn maintenance equipment, court powerwashing machine, and garbage/recycling
- extend covered patio eastwards to full depth of clubhouse
- need wall space (perhaps external part of wall between covered patio and lounge?) to install hooks/cubbies for backpacks/lunch bags for 40 camp kids
- should we consider moving the kitchen to the south wall adjacent to the covered patio? (this area to be used for social events and junior camps)
- install oversized water supply line to clubhouse; include two exterior water taps at each of north & south ends of building (for court powerwashing)
- Other items that need a designated location: trophy case (on wall to the left on entering clubhouse?); donor wall (on wall to the left on exiting the east door?); flatscreen TV (mounted diagonally in south-east corner to minimize glare from windows?); coffee & tea

station for self-serve located near the service counter (at south wall?); water fountain with bottle refill station (mount second existing water fountain on south side of clubhouse?)

## **Project Details**

### **Site Drainage**

The current plan under consideration is to remove the concrete pads and install site drainage, both above and below the courts. It is expected that there will be a slight raise in grade of the new courts to provide an improved base. Surface drains (swales) would run along the base of the fences between the courts to minimize drainage across courts.

It is more economical to remove the concrete pads and install proper drainage connected to the Hill Street sewer than to keep the pads that we have and instead install concrete pads for Courts 7 & 8, which do not have existing pads. Asphalt courts cannot be successfully constructed or rebuilt without an underground drainage system in place.

Advantages to installing site drainage include court construction with known consistency, a lawn that no longer contains pools of water following heavy rainfall, and increased peace of mind to be able to construct a basement.

### **Stormwater Management**

Doug Prinsen has updated the site plan for the Trillium application and it includes the revised drainage system based on a connection to the Hill Street sewer. Subdrains will be installed around the perimeter of the courts. For Courts 2 & 3, there are three 1200 x 1200 catchbasin manholes for surface drainage.

Doug Prinsen's comments on the site plan:

To provide the required retention volume for stormwater management, an oversized 750mm diameter storm sewer is proposed on site – rather than an underground chamber or pipe network. The internal storm sewer would ultimately be extended to the north property limit to provide surface drainage capture there. It is expected that there would be a slight grade raise of the new courts to provide an improved base.

Since we now have a storm outlet we can incorporate some surface water drainage improvements (catchbasins) to minimize drainage across courts. The surface drainage arrows show court slopes – there would be swale at south end of each tier of courts draining water to catchbasins. I'd expect another future catchbasin at the north end to capture flows there from back yards. Subdrains are separate 150mm pipes.

Post development peak flows still need to be controlled to pre-development levels. As such, storage is required.

The 750mm sewer is just an oversized version of the sewer between the catchbasins. Subdrains will be extended separately around the court perimeters between the catchbasins near the top elevation of the sewer. Only during and briefly after larger storm events would the water rise in the larger storm sewer. Most of the court base would be above that elevation.

The exact location of the sewer, drainage tile, lighting ducts (or conduit) can be fine-tuned later.

## **Basement**

1. We would ideally like to maintain the planned elevation of the ground floor so that a wheelchair ramp(s) is not needed for access. However, this will limit the depth and scope of use of a basement.
2. Basements are cost advantageous since they are not assessed for property tax, whereas a second storey would be, and they are extremely cheap to construct.
3. Could the basement serve as an overflow space for the junior summer camps, similar to the application of the 2015 design which had a second-floor multipurpose room? The basement would essentially be one big open space that could also include the utility room and some storage.
4. If the basement is fully below ground and has no windows, is this a safety hazard and disallowed for a public space? Would we need two exits for the basement? Does it have to be accessible - would we need an elevator for a basement?

Feedback from Doug Prinsen on the topic of drainage and a full-height basement:

Sub-drain system depth of approximately 1m across site was envisioned. Some significant cost would be encountered to deepen that. A sump pump would be needed to address perimeter flow with any basement proposal.

Catch basin near Hill Street is quite shallow so it doesn't allow for much increased depth on storm sewer. Bedrock near Hill Street is also a little higher.

A deeper storm sewer at site would require a larger pipe (to accommodate flatter slope), additional rock excavation, and more boulevard / driveway restoration – if the extra depth is even viable at all. I expect that a full depth basement could not be fully served by gravity due to the shallow connection point on Hill Street. One would quickly spend an additional \$30K to gain even some depth.

Clearly the cost for a sump pump system is small. Any storm sewer system will provide an effective pump discharge opportunity. Sump pumps can be difficult, problematic depending on

flow, conditions, etc. They need to be done right with alarm and backup pump but can work fine.

Feedback from Mike Preston on basement access – staircases and elevator:

If you were to use the basement as habitable space, I believe you would need either two staircases or you could have one staircase and a door leading to an outside staircase up to grade (which could be useful). If you provide rooms in the basement that are for public use, then you would need to provide an elevator. If it's just storage and mechanical then you do not. I think a basement would make sense if you can control the water issues, but maybe just used for storage and mechanical?

I am fairly positive that you would only need one staircase from the basement if it is just mechanical and storage. I believe that it could be either interior or exterior. I can confirm all this with Sandy Wilson's office though. Personally I think if you can do a basement then you should. Perhaps it's not full height right across if bedrock is an issue, but I would do it where you can.

From Doug's feedback, it is infeasible to count on the sub-drain system alone to keep water away from a basement and we would have to rely on a sump pump.

In conclusion, a basement could be constructed, either full-height or partial height, but it is advised to use only for storage and mechanical and not for public space. A basement would most likely be partial height due to bedrock in the neighbourhood (further information will be available following the Geo Tech study). It is best not to excavate bedrock as it may result in ground water entering the area on an ongoing basis. Scott McNeely estimates that the cost to construct an unfinished basement would be \$20,000.

### **Court Improvements**

- Improved surface drainage
- Known foundation for courts, with sub-drainage
- Installation of LED lighting on Courts 2 & 3
- Widening of space between/alongside Courts 2 & 3
- Construction of an eighth court
- Removal of trees growing against & through perimeter fencing and below courts (to be replaced along Napier Street with shrubs that do not encroach upon the courts; details to be confirmed following receipt of arborist report)
- Construct/install court benches that include shade from the sun
- Electrical outlets at each set of courts

Maintaining the courts will be simplified after the courts are rebuilt since the areas where weeds currently grow between and beside the courts will be removed and either paved over or replaced with drains below the fences. It was suggested that we pave beyond the fence line by 6" (our



property extends 10-12" beyond the fence) to prevent the weeds from re-establishing. This also provides a straight edge for neighbours to mow their lawn, as applicable.

Over the decades, trees have been allowed to establish and grow adjacent to the courts. This has resulted in roots disrupting the surface of the courts, tree trunks growing through fences, and leaves and nuts falling onto the courts in prolific quantities. Leaf litter contributes to the breakdown of the court surface and makes it dirty and slippery. Slipping on a slimy surface is a recurring safety concern for players. This is an ongoing problem at the south end of Court 4 - all the courts currently drain down to it since it is the lowest point in the club. Additionally, this area is shaded from the sun and slow to dry.

The extreme tree growth surrounding Court 7 can provide relief from the sun for some, but for many it provides dappled light and shadows that make it difficult to clearly see the ball in play. Outdoor court conditions are maximized when free of encroaching tree cover. Shade is appreciated by players when sitting down to rest while changing ends, and shade will be incorporated into the seating areas wherever possible.

### **Court Dividers**

Court dividers (curtains) are used to separate courts when multiple balls are in use due to lessons or a ball machine. It is proposed that two of the three north courts, Courts 1, 7 & 8, will serve as teaching courts. This area can be enlarged to a total width of 167' to provide 17' between the side lines of each pair of courts. When the divider is pulled closed, there would be 8'6" on each side of the curtain to the court side line. For comparison, the south courts currently have 3' between the adjacent net posts and a total of 10'6" separating the side lines of each pair of courts. If this were to be divided in half, each player would have 5'3" as their share of the court space. The Credit Valley TC has court dividers (curtains) to separate two courts and the distance between the two net posts is 3'9". They recently installed new dividers to replace ones they had had for 15 years.

### **City of Kingston**

Current feedback from the City is that we consider connecting site drainage to the sewer on Hill Street. They are recommending we provide one handicapped parking spot on site (despite the minor variance) and have requested a noise study. Doug Prinsen to oppose these on our behalf.

### **Geo Tech Study**

The Geo Tech study quoted in 2015 (and not yet done) specified five bore holes: the four corners of the clubhouse and the centre of the clubhouse, all of which are on the lawn area. Doug Prinsen was asked if we have reasonable knowledge of the depth of the rock based on roadwork and residential work, is it worth paying \$6,200+ for the GeoTech? He responded:

Rock elevations for past work on Napier Street suggest rock was not encountered with water main and sewer work – as such it is expected to be at least about 2m deep. Test dig or borehole at the proposed building (or advancing the Geotech) could confirm. Recent house construction on MacDonnell suggested about 1.5m depth there?

Geotech input is for your benefit (and to assist with design and contractor pricing). Not just bedrock info is obtained. In my opinion, groundwater, soil, court granular base, and court concrete info would be obtained and is valuable – helping design efficiency and removing contractor guesswork \$.

Doug recommends that we also assess the concrete pads underneath the courts as part of the study and that we can relocate boreholes to maintain the Geotech cost.

Infrastructure Ontario (IO) requires a Geo Tech Study as part of the loan application.

## **Trillium Grant**

The application deadline has been extended to September 19 due to delays associated with the provincial election. Paula spoke with Trillium staff on July 17 and August 7 to coordinate submission of the grant application. General contractor (GC) quotes to be finalized by September 10. Once all GC quotes are received, Doug will review their submissions to verify what they have/have not included. They will include quotes from sub-contractors for lighting and court painting.

### **Spec provided to general contractors to quote for work related to Trillium grant**

Kingston Tennis Club is seeking quotation for replacement / widening of Courts 2 & 3. Work to proceed in fall 2019. Please provide breakdown for work. Thank you.

Work includes:

- 250mm storm sewer to site including connection to existing catchbasin at Napier / Hill
- remove existing court concrete pads and asphalt
- remove adjacent trees and roots on east side
- 750mm storm sewer on site
- three 1200 x 1200 catchbasin manholes
- 150mm subdrains along court perimeters
- lighting conduit
- wiring to the existing court lighting panel
- install seven concrete bases for lights (supplied by others)
- remove and replace east side fencing (14' high) with gate

remove and replace south side fencing (10' high) with gates  
install net posts and centre tie (supplied by others)  
grading of underlying material  
excavate to widen existing court to the west  
granular base 200mm B and 150mm A over all of both courts  
asphalt 50mm HL8, 40mm HL3F  
repair edges / reinstate  
court painting (by others the following spring)

# President’s Report on the Capital Project

Presented to the KTC Board by Chloe Wilson at  
the August 29, 2018 Board meeting

## **Table of Contents**

Purpose of the Report.....	2
What Improvements are we Seeking, and is the New Clubhouse on the Lawn the Only Way to Get Them? .....	3
Problems introduced by moving the clubhouse to the lawn.....	4
Reduced open space makes socializing at the club less comfortable:.....	4
Indoor space for campers situated in the entryway to the club.....	4
Clubhouse security reduced with clubhouse on the lawn .....	5
Court layout worsened by moving the clubhouse to the lawn.....	5
Cutting down trees reduces shaded courts and decreases “curb appeal”:.....	6
Clubhouse on the lawn distracts from the charm, look and feel of the KTC.....	6
Clubhouse on the lawn introduces drainage complications.....	6
Clubhouse on the lawn is expensive:.....	7
Project Management Issues.....	7
Proposed Alternate Solution – Clubhouse Renovation/Upgrading .....	8
Summary.....	11
Appendix – Comparison of Clubhouse/Deck Costs.....	13

## Purpose of the Report

In this report, I'd like to outline my concerns with the capital project and my reasons for believing we should instead invest in restoring our existing clubhouse. These reasons provide the basis for the motion that I'm planning to make at the upcoming Board meeting on August 29th.

This year, we established a Capital Project Committee that is working on carrying out the project that was voted on at the 2017 AGM. This project involves tearing down the existing clubhouse, building a new one-story clubhouse on the lawn, and building an 8th court. Lights will also be added to courts 2 and 3 as part of the project.

We also established a Finance Committee that is responsible for helping the Board with financial decisions.

As President, I have a unique perspective as I am the only Board member to sit on both committees. We've also had extensive discussion at the Board level about many aspects of the project, including the process by which it's being run, the financial impact on the club, and whether or not the proposed benefits outweigh the high costs (both financial and opportunity) of the project. Further, as President, I receive feedback from members and do my best to engage and learn the various perspectives on what members are looking for in their club.

The current proposal - to demolish the clubhouse, build a new one on the lawn, and build an 8th court - has some potential benefits, but it also comes with many drawbacks, not the least of which is the high price tag. I'm concerned that the Board hasn't done a sufficient job of communicating these drawbacks to the members and soliciting feedback. The project has always been presented as the only option available for dealing with the need to do something about our clubhouse.

This report examines 3 main issues. In the first, I discuss why I believe that the clubhouse does not need to be moved in order to achieve most of the improvements we're seeking. Next, I discuss why moving the clubhouse is problematic. Finally, I discuss why I believe an alternate solution - renovating the current clubhouse in place - is a better project for the KTC.

This report is a summary of my thoughts on the "qualitative" aspects of the project. It looks less at the finances (because the Finance Committee has reported on this part) and more at why we're doing the project, and whether or not the project really meets our needs.

## What Improvements are we Seeking, and is the New Clubhouse on the Lawn the Only Way to Get Them?

Why are we doing this project in the first place? What are we hoping to achieve? This is a major undertaking that will cost us a lot of money and put the club into significant debt, so we need to be sure that it results in a facility that is an improvement over our existing one, and that these improvements couldn't be achieved in a more affordable or simple manner.

Other than the addition of the 8th court, many of the potential benefits of the new clubhouse on the lawn can be achieved just as well by renovating our existing clubhouse and potentially making some upgrades to our existing layout. These include:

- Better steward oversight and increased member/steward interaction. This will be improved in the current proposal because members will have to walk through the clubhouse, past the steward desk, as they enter and exit the courts. However, we can also achieve much of this benefit by building a steward desk/office on the main floor of the existing clubhouse. The steward and office would be more accessible to members, and the steward would be easily able to see the grounds. However, the entry/exit of the club would remain uncluttered, and members could choose when they wanted to interact with the stewards or when they simply wanted to head to their court.
- New clubhouse amenities: Our clubhouse is very old, and members currently have to use outdated facilities that, quite frankly, are not very nice and difficult to keep clean. The clubhouse does not need to be moved to improve this situation. We can renovate, either keeping the same layout or increasing the size of the washrooms and lounge. The renovation would be a major overhaul resulting in a "new" building that maintains the historic look and feel of the existing clubhouse. We can investigate areas where we can maintain original materials of the building, and areas where replacement would be necessary.
- New storage area: our storage shed, while more than sufficient in space, is caving in. We do not need to move the clubhouse to improve this, we can simply rebuild the existing storage shed, complete with a new foundation.
- New lights on Courts 2 and 3: Obviously, this can happen no matter where the clubhouse is. However, the more we can simplify and minimize the cost of the clubhouse part of the project, the sooner we'll be able to add lights on 2 and 3, and, ideally, upgrade the lighting on 4, 5 and 6. The membership survey of 2016 indicated that court lighting was the 3rd most important aspect of the tennis club to the most members, behind court quality and management/staffing.

Not only do I see that, other than the 8th court, the purported benefits of the current proposal can be achieved by renovating our existing clubhouse, I also believe that moving the clubhouse to the lawn introduces problems that we currently do not face.

## Problems introduced by moving the clubhouse to the lawn:

### Reduced open space makes socializing at the club less comfortable:

- I believe that one of the main arguments for moving the clubhouse, originally, was to enhance the “non-tennis” appeal of the club and to encourage people to use the club when not actually playing tennis. We were planning a large multi-purpose room upstairs, potential dining/bar options, and off-season clubhouse use. Now, I’m concerned that we’re decreasing the appeal of the club from a non-tennis perspective by crowding our property. The outdoor congregating area will be the small covered deck and lawn space, allowing only limited tennis-watching. The narrow deck along the edge of court 3 will also serve as a walkway to get into and out of the club and to get to courts 1, 7 and 8, so sitting in that walkway might be uncomfortable.
- I’m concerned we are going from a layout where we have multiple gathering spots with plenty of open space to one with a single, small gathering space (much of which also serves as the main thoroughfare into the club). I’m seeing this as moving us more in the direction of a club where people will only come to play tennis, as it will not be a comfortable or attractive place to just hang out. I appreciate that in urban centres tennis clubs do everything they can to maximize the number of courts, and members accept that a crowded property is necessary. I don’t think this needs to be the case for us, and would like to see us capitalize on our open space by designing comfortable seating areas for socializing and watching tennis.

### Indoor space for campers situated in the entryway to the club:

- This is another “benefit” of the project that is no longer a benefit now that we aren’t building the 4000sqft clubhouse.
- I’m concerned about crowding of the clubhouse during camp season. The “lounge” area of the clubhouse is also the only entryway to the courts during the daytime. The campers will need space to store their backpacks (right now they use shelves in the existing clubhouse, but we do not have enough shelving and a lot of their stuff sits on the floor). Plus the campers themselves take up a lot of room, and, as kids do, often make a lot of noise, before and after camp and during the lunch hour. This will mean the lounge/entryway will be quite chaotic and messy.
- The camps, right now, use the lawn space for some of their activities for parts of the day. They will have a very small lawn space to enjoy after the clubhouse move.

- The camps have a make-shift shaded area on the lawn that they use throughout the day for breaks, etc. This means that the clubhouse deck is still open for members to use. In the new arrangement, however, the campers and members will need to share the deck and small lawn space. I believe this will feel quite crowded, and will likely discourage members from using the deck space.
- As recently as the 2017 AGM the Board has been using an improved space for campers as a reason to move the clubhouse. This argument stopped being valid when the 2-story clubhouse turned into a single-story clubhouse. The existing clubhouse quite simply provides a much better space for campers, where they have their own space that members infrequently need to enter. We can further improve this in the existing clubhouse location if we build a steward office on the deck, and thus dedicate the entire upstairs to a camp space during camp season.
- There is some talk now of adding a basement to the new clubhouse on the lawn to provide a space for campers and their belongings. We need to investigate this further to see if it's logistically possible, how much it would cost, and what safety measures would have to be added in order to have children spending significant time down there. I think this is a perfect example of our really trying to make the lawn option work, when we already have a set-up that works well and, with improvements, work even better. Why build on the lawn, where the campers will have to spend time in the basement, when we can stay where we are and they get a nice 2nd floor space? Do we really need the 8th court this badly?

#### Clubhouse security reduced with clubhouse on the lawn:

- Currently, the clubhouse is located away from the street, and members playing tennis and stewards tending to the courts can see who is coming and going into the clubhouse. With the proposed design, the clubhouse will be accessible from the street with members and stewards not knowing. I'm not clear yet on whether or not we're planning on locking the front door whenever the steward is out on the grounds, which would appear to mean members would need keys or codes to get in.
- Improved court security is meant to be a selling feature of the current proposal, but if the object is to prevent non-members from using our courts, well, when was the last time a member was denied use of a court because a non-member was on their court?

#### Court layout worsened by moving the clubhouse to the lawn:

- Currently, our court layout has courts 1 and 7 separated by the clubhouse, which means these courts are ideal for lessons and ball machine use, where a more private court is necessary to prevent errant balls and coaching instructions from interfering with neighbouring courts. These courts are also very popular courts for regular bookings because, for example, members appreciate the shade available and the absence of balls from other courts.



- The current plan is to install curtains between courts 1, 7 and 8, which will be drawn closed when lessons are happening, and can be opened when they're not. However, we're limited in space, so when the curtains are closed, the space beside the courts will not meet ITF minimum recommendation for recreational tennis. On courts 5 and 6, for example, both players "share" the space between the courts (on a wide ball you might find yourself closer to your neighbour's court than your own). If a curtain separated those two courts, each player would only get half the space, and this could interfere with the game. I understand that to maximize the number of courts, some clubs would choose to forego the space between the courts. But this isn't actually necessary for us. At the very least we should be transparent with the members that this is what we're planning.

#### Cutting down trees reduces shaded courts and decreases "curb appeal":

- Cutting the trees down along the Napier St. edge of Court 7 eliminates the shade that we currently get on Court 7 from 3:30 onwards. This is a desirable court for members because of the shade (I've received this feedback from members). The trees also provide a wind barrier and add to the natural, established look of the club, and disguise the look of the hitting wall. Even if we found out we could plant new trees here (this would be on City property, and quite close to the road, so there's some uncertainty here), it will be many years before we again have a shady court 7 and an established look.

#### Clubhouse on the lawn distracts from the charm, look and feel of the KTC:

- Our existing clubhouse is nearly 100 years old, and hasn't substantially changed in that time. It has the look of a tennis club, and represents the club's history. Many members value the clubhouse and believe it adds charm to both the club and the neighbourhood.
- The proposed clubhouse, with the hitting wall next to it, will create a 130ft wall along Napier St. Currently, passers-by get to see green space, people playing on the tennis courts and a historical building set back from the road where it can be appreciated. Our proposed clubhouse will have essentially a solid wall (clubhouse and hitting wall) along 130ft of the street, closer to the street than the current fence, and spoil the view of the courts.

#### Clubhouse on the lawn introduces drainage complications:

- At the 2017 AGM, despite some Board members knowing, no mention was made to the members of the need to install a sub-drainage system underneath our courts to avoid premature shifting and cracking of the courts given our very wet sub-soil conditions and that we're planning to remove our existing concrete pads.
- This is an issue that is not yet well-understood, but we do know that in order to do it the City has told us that we will need to build a sewer line to connect our drainage system

with the Hill St. storm-sewer. We don't have pricing on any of this yet, and it's also unknown whether the Hill St. storm-sewer has the capacity to accommodate the flow from the club.

- If we don't remove the concrete pads, we can avoid the sub-drainage system, but will still need to deal with the surface water that will be collected on the new court. The lawn beside Court 3 currently gets quite swampy after a rainfall, indicating that our property does not drain well. The plan would likely be to direct water to a "swale" (shallow ditch), along the Napier St fence line at court 6. This is also not well understood. We don't know how much water we would expect to be in it after a rainfall, considering that it is essentially in an area that people walk along, and again uncertain is whether the City will allow us to have the swale?.

#### Clubhouse on the lawn is expensive:

- So far, I've really only addressed some of my "qualitative" concerns. The Finance Committee submitted a report at the July 25 Board meeting detailing its recommendation that the club limit itself to a 400K debt. Because the Board is reluctant to follow this advice (as it would mean the current proposal would be essentially unaffordable), the Finance Committee is lobbying to have the Board approve a \$1,000 expenditure to have the report vetted by our auditors, Wilkinson.
- The high price tag of the lawn option and the resulting high debt load (and how this impacts our ability to properly run and maintain our facility, let alone deal with unexpected circumstances) are also major issues that need to be sorted out. We will be relying on donations for a substantial part of this project, but so far the only donation offers that I'm aware of have come from members who support keeping the existing clubhouse.

## Project Management Issues

Before moving on to looking at an alternate proposal, I want to address one more issue: I don't believe we are doing a good job of managing this project.

One of the great things about the KTC is our volunteer involvement, and we have some passionate people who want to improve the club. However, in my opinion, there comes a time when professional management is required, and I believe this project is a good example. We have spent almost 80K on this so far (mostly for abandoned work), and 6 years, and are not much closer to having a new clubhouse. We still spend the majority of Board meetings and member meetings arguing about what to do and issues with the process. Feedback that I received after the 2017 AGM said members were shocked to see the negativity and arguing that took place. This has been going on for years. I don't see how, if we continue in the same fashion, we should expect a different outcome.

The current Board is being asked to make decisions, such as approving 20K expenditures on the project, with no documented project plan. The business plan we're using to justify the spending and explain how we're planning to pay for the project has not been updated since well before the 4000sqft clubhouse proposal was presented to the membership in 2015. We are operating without a pre-construction budget or timeline.

Also, rather than assessing the merits of the project when determining whether or not to proceed as we continue to gather new information, some Board members are using the argument that the project has already been approved, and therefore it must happen. Open dialogue regarding the evolving costs, benefits, drawbacks, and alternative solutions is not taking place as it should.

I worry that if we continue in this manner we will continue to spend money on a project that is either never actually going to happen, or if it does happen, there will be currently unforeseeable compromises, and we won't like the result.

I'm also concerned that we are not fully aware of the challenges and unexpected circumstances that can arise during construction and are unprepared for these events. We haven't done any sort of risk analysis, where we would look at things like cost and schedule overruns and ensure we're covered in these cases. We are taking on a project that leaves almost no wiggle room for unexpected costs or delays, which, in my opinion, is very risky behavior, particularly since we need to get most of the project done during the winter when weather is unpredictable, and schedule delays could extend construction periods into the tennis season.

## Proposed Alternate Solution – Clubhouse Renovation/Upgrading

Until now, I believe that many members are, understandably, comparing the new clubhouse on the lawn option with the existing clubhouse that's falling apart around us. The Board has never put forward the idea of renovating the existing clubhouse as a viable or desirable alternative.

The Board received a high-level estimate for the cost of renovating the existing clubhouse this year. The estimate was for a clubhouse that was upgraded as follows:

- new foundation
- repair/rebuild of decks, floors, walls, roof
- insulated building with HVAC including furnace and air conditioner
- steward office built on the deck (to increase steward oversight of property and interaction between stewards and members)
- accessible main floor (ramp and washrooms)
- rebuilt storage shed
- 2nd story addition on top of rebuilt storage shed

The estimate came out at \$615K. If an elevator is required for accessibility (which I do not at this time believe to be the case but I'm not sure), then the cost would rise to around \$675K.

So the cost to rebuild/repair the clubhouse (with the listed upgrades, some of which aren't necessary) would be similar to (but less than) the cost of building the new clubhouse on the lawn. See the Appendix for the cost comparison of the renovation vs the new clubhouse (clubhouse and deck costs only).

The price could be reduced by renovating "as-is," for instance by not having the clubhouse insulated, keeping the office upstairs, and having no additional space.

However, it's not just the cost of the clubhouses themselves that need to be compared. Other savings incurred by renovating instead of moving include:

- the site costs associated with renovating in place would be lower
- we wouldn't be building an 8th court
- less fencing work to do
- little tree removal required
- no need to demolish and rebuild the hitting wall
- smaller building permit cost
- no drainage system to pay for

In comparison to the clubhouse on the lawn option, keeping the clubhouse in place and keeping the look and feel of it does the following:

- maintains the upstairs space for campers and their belongings (and this space can be made even bigger if we do a 2nd story addition).
- maintains our existing variety of court configurations, which permits shade/no shade options for members, makes lesson courts unobtrusive and at all times maintains existing court widths on all courts.
- maintains our existing open-space layout with options for easily viewing play on Courts 1, 7, 3, and 6. We can invest in better seating in these locations if we wish.
- maintains our existing concrete courts on courts 1-6. Court 7 (currently not on a concrete pad, which is likely why it is less level/smooth than our other courts, according to a Queen's Geophysics study) can be rebuilt with concrete (more expensive) or, for now, can be rebuilt with asphalt and rebuilt more frequently to keep it in good condition.
- maintains our large existing lawn, lower deck, upper balcony, and upper lounge allowing people to either congregate together or separate into smaller groups, allowing flexibility for larger group interaction or privacy and less stressful, quieter gatherings. We could consider investing in a tent for large gatherings on the lawn, or could rent these when we need them. Keeping our large lawn gives us the flexibility to do this if we want to.
- keeps our garbage hidden in 10x10 shed between courts 1 and 7.
- enables us to keep our existing hitting wall (would require repairs).
- maintains our existing easily accessible storage shed, and security can be improved.

- keeps the lower cost of maintaining only 7 courts (court maintenance costs, on average, 2K per court per year).
- requires no reduction in parking on site, and no requirement for accessible parking.
- gives us the flexibility to build a small covered entry pavilion with electric gate to improve security into the club if this is something we're concerned about (although this is likely not a major problem right now).

Further, by lowering our debt for this project we would keep ourselves more flexible for future improvements/investments we might consider, including:

- improved member service through increased staff and/or a club manager, which would also decrease the workload of the volunteers.
- clay courts.
- partnerships with the City or other parties in establishing indoor tennis.

We already know that the clubhouse on the lawn project will require multiple phases (over two years or more) until we have our 8th court. Renovating the clubhouse will be much more simple logistically and can be completed in one construction phase, thus limiting the impact on our normal operations. Once complete, we can determine at what point we want to add lights to courts 2 and 3. We are not committing ourselves to as major a construction project, and can more easily tackle smaller aspects of the project as funds allow.

The following image shows a very preliminary rendering of what the renovated clubhouse could look like, with a larger, accessible main floor deck, a larger 2<sup>nd</sup> floor balcony, and a steward office on the main floor:



## Summary

As we make decisions on this project, I believe we need to keep in mind that we currently have a court layout that meets our needs, and a clubhouse that, for the most part, does as well (with good prospects for improvement).

How much do we need the 8<sup>th</sup> court? Is it worth the costs of the project? We need to weigh the pros and cons as we decide the best path forward. For me, it's hard to see a need for an eighth court since the Club membership has not grown over the past ten years, but more importantly the cons of the lawn project far outweigh the benefit of the 8<sup>th</sup> court. On the other hand, the clubhouse renovation presents so many positive aspects, without the high cost and complexities of moving the clubhouse.

We have ample storage space that's conveniently located in a clubhouse that is well laid-out for camps. We have a beautiful property with green space, established trees, and plenty of seating areas for members to enjoy. Most importantly, to me, we have some unique features including our historical charming quality and neighbourhood feel. We need to take a step back and look at what we're aiming to achieve with our capital investment in the first place, and look at whether spending this huge amount of money is really getting us the things we want, and also to make sure it doesn't introduce new problems that we don't currently have.

While I appreciate that we've been working on this for a long time, and have put a tremendous amount of time and effort (and quite a bit of money) into it, we need to decide sooner rather than later what direction we want to go.

Of course I am just one person sharing my opinions, but I do know there is a great deal of membership support for keeping the existing clubhouse. I believe we need to make sure we can justify tearing it down (ie there needs to be very compelling reasons to do so), otherwise we're taking on a long, expensive and complicated project, the headaches that come with construction (likely more than one phase), and a huge debt load, knowing that a good portion of the membership is not supportive of the endeavour. What the members said in the 2016 survey is very clear in that they put maintaining great tennis courts as the priority.

The current project has only ever been presented to the membership in a positive light, with discussion of any drawbacks being minimized, and still the support has only been around 50% once we actually started looking into what the project would involve. I'm also concerned communication with members could have been stronger and opportunities for feedback increased.

Taking all of this into account, I believe it is time we realize that the existing project is not in the best interests of the club. In my opinion, we should be dedicating our time and resources to maintaining the historical charm and neighbourhood feel of our club, and plan for a future

where our club has the financial freedom to maximize the membership experience through services like well-maintained courts, a clean, comfortable and functional clubhouse, online booking, instructional programs, court lighting, and opportunities to socialize.

## Appendix – Comparison of Clubhouse/Deck Costs

In February of this year, we obtained an estimate from Bill Anglin for renovating the existing clubhouse in place. His estimate was 460K. We estimated an additional 155K for rebuilding the existing foundation, bringing the estimate up to 615K. An additional 60K might be required for an elevator, which would bring the total estimate to 675K.

The estimate we got from Bill Anglin in the fall of 2017, that was presented to the membership, was separated into “building” costs and “site costs.” Bill's "building" cost (the sum total of the "building" column) is \$638,132. This is currently being compared to the 675K estimate for the clubhouse renovation estimated by Bill (and including the estimated cost for a new foundation, and for an elevator). Thus, the renovated clubhouse appears to be more expensive than the new clubhouse on the lawn.

However, Bill's site costs in the lawn project estimate include some costs that are already included in the 460K building cost for the renovation. These include the cost to build the deck, and the cost to build storage units. These costs must be added to the 638K lawn building cost in order to directly compare the 2 building costs.

Further, 25K must be added to the lawn clubhouse building cost to account for abatement of designated substances (25K was included in the renovation estimate already).

Further, the site costs in Bill's lawn clubhouse estimate includes the cost of tearing down the existing clubhouse (18K, not including abatement of designated substances). This needs to be added to the building cost in that project as it's a necessary expense related to the building, and obviously isn't required for the renovation.

The costs that must be added to the \$638K building cost for the clubhouse on the lawn are as follows:

Deck: 54K

Storage sheds: 25K

Abatement of designated substances: 25K

Demolition of existing clubhouse: 18K

Total required additions to Bill's lawn clubhouse building estimate: 122K

$638K + 122K = 760$

So the more accurate comparison between the cost to renovate the clubhouse in place and to build a new clubhouse on the lawn is as follows:

New clubhouse on the lawn: 760K Clubhouse

renovated in place: 675K



Renovating the existing clubhouse is 85K cheaper than building on the lawn in this comparison, which is significant for the KTC.

However, recall that this difference is based on the existing clubhouse requiring a 60K elevator (which it might not) and for an “upgraded” clubhouse (including insulation, air conditioner, furnace, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor addition, expanded washrooms/changerooms and steward desk on the deck).

If we eliminated some of these upgrades the price difference would increase further.

Of course, the lawn clubhouse could also be made cheaper, but it is already quite small, so the only realistic scale-backs would be the heating and air conditioning systems.