

RACQUET CLUB VILLAGE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
PO Box 680876 • Park City, UT 84068
(435) 645-7888 • (435) 645-7890 fax
www.pcrchoa.org

Landscaping and Irrigation

June 11, 2010

Dear Homeowner:

As you know a Special Meeting was held on June 3, 2010 to consider the landscaping and irrigation plan. The minutes from the meeting are attached. In sum, a quorum of 95 proxies and individuals were in attendance at the meeting (90 is required based on the CC&R's to hold the vote on the Landscaping and Irrigation Plan). Approval of the Plan required a "yes" vote from 60% of those in attendance or those who provided an affirmative proxy (since there were 95 in attendance or submitting proxies 57 votes were required to pass the motion). The final vote was 64 "yes" and 31 "no." Thus, the motion was passed.

The process at this point is as follows:

1. **Develop a final landscape and irrigation plan.** Attached are suggestions for plan changes we have received from owners. You will have until June 30th to make additional requests or suggestions. Please make those requests either by e-mail (toby@pmaparkcity.com), by phone (435-645-7888), or simply write down your request and leave it at PMA's office. We will log all requests that pertain to modifications in the landscaping and irrigation plan.
2. **Arrange for Eric Lyman Associates (our landscape designer) to meet on-site** and consider each request. Our intent is to meet each request if possible. If necessary we will contact individual owners and discuss modifications to their request. After all requests are considered we will post the final decisions.
3. **Develop a final plan based on the modifications we provide Eric Lyman and Associates.**
4. **Prepare a guideline for those bidding the job** – Eric Lyman & Associates will provide some suggestions of reputable firms that can handle this job. We may also request bids from local Park City landscape contractors
5. **Review bids and interview a short list of contractors.**
6. **Complete Phase 1 this summer/fall.**

We recognize this is an ambitious schedule (to say the least). We will not cut corners on the process. It is very important that we fully consider homeowners preferences and adjust the plan accordingly, but please recognize that this may require everyone to compromise a little.

Comprehensive information about the Plan is provided on the Racquet Club HOA website http://www.pcrchoa.org/?page_id=188 . This includes planting plans, proposed tree removal and pruning, graphic renditions of landscaped units and the approved financing plan. Hard copies of the plan are available for review at PMA. If you prefer to look at the hard copies, please call Toby to set up a time to review the information. Eric

Lyman, the Plan designer, estimates the water savings from the current Plan at an average of 50% (across the watering months based on 2007 and 2008 water usage data). The financing plan is an estimate based on our current finances and a total landscape and irrigation bid of \$800,000. This budget calls for a special assessment of \$125 per quarter for 2011 and 2012. Based on the actual bid, quarterly special assessment payments will be adjusted annually. Importantly, the board believes the budget provides a good estimate of the cost of the landscape and irrigation plan.

We look forward to moving this process forward.

Thank you.
Racquet Club Village Board of Directors

**RACQUET CLUB VILLAGE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
SPECIAL MEETING JUNE 3, 2010
MINUTES**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:05pm at the Saddlevue Office Park, 2200 Park Avenue, Building B, Park City, Utah.

A total of 95 units were represented: 37 were present in person and 58 by proxy.

The board members present were: Ben Kraft, Don Lonn, and Andre Shoumatoff.

Toby Tolpinrud, Tim Jones, and Kay Adams, from PMA, were also present.

2. LANDSCAPING DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS

The landscaping is quite overgrown – pruning was not done often enough or properly. Until just recently, the trees and bushes were only pruned every four years – as part of the painting rotation. The foliage was just cut back enough to allow the painters to get to the buildings. Some trees were planted too close to buildings; the roots are growing into the foundations and branches are damaging the siding and roofs. The aspen trees, which have an estimated life of only 25 years, have been growing shoots for years – they have gotten too thick and need to be thinned out to keep them healthy.

The plan is to keep as much of the current trees and bushes as possible. If the landscaping that is currently in place is causing damage, is too close to buildings, or is diseased, it is scheduled to be removed. The plans have been made available to owners on the website or at the office of PMA. The contract with the landscape architect allows for one revision of the plan. Owners with any issues about anything that is scheduled to be removed were again reminded to notify Toby at PMA of their concerns. Toby will be arranging a meeting with the landscape architect to discuss the issues then he will proceed with the final version of the plan.

3. IRRIGATION PLAN AND QUESTIONS

Owners asked if the project could be separated into “Landscaping” and “Irrigation”. The board stated that landscaping and irrigation really cannot be separated; earlier in the planning process, they had tried to separate them but soon discovered that there are numerous issues with each and they are very dependent on each other. For example, the irrigation around the buildings should be drip irrigation because it reduces water use and it reduces building damage. Many of the buildings do not have landscaping so you cannot use drip irrigation. The end result is that if we want to conserve water then we have to have landscaping in place that is cost effective.

The board really wants to reduce the amount of water used on irrigation – both because of cost (the HOA spends approximately \$100,000 per year on irrigation water) and it's the right thing to do.

The irrigation system is 30 years old. No plans exist on the placement of the pipes from 30 years ago. The system was originally set up with huge zones – some of the areas within each zone get too much water and other areas do not get enough. The association pays \$5,000-8,000 each year in repairs to the system. The system does not allow for any drip irrigation that would reduce the amount of damage done to the buildings and decks as well as reduce the water used.

The landscape architect evaluated the current irrigation system and the proposed changes and estimates that the association will use an average of 50% less water annually (there is some variation depending on the weather in May and June). An owner pointed out that with an estimated cost for the project of \$800,000, it would take almost 15 years to see a return on the investment. Others stated that using less water and having the property look better was more important.

Owners were reminded that currently the electricity to the irrigation system is wired into various units. This past summer, while the city had the entryways torn up, the association installed common area meters. The new system will be wired into the common meters – this will alleviate problems with owners accidentally cutting power to the irrigation by turning off breakers.

4. FINANCING PLAN AND QUESTIONS

The financing plan to be voted on at this meeting is the same plan that was favored with the owners in January - \$125 per unit per quarter for two years (to complete the landscaping project in 3 years) and a larger, but gradual and predictable, buildup of reserves to reduce the possibility of special assessments for expected capital expenditures (asphalt, roofs, etc.).

Several owners wanted to know why the board chose to go forward with this project now with the economy the way it is. They responded that this has been in the works for a while, if the owners vote not to proceed at this time, the plans portion will be completed and they can be sent out for bid at a later date.

The landscape architect has provided a ballpark price of \$800,000 to have the work done. He will give the HOA recommendations of contractors to do the job. Several owners were concerned about keeping the project within budget. The board said that their plan would be to make revisions to keep it within budget but agreed that there are always unforeseen situations. Once the plan is finalized the board will be able to get firm bids. With the economy as it is the board is hopeful that contractors will be eager to get

the work and pricing will be more favorable. At this time it is unknown if the same contractor would be hired to do all of the work, if each phase of the project would have a different contractor, if the landscaping would be done by one contractor and the irrigation by another, or any other variation. Until the plan is finalized and it goes out to bid nothing is set in stone.

5. VOTE ON OVERALL PLAN

Two owners who were not able to be present at the meeting submitted letters with their proxies that were to be read at the meeting. These letters were read as the owners present prepared their ballots.

The vote passed with 64 units in favor and 31 against (90 proxies or owners were necessary for a quorum; 60% of owners (57) represented by proxy or present were required to pass the motion).

6. ADJOURN MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10pm.

General Approach Landscape and Irrigation Design

1. Preserve existing bushes and vegetation where possible; even if it means severe pruning to bring it back into shape.
2. Low water use; low maintenance; durable; cost effective;
3. Designed so we may break the construction into pieces

Homeowner Feedback -(5/25/10)

1. Berm or trees at the end of parking area in Vantage Court (unit 78)
2. Entry berms – both entrances; need to reconsider lighting at both entrances in the design – focus on lighting racquet club sign and eliminate large lights which bother residents
3. Berm along little Kate by phase 1
4. Crab apple trees by unit 54 - Owner wants them to remain; evaluate pruning and what it will take to preserve these trees
5. Tree in front of 56 – owner wants the tree to remain; currently one tree is proposed to remain and another is proposed for removal. Need to clarify which tree the owner is referring to
6. Remove aspens at the front of 56 and evaluate whether aspens at rear of 56 should be removed as well
7. The big shrub at the front of #55 may be too large for its location. It partially blocks the sidewalk especially when it gets wet or loaded down with snow. Hopefully it is the type of shrub that would look as good as the new shrubs after it is pruned, but **if not maybe it should be replaced**
8. The existing shrubs along the North side of #55 have been severely pruned and are not that attractive. From a maintenance, aesthetic and property value points of view, I **think the existing shrubs should be removed and replaced with Snowberry** like what is proposed for along the rest of the North side.
9. The Juniper by the garage (people door for #55 and #56) has become too large and disfigured over the years. Every year or so another large branch breaks off. The most recent one was in April of this year. It was loaded with snow and bent over the sidewalk such that I had to duck under it and was worried that it would fall on me. I made several trips back and forth to the garage that day without getting clobbered. It fell shortly thereafter. I took a picture before it broke and can send it to you if you wish. I **think the Juniper should be removed and replaced with Dwarf Ninebark** not only for liability reasons, but to reduce maintenance and increase aesthetic and property values.
10. Unit #7 – owner does not like the shrub selection and would like to work with the landscape person on selecting shrubs around the units
11. Units 36, 37, 38 – reconsider trees slated for removal (there are others they feel should be removed; review this with these owners); convert the area identified as “pond” on the master plan to a “green belt”; do not want to minimize grass cover (note: the plan calls for maintaining large areas of grass; only small areas that are difficult to water slated for removal; they will need to identify where they would like a change)
12. #78 - Mark on plan which shrubs will be pruned and which will be removed – I presume we are going to keep some of the Lilacs, especially along the garages and prune them.

13. #78 – Would like to keep lilac in back that is growing as block between decks (or plant something else that will give us privacy)