

SEMINAR ON THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF URAMBI -  
SOME QUESTIONS

Origins of the Idea

- . AGM resolved that a seminar should be organised on the future development of Urambi. This is the only formal decision taken to date.
  
- . Main points made seem to have been:
  - should be a significant event (perhaps lasting a whole weekend)
  - need for careful planning and structuring
  - need for detailed papers to be prepared in advance.

Purpose of this Meeting

- . Called primarily to:
  - define more clearly the objectives and scope of the seminar
  - identify the major issues
  - decide the duration and perhaps the date of the seminar
  - hopefully, form a small committee to organise the seminar.
  
- . If time and patience permit might also discuss, for example:
  - ideas on a suitable format
  - whether someone like Dysart should be invited
  - desirability of an associated social function.

Objectives and Scope

- A. Is the seminar meant to be, for example:
- a rethinking of Urambi's broad objectives as a community, i.e. "development" in its broadest sense.
- or
- an assessment of physical development objectives and priorities, particularly for the short-term (say 12-18 months).
- or
- a combination of both with one or the other dominating.

- B. What do we see as the end-result of the seminar, for example:
- a series of resolutions as statements of long-term objectives for Urambi as a community?
  - or - a series of resolutions setting out specific statements of short-term development priorities for the guidance of the Body Corporate Committee?
  - or - a series of such resolutions containing formal directions to the Body Corporate Committee (if so, legal implications would need to be considered)?
  - or - one or more formal reports on the major issues for the guidance of the Body Corporate Committee and for the information of residents generally?
  - or - no resolutions or report at all?

#### Issues

- . What are the major issues? In particular what would be the 3 or 4 major, relatively self-contained issues, i.e. issues which could usefully be discussed separately?
- . One suggestion:
  - rate of development (implication for levies, working bees etc.)
  - desirable forms of development and assessment of development priorities, especially for the short-term (i.e. 12 to 18 months)
  - major specific developments, notably the swimming pool - any others?  
(Development of the community centre would be an integral part of each of the above.)
- . The above groupings would not preclude discussion of broad objectives for Urambi as a whole, in fact serious discussion of these topics would demand it.

Duration and Date of Seminar

- . For example: whole weekend, single day, one or more evenings, one day with a follow-up evening.
  
- . Note:
  - working bees planned for 17 September, 15 October and 12 November.
  - Urambi Art and Craft Fair to be held on 19 November.
  
- . Need to give people adequate notice and allow time to prepare useful papers.

A Committee?

- . Any volunteers to assist in organisation of seminar, particularly preparation of papers?
  
- . Would an individual or small group of people be interested in offering now to prepare a paper on any of the major issues to be discussed?

Other Matters

- . Suitable format?
  
- . Might Dysart, Bell or others be invited to attend and perhaps even address the seminar?
  
- . Would it be worthwhile organising a social function (e.g. B-B-Q or party) in association with the seminar?

Bill Mutton

13 September 1978

URAMBI BODY CORPORATE COMMITTEE  
REPORT TO THE 1979 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Membership

At the 1978 AGM Geoff McAlpine (Convenor) Keith McIntyre (Treasurer), Terry Moran (Secretary), Donna Christie, Terry Healey, Peter Kent, Bill Mutton and Geraldine Ohlsson were elected to the Committee. Following Peter Kent's resignation Steve Cartland joined the Committee.

Role of the Committee

Allen Curtis and Partners have managed the Body Corporate's accounts efficiently throughout the year. Other work has been undertaken by the Body Corporate Committee, the Development and Maintenance Sub-Committees, the Community Centre Sub-Committee and various ad hoc groups.

x The amount of effort required to organise working-bees and Social activities, engage contractors for work associated with development and maintenance, become involved in some of the problems which inevitably arise in a community and maintain a minimal amount of communication and within Urambi is considerable. Throughout the year the number of people making the effort has declined. This seems to be associated with an emerging reluctance on the part of an increasing number of residents to accept responsibility for those tedious chores which are a part of sustaining Urambi as an integrated community.

This may be a problem for the future. The maintenance of the fabric of Urambi may require that we employ a manager whose responsibilities extend beyond those presently accepted by Allen Curtis and Partners.

Dogs

A new dogs policy was adopted in November 1978 and a copy distributed to all residents. Occasionally the Committee has received complaints about individual dogs.

Landscaping

> Thanks mainly to the efforts of a group of working-bee <sup>W</sup>stapants, this year saw virtually the whole of Urambi covered either with grass or wood chips and shrubs. Only minor additions and improvements are required to complete the path system and a number of additional visitor parking spaces have been constructed to relieve areas of particular stress.

Although much remains to be done to refine and develop the landscaping the general pattern that this development might take is starting to become clear. It is pleasing that with very few exceptions residents have observed the long standing Urambi policy that the main plants in public areas should be Australian natives: This is helping to give a sense of unity to the landscaping and helping to blend Urambi pleasantly into its surroundings.

The largest part of the year's development, except in areas closer to houses, has taken place in some nine working-bees attended on average by up to thirty people usually from about twenty-four houses: In some ways this has been a reasonable result considering that the start of the year saw only about sixty houses occupied and about ten of these by tenants. Thus, of the approximately fifty owner-occupied houses, about half the occupants provided free labour and skills at working-bees. However all residents benefitted in receiving better surroundings at relatively little cost. Attempts to involve more residents by varying the tasks performed, changing locations and experimenting with advertising methods have had mixed results. The option for unavailable, unfit or unwilling residents to contribute additional money in place of labour has been a total failure. This led the Committee to discuss the alternative of rewarding workers with a rebate on levies but although attractions were seen in this type of system it was not found possible to implement this idea in 1978/79: the Body Corporate might like to experiment with this system in the coming year or to find some other way to arrive at a more equitable balance of contribution and benefits. (not withstanding that active participation in Urambi's development is seen by many of us as reward in itself). Alternatives include spending additional money for professional workers whilst <sup>ew</sup>would penalise those willing to work, or further reducing the rate of development. The AGM might give direction on these matters.

Highlights of the landscaping were the completion in basic form of all lawned areas; development of paths to almost all areas (including the testing of gravel paths as a cheaper and faster alternative with benefits in terms of flexibility of shape); the planting of many hundreds of plants and spreading of large amounts of woodchips. Several hundred cubic metres of new chips were purchased, treated pine logs acquired for future parking control and quite a few Government plants are still to be picked up for planting in Spring 1979. A children's playground area was also developed at working-bees as were four visitor parking <sup>ba</sup>bags. Towards the end of the year a contractor built the fence for a clothes drying area east of house 9 after it was confirmed that demand still existed for such a facility. Resident participation will be necessary to complete this area.

## Structures

There is a clear requirement in the Unit Titles ordinance for all structures, whether within individual title areas or otherwise, to be approved by the Body Corporate. The Committee and its predecessor advertised this fact on several occasions and developed procedures to facilitate approvals; these procedures do not meet full requirements of the Ordinance but were adopted in the spirit of avoiding unnecessary delays.

For the most part residents proposing structures have consulted the Committee and attempted to have regard for the aesthetic standards of Urambi. In some cases the Committee rejected or modified resident proposals in order to maintain standards, be consistent with previous decisions or to avoid precedents which might cause future difficulties; these cases inevitably caused friction at times between those involved and other interested residents but the Committee maintains its belief that firm observance of the procedures which have been developed is the best means of avoiding difficulties. Of greater concern to the Committee and most residents would be instances where structures are erected (or landscaping carried out beyond unit areas) without consultation. It is a regrettable fact that this has occurred although only in a very few instances and in no cases has it yet been necessary to resolve the issues by action under the ordinance.

## Maintenance

Most maintenance work has been concerned with horticultural maintenance rather than utilities.

It was decided to let a contract for weed control on the common areas, which included spraying and removal of weeds. A more comprehensive plan is currently being prepared to be passed on to the next committee.

The "Rover" ride-on mower has had a number of mechanical problems over the last few months and it seems as though it might not be up to the task of mowing the inner areas. (The western and northern perimeter are mown by the horticultural contractor).

As more areas are developed the work involved in maintenance is increasing. Perhaps in future some consideration should be given to either setting up a Maintenance Sub-Committee or, if a less formal approach is preferred appointing one or two volunteers to monitor maintenance in their immediate locality.

## BACKGROUND

## LEGAL POSITION

Section 44(1) of the Unit Titles Ordinance would enable the Body Corporate, if authorised by a special resolution, to purchase a pool and authorise associated works. A special resolution must be put to a duly convened general meeting. To pass it requires votes representing not less than two-thirds of the total number of units and not less than half of the aggregate unit entitlement of the units.

Section 42 of the Ordinance would enable the Body Corporate to raise a loan for the purchase if the loan were authorised by a unanimous resolution. (See below)

Section 38(4) (b) would enable the cost of the pool to be met by levies based on other than unit entitlement if an alternative were passed by unanimous resolution. However it would seem sensible and consistent to meet the cost of the pool in the usual way, i.e. on the basis of unit entitlement.

A grant of special privileges in the use of common land to individuals, say to a swimming club, would require a unanimous resolution (Section 46 of the Ordinance).

## POOL OPTIONS

The types of available and suitable pools and their costs at current prices, are listed in the attachment. Costs are based on written quotes. "Other" costs shown are based on oral quotes. Though they will vary according to the landscape design and materials finally adopted, the figures are considered realistic indicators of cost, at current prices. Costs are given only for essential items (of high quality). Plantings etc have not been costed.

Reasons for recommending the size and type of pool proposed, i.e. 50ft x 20ft in concrete with "marble sheen", finish, are best explained at the AGM.

The proposal to defer installation of pool heating is mainly aimed at minimising the initial financial blow. Also, reports on the cost/benefits of existing pool heating systems were not encouraging. Additional cost for solar heating would be at least \$4000.

## THE INITIAL COST

The actual estimated cost of the proposed has been rounded off, by a small amount, to \$20,000. This

would result in an average cost of \$280 per house, and a range of \$170 to \$400 according to house size, assuming the money is raised by unit entitlement and everyone is required to pay.

In assessing your ability, or desire, to raise the requisite amount you should take account of the significant reduction in estimated expenditure on Urambi in 1979/80 and its obvious impact on Levies. It seems likely that levies can be reduced by something like 40%.

While the Body Corporate could theoretically borrow the necessary funds it would seem more sensible if the raising of money were left to individuals. This would enable those who prefer to pay cash and avoid interest charges to do so. It would also be more straight-forward administratively. As already noted a unanimous decision is required for the raising of a Urambi loan.

#### TIMING

Time from signing of contract until completion of pool is approximately: 4 months (concrete) and 2½ months (fibre glass and modular).

Given the amount of money involved the Body Corporate Committee could not responsibly sign a contract until it had all money in hand. Consequently the timing of the installation of the pool would be heavily dependent on the co-operation of residents in submitting money by the nominated date.

Circumstances militate against installation of a pool for this swimming season. If a pool is wanted for the 1980/81 season the best construction time would be Autumn or Spring 1980. The former is a favourable construction time, the latter would provide additional breathing space for those who are financially pressed without sacrificing any swimming time. Winter is unsuitable for construction and some firms close down.

#### MAINTENANCE

Regular maintenance is not likely to bring about a significant addition to levies. However Allen Curtis and Partners advise that the maintenance costs resulting from abuse and vandalism can be considerable. Their experience of a limited number of communal pools in Canberra and Queanbeyan is that annual maintenance costs have been around \$1600. These costs largely arise through abuse of the pool and associated equipment and facilities by children, especially non-resident and unsupervised children.



In addition significant longer-term maintenance costs must be kept in mind. These can be expected to arise every 4 to 5 years (painted concrete pools) or about every 10 years (fibre glass, modular pools and "marble sheen" concrete pools).

To keep these costs in perspective, even costs of about \$2100 per annum would amount to an average annual cost per house of \$30.

Maintenance also raises questions of organisation. Allen Curtis suggest that rosters for regular week-to-week maintenance do not work. Pool companies also consider a roster would be ineffective. A choice will therefore need to be made between maintenance by a pool maintenance company, a paid individual (perhaps from Urambi) or one or 2 reliable volunteers. Pool companies claim that reserve maintenance could be limited to about 2 hours, once per week and  $\frac{1}{2}$  hour a few times per week. Facilities can be purchased to reduce this work by about 75%.

#### SAFETY AND PROTECTION AGAINST ABUSE

The need to ensure safety and to protect the pool from abuse presupposes among other things the need for controls over access to the pool area and the requirement that children up to a specified age be supervised. As such regulation seems inevitable in our situation it is suggested that anyone unprepared to accept it regulation would be unwise to support installation of a pool.

URAMBI VILLAGEINFORMATION FOR NEW OWNERS AND TENANTSUrambi Village - Why was it built?

Urambi Village is unlike almost all other medium density housing developments in Canberra in that it was conceived and designed, not by a builder, but by a group of people who planned to live there. It has been built because a group of people wanted to live in a community that offered more than the usual quarter-acre-block life style.

There are many different reasons why the residents of Urambi have chosen to live there. But there is no getting away from the fact that it exists to be something more than a collection of attached houses. While each householder has some land which is totally hers or his, and each householder is entitled to complete privacy there, we also own a lot of land in common, and we've built a community centre as a focus of our life as a community. Various clubs and social events take place, a newsletter is published fortnightly, we get together from time to time to work on landscaping and we've made decisions about living in Urambi (see below) to make sure that it remains a place where we are able to have both a private and a communal life. By choosing to live in a place like Urambi, we gain the benefits of being part of a larger community, but also have obligations to make sure that our own life style doesn't interfere with the rights of other residents.

Those decisions were made by the Body Corporate, a committee which has the legal responsibility (as a result of the Unit Titles Ordinance) for looking after the finances of the place and making decisions about corporate life. The members of the Body Corporate are elected from, and by, the residents each year at the Annual General Meeting. By the authority given by the Unit Titles Ordinance, decisions made by the Body Corporate are legally binding on residents - they are not simply suggestions which residents may or may not follow as they wish.

The following are some of the decisions:

## Structures and Landscaping

It is one of the important rules here that no one may build anything onto their house or on their land without first having the plans passed by the Body Corporate Structures Sub-committee. Of course most of the applications are approved, but it is important that the overall look of Urambi is not spoilt by something which simply does not fit in.

The same is true of landscaping outside your legal boundary. Residents are encouraged to look after and develop common land, but only if it conforms to the overall development concept. So you should consult the relevant member of the Body Corporate about your plans (who at the moment - 1980 - is Jan Robbins, tel. 317 391).

It has been agreed that planting on common land will be of predominantly native plants.

## The Community Centre

1. Any resident, owner or tenant, may book either of the Centre rooms, or use some of the equipment, such as chairs, tables, and the like. The current booking secretary for the centre is Ros Cartland (tel. 319 257).
2. A playgroup operates each Thursday morning, to which all residents are invited to bring their children. Parents take it in turns to organize activities for the children. Co-ordinator is Margaret Shann (tel. 317 149).
3. There is also a babysitting club, for which the convenor is Margaret Shann (tel. 317 149). Families take it in turns to be the secretary.
4. A number of different clubs or special occasions are organized, open to all residents, such as Christmas parties, film nights, card nights and the like. Urambi News, our newsletter, gives details of these.

## Garbage

Bin nights are Monday and Thursday. Empty bins left lying around the road are ugly, so its important that residents take in their bins as soon as possible.

## Cats

Cats tend to scare off (and sometimes kill) some of the many birds that are coming back to Urambi now that all building is finished. Cats are therefore to have bells put around their necks, and male cats are to be desexed.



### Garages

Garages should be kept tidy as they quite often give a first impression of Urambi to visitors and residents alike.

### Cars

Urambi was designed to be as car-free as possible to provide a safe (especially for children) and aesthetically pleasing environment. It has been agreed that cars should be kept away from houses except when moving or when absolutely necessary (e.g. in the case of illness).

### Parking for Visitors

Please tell your visitors that the parking bays are owned by the residents and they should park their cars on Crozier Circuit.

### Dogs

Dogs have caused considerable ill-feeling between some Urambi residents and the attached Dog Policy was drawn up to try to alleviate this problem. It is important that the Policy be adhered to, which in essence means that no dog is to free-range over Urambi - it must be confined within the house and courtyard of its owner.

UNIT 44,

URAMBI VILLAGE.

KAMBAH.

ACT 2902.

3-4-81.

Dear Arminel,

I am writing this letter to confirm my verbal complaint to you on April 1st re the positioning of a mobile refuse hopper in the immediate vicinity of my home.

It seems quite inconceivable that the Corporate Body could sanction the placing of such an ugly eyesore near the entrance to a private home, and my wife and I both have the strongest possible objections to such a placement. It is not difficult to envisage this hopper overflowing with wet decaying refuse which, especially in summer could present both health and odour problems. No doubt when the receptacle was filled rubbish would be left on the ground around it, perhaps not from Urambi residents at that.

Since the bin has been in position we have had several visitors who have expressed amazement at such a receptacle in near proximity to a 'so-called' exclusive housing development.

When I recall the objections raised by the Corporate Body to the erection of a white painted wrought iron gate in my front courtyard because it would spoil the aesthetic effect at the beginning of the project, the comparison seems trite indeed!! Another example was that the mortar in my back courtyard wall was the wrong colour!!

Might I suggest that the correct place for such corporate rubbish bins, (if in fact any case can be made for having them at all), is at the Community Centre and not outside peoples' homes. I seem to have a constant battle to keep the land outside my home and courtyards from becoming a dumping ground and I think it is high time that the Corporate Body took a much stronger line on this sort of thing more in keeping with the attitude shown me and enumerated in the paragraph above.

I should like to request that the above mentioned eyesore is moved from its present position as soon as possible.

Yours faithfully, HED (MD & F DEPT)

20 Urambi Village,  
KAMBAH A.C.T. 2902

10.4.81

To: Mr Brady,  
Engineering Section,  
Department of the Capital Territory.

Dear Mr Brady,

I refer to our telephone conversation today,  
concerning the 2 Garbage Hoppers recently placed on a  
trial basis at Urambi Village.

This is to confirm that we would like to have  
the Hoppers removed at your earliest convenience.  
As I explained, there was a misunderstanding on  
our part as to what was involved.

I regret the inconvenience.

Sincerely yours,

A. Ryan.

Secretary - Urambi Village  
Body Corporate.

# GARBAGE !

Some people may have wondered what happened to the 2 white industrial hoppers which made a fleeting experimental appearance at Carpark B & E.

The B.C.C. decided not to persist with them at this stage for the following reasons:

## A. Expected costs

- ① At present, Urambi's garbage is collected by payment of General Rates. To have a hopper in addition to the collection of bins at an enclosure would cost \$8.75 per hopper per week, in addition to the General Rates. (ie: an additional \$455 per hopper per annum).
- ② a) If we were to discontinue use of the garbage enclosures & move entirely to hoppers instead of bins, the additional weekly cost per hopper is only \$1.65 (ie: an additional \$85.80 per hopper per annum.)  
b) In this case, the number of hoppers required for a development of this size would be 7 to 9, so that the annual additional cost would be from \$580.40 to \$772.20.
- ③ This ongoing annual cost would not be the only charge we would incur.
  - a) Concrete or bitumen aprons would have to be provided for each hopper (or set of hoppers), at a cost of at least \$100 each.
  - b) Enclosures would have to be built for the hoppers. Only at Entrances A & B is the present enclosure suitably sited for adaptation to take a hopper, & even in those cases very considerable modification would be necessary. The cost of erecting the

bin enclosures in 1979 was \$1000. We would pay at least that again if we were to adopt arrangement No 2; and would have to allow at least \$200 per hopper if we took up Arrangement No 1.

Summary of financial considerations

Arrangement No 1 : \$ 455 per hopper per annum above Rates.  
(assumes 1 hopper only)

\$ 100 per hopper for concrete.

\$ 200 per hopper for enclosure.

---

\$ 755 per hopper in the first year.

Advantage: the bin enclosures would remain in use, & our 1979 investment of \$1,000 would not be written off.

Arrangement No 2 : \$ 580 - \$ 772 per annum above Rates.  
\$ 500 - \$ 800 for concreting  
\$ 1000 for enclosure  

---

\$ 2080 - \$ 2572 in the first year.

Disadvantage: the present bin enclosures would be effectively written off, so adding \$1000 to the cost.

B. Other Factors

① ~~Maintenance~~ <sup>No maintenance</sup> advantage: While the present arrangement is certainly not perfect, it is a great improvement on the previous one; and it has been the experience of members who have "lived with hoppers" that there is no less scattering of rubbish by cats & possums, no less spilt muck & foul odours, with hoppers than with bins.



~~Resident increase~~ Invitation to

② ~~Resident increase~~ Garbage cuckoos : We already have to contend with a <sup>surge</sup> ~~significant~~ growing number of our own residents who do not own a bin, & even more who have no qualms about putting their excess rubbish into someone else's bin. Putting hoppers in won't solve this <sup>(sort of irritant)</sup>: during the experimental hopper days they are at "B" was used by ~~at~~ one ~~of~~ or several of us to clear out accumulated rubbish without the bother of a trip to the tip, which of course meant there wasn't enough space left for "normal" garbage. Moreover, industrial ~~and~~ <sup>hoppers</sup> ~~bins~~ on the street ~~a~~ would be an invitation to other Kambah residents to deposit waste.

③ Unattractive appearance : It has been argued that the presence of large white hoppers would give an unpleasant, industrial appearance to Urambi's entrances, & that this would be inconsistent with previous policies which have aimed at beautifying the Village.

④ Noise : The collection of hoppers is a far noisier operation than the collection of bins.

⑤ Loss of Visitors' Parking Spaces : in most cases, hoppers would be permanently parked in places where gravelled spaces have been provided for visitors' vehicles.

⑥ ~~No incentive to responsibility: the Country of a~~

\*

The Committee believes that the present unsatisfactory aspects of our garbage collection system can be more cheaply & fairly improved by a combination of the following measures:-

- ① Enlarging overcrowded enclosures,
- ② Provision of standard B.C. metal bins, to supplement

& gradually replace residents' existing bins.

③ Employment of a handyperson whose brief would include a weekly clean-out of uncollected rubbish & regular trips to the tip with the Urambi trailer.

④ Ultimately, concreting enclosure floors so that they can be hosed down.

● Measures 1 to 3 are expected to be proposed as part of the 1981-82 budget.

We trust that this explanation, & these proposed actions, will be acceptable to the majority of owners (especially the bin-owners!)

Arminel.

# AGM resolutions of continuing importance

Minutes of  
AGM 1987 (Convenor D Watson/Woodgys-Managing Agents)  
1986-87 T

(T Leffers reported swimming pool club rules should be annexed to Articles of Association. Suggested re-opening BCC book at)

~~\*\*\*~~ First Quarter Levy T Leffers moved that the 1<sup>st</sup> Q Levy which is due on 1 July each year be based on the previous year's quarterly levy, it be called for on 1 July, and any increases or decreases resulting from the accepted budget be implemented from the second quarter levy notice. He explained that this would avoid cash flow difficulties at the start of the financial year.  
Seconded Ms D Christie - Carried

~~\*\*\*~~ Managing Agent T Leffers moved that Raine and Horne's quotation be accepted and that they become the Managing agent for Urambi from 1 October 1987. Carried

## Urambi Plans

\* Ms V Ballard queried the location of plans of Urambi. It was agreed that the new BCC should consolidate records held, and that they should be held in a central location.

Minutes of  
AGM 1986 (Convenor Sue Boyd)  
Treasurer T Leffers

"This duly convened Annual General Meeting of the Proprietors of Units Plan 119 approve, in accordance with section 38 of the Units Titles Ordinance 1970, that:

1. Interest be charged on all amounts overdue to the Corporation,
  2. Overdue shall be taken to mean any amounts remaining due to the Corporation one calendar month after
    - a) the amount became due to the Corporation, or
    - b) the amount was levied,whichever is the latter,
  3. The rate of interest be set at 24% per annum and that this interest be charged at a monthly rate of 2% of the amount overdue,
  4. The interest so charged be considered a debt due to the Corporation and as such, interest be payable on this debt."
- Moved Mr Leffers Second Ms Humphreys  
Unanimously Carried.

'86 (cont)

Cleaning of Community Centre - Committee will investigate rates and draw up list of specifications for cleaning.

1984 - no motions of continuing nature but vote about lack of approval for pergoles & fireplaces <sup>insurance problem</sup> potential

1982 - Form of Proxy with space to record Yes/No vote for Motions 1-9.

Minutes of 1981.  
Business Arising from Minutes

### Vegetable Garden (Motions on Notice)

Moved C Lang, seconded J Vicbary, that the AGM opposes the use of common land on the central spine for vegetable gardens (This motion had been tabled at the previous AGM) After considerable discussion, this motion was put but lost (14 to 28)

Moved by J. Noyce seconded K McIntyre, that the Garden Club be granted continuing use of the existing vegetable garden, subject to the Club's observance of all the present conditions

An amendment to this motion (moved W Mutton, seconded D Watson), that the words "for a further 12 month trial period" be inserted after "continuing use" was put but lost (19 to 21)

J. Noyce's motion was then put and carried (29 to 10)

### 1982 Motions 1 relates to Articles

Didn't get  
2/3 or 48 votes  
and so FAILED in 1982  
But PASSED in 1983  
48 votes to nil.

- a) give force of law to rules made by BCC about use of pool.
- b) to make maintenance and related charges for pool binding on users.
- 2. formalises status of pool club requires all Urambi users of pool to join the club ✓
- 3. formalises pool management arrangements. ✓

(Sub point 1 of which says "The pool facility be managed by a body corporate sub-committee  
2 days PMC Chairman called the pool management committee (PMC) convened by a member  
is 2 with convenor & 1 deputy & 1 secretary" off the body corporate committee (BCC).



1980  
AGM.

Moved by Mary Hodge that the Body Corporate Committee be increased by one to number nine persons seconded  
CARRIED

1985 - no motions of ongoing importance

~~1986~~ - 1983 - Special Resolution Amending Articles to Include Pool.

- cont

AGM 1977 - under rules of Unit Titles Ordinance meeting must elect BC committee of not less than 3 and not more than 7

1991 - no motion of ongoing significance

AGM 1988 - " " " "

1990 Mrs McAlpine asks no further trees be planted without consent Horticultural Committee and no gums closer than 5 metres to buildings.

April 1979 Paddy's River gravel "visitor" parking only area

August 1979 Roll-a-doors for 19/20/21

86-87

Community Centre bookings

Ms P Kay had been coordinating bookings for Community Centre for some time and looking for somebody else. outgoing BCC recommended there should be payment for the service.

Residents Package - thanks for new residents package, in particular to David Keightley & Jennifer Norberry.

Development Plan - Graeme Hopkins plan.

Convenor's Report on 83-84

A few disappointments

- continued planting of trees & shrubs in areas where they will cause future problems
- A Ryan - bookings/clearing of CC

~~1984~~ 84/85 M Robbins on BCC as Swimming Pool

Cat Policy (Sept 77)

Dog Policy (Sept 77 & Feb 79) dogs are not allowed on Urambi Common Areas without their owners

Structures Guidelines issued 1977 modified & reissued 1982 (August 1981)

1988 - M Robbins asked a tree survey be done as quite a number of self seeded trees.

May 1991 BCC T Leffers paper on CC Hiring