

Dear Board,

Firstly, I would like to thank Ian and the LRP and other committees for their work on the course renovation plans.

A few thoughts:

Broadly speaking, I find the scope and financial costs to be out of whack for a club like Mount Bruno which has such a small membership .

While there are definite improvements needed, I question the reasoning that it is an all or nothing plan. There should be a priority given to each element (bunkers, greens, fairways, tees, practice area etc.) but it appears everything is a priority.

I am not sure why we need to completely transform to a links style course. As I have stated before, beauty is in the eye of the beholder - I for one love the existing beauty of the course and not a "windswept environment" devoid of trees. The existing plan completely changes the look of our club which I don't find is necessary.

I cannot understand why it is necessary to redo the fairways which are magnificent. Again, is this such a priority?

The shortening of the yardage of the red tees and eliminating 2 par 5s to accommodate beginners or lower handicaps assumes these players will never improve their games and lower their handicaps. It also ignores existing members who enjoy the current challenges.

The logistics of having a 9-hole course for 2 years will be a nightmare for the Pro Shop Staff to manage even with tee times. How will members be able to play 18 holes? Could we have a sample day explained?

The latest email from the Board states "after recent consultation with Past Presidents and Past Captains...it is with pride and enthusiasm that we are now ready..." which incorrectly infers that the Past Presidents and Captains have endorsed the plan. Nothing of the sort happened at that meeting.

Unfortunately, the messaging and communications on this project received so far have led to confusion and rumours and divisiveness. This does not bode well . It is far more effective to gain consensus by really listening ( and perhaps compromising) to the concerns of the members who will be the ones who will have to pay. I am glad to see that there will be a vote although no percentage is mentioned. 75-80% would be needed at a minimum in order to move forward with a project of this magnitude and to not fracture the membership.

Respectfully,  
Di Deruchie