

Says 100 metre buffer between
golf course housing Existing houses
— but this not care for urandi (at ends)

→ What buffer arrangements made for urandi
(buffer strip seems about 30 metres at narrowest
— this correct — if so seems too narrow)

What sort of landscaping

Holes 5 & 6 need to be absolutely sure mishits
cant damage house → which have large glass
areas oriented towards course.

can't

can't

can't

David Watson

Balanced dev of Kambah

— schools etc. perhaps
overlooking if internal layout

Current goes ahead together →
is that sensible?

golf club house now not
in good aesthetic posn

Project now maximises housing on
multi housing to south west of urandi

Is it a question of good hardy community
land to developers at little cost.

Would betterly of holes (19-27) go to housing
if course fails to go ahead sufficiently well.

about 400m from house 1 (#20-22) to house 16 (med density) about 200m from house 16 to house 16 south. 250 houses 20, 21, 15, 16 to the south

970 to office south of house 16

new road



Area 100m from house 16

After houses are finished with than before

Approx Hole Lengths

- 1 - 350
- 2 - 400
- 3 - 500
- 4 - 380
- 5 - 180
- 6 - 450
- 7 - 130
- 8 - 400
- 9 - 350

Could lengthen #2, shorten #6

tee closer here (100m alternative)

tee closer here (100m alternative) (tees 20-50m from clubhouse building)
 - Hole 5. Shorter than hole 6. (50m from clubhouse)
 - Hole 6. No better than hole 5. - not changed
 a tee is 25m from house 22

DIAGRAMMATIC REPRESENTATION ONLY TREES TO BE RETAINED AND EXACT HOLE ALIGNMENT TO BE DETERMINED ON SITE

MURRUMBIDGEE COUNTRY CLUB
 Denton Corker Marshall Pty Ltd
 John Hindmarsh Canberra Pty Ltd

1:2500 March 1983



about 400m from boundary (#20-22) to houses to west (med density) about 200m from houses 1-10 to houses to south. 250 houses 20, 21, 15, 16 to the South

950 to other South of west.

It appears that these houses are further north than before



Drawn 400 long dimension x 250 short

tee closer here (Note alternate tee locations) houses removed here (tees 20-50m from boundary)

- Hole 5 shorter, but as close edge 30m, center line 50m from N boundary
- Hole 6. No better than before - not acceptable
- tee is 25m from house 22

Houses removed here

DIAGRAMMATIC REPRESENTATION ONLY. THINGS TO BE RETURNED AND EXACT WEDGE ALIGNMENT TO BE DETERMINED ON SITE.

MURRUMBIDGEE COUNTRY CLUB
Denton Corker Marshall Pty Ltd
John Hindmarsh Canberra Pty Ltd

1:2500 March 1983



Starts 75m west of Colson corner. Houses 1-10 of boundary 20-75m from U.S. boundary near houses 15, 16, 17-20. Then down to houses 1-5.

950 to office
 South of office
 About 400m
 from boundary (#20-22)
 to houses to west (med density pp)
 about 200m from houses 1-10
 to houses to south.
 250 houses 20, 21, 15, 16
 to the South

It appears
 that these houses are
 further north than before



Urandi
 400 (or so)
 dimensions
 x 250 (or so)

Tee closer here
 (Note alternate tee locations)
 (tees 20-50m from Urandi boundary)

- H/L 5 shorter, but as close as 20m, can be 50m from Urandi
- H/L 6. No better than before - not acceptable
- tee is 25m from house 22

DIAGRAMMATIC REPRESENTATION ONLY
 TREES TO BE RETAINED AND EXACT
 HOLE ALIGNMENT TO BE DETERMINED
 ON SITE

Houses shown here

MURRUMBIDGEE COUNTRY CLUB
 Denton Corker Marshall Pty Ltd
 John Hindmarsh Canberra Pty Ltd

1:2500 March 1983



15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22
 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100

I am writing to follow up your discussions of 7 June with the Urambi Body Corporate Committee and interested residents.

It was clear that your committee and consultants should be aware of the discussions and understandings which underlay the planning of Urambi Village and which were in the minds of most of those who purchased here. If these matters are taken into account in your planning, then you should expect support from many of the residents (although none of the views in this letter in any way commit any resident).

Preliminary discussions took place with NCDC in 1973 and 1974. People there were generally supportive of the emerging cluster housing concept and several potential sites were identified in Belconnen and Tuggeranong. One of the attractions of the Crozier Circuit site was the proposed golf course right alongside. There was certainly talk of possible associated housing, potential locations were pointed out and we clearly understood that the exact location and amount was largely notional at that stage. Nevertheless, there is no question that anyone anticipated numbers anywhere near as high as in present proposals and any objections which relate to the amount of housing certainly have some justification on the basis of 'expectations'. The course was seen as a part of Canberra's sporting infrastructure, not as a self-financing commercial development.

Naturally we paid close attention to likely developments close to our chosen site and discussed possibilities in some detail. There did seem to be a reasonable prospect of housing bordering Drysdale and Armytage Circuits and that part of Crozier Circuit south of Urambi Village. We were given assurances which became part of the design brief to our architect and which he went on to discuss personally with the NCDC (even, in fact, putting forward, on his own behalf in 1975, an outline plan for development of the golf course and associated areas).

A major part of our understanding is illustrated by Attachment A which was part of our architect's planning presentation to potential members (and to the NCDC) in late 1974: it was directly based on NCDC material. The key features are the general buffer zone concept and the landscaped corridor immediately east of Urambi Village.

The Land East of Urambi Village

The promised strip linked the housing "inside" Crozier Circuit with the golf course area. Residents of Urambi continue to regard this strip as essential. Your present concept plans do not seem to allow a viable corridor despite Mr. Hindmarsh's reported words in The Canberra Times of 7 June about a 100 metre buffer zone between all existing and proposed housing.

On the basis of historical expectations we are quite willing to accept a reduced buffer strip between Urambi Village extremities and adjacent housing, i.e. we are not seeking an extension to 100

metres, but will argue that some 50 metres properly landscaped is proper and reasonable. The attached sketch for the housing group east of Urambi Village indicates what might be possible. It does not take any more account of the wishes of homeowners in Drysdale Circuit than do your present plans.

On this general question, I can only say that those who developed Urambi Village had an expectation based on our careful and direct discussions with NCDC that there might be housing along some of these Circuits. We believe that our assurances from NCDC are a strong reason for not accepting a lesser situation whereby houses are shifted closer to Urambi merely to accommodate others - although it is, of course, possible that these people were misled as to likely developments (and are perfectly entitled to put forward arguments as to how their proper self-interests should be met).

The Buffer Zone

A "buffer zone" was an absolutely fundamental concept in Urambi's planning. Houses on our long perimeters are oriented to the course area, overlooking it through large window areas. Obviously this practice was based on the assurances that adequate precautions would be taken in siting fairways, part of that precaution being in the form of reasonable distances from houses to golf course, plus appropriate landscaping. It should be noted that for reasons of safety and amenity, residents of Urambi Village have been maintaining the Urambi edge of the buffer strip at their expense for five years.

It is in all of our interests not to compromise on the safety of property and, more importantly, of residents of all ages. This, of course, is a problem which your planners will have to handle in all sections of the course perimeter although in other areas they will have the advantage of being able to fully integrate playing and living areas at the planning stage.

Privacy is a consideration in addition to safety, although we would expect that proper attention to the latter should largely ensure the former. In discussions with the NCDC a width of 200 feet was suggested as appropriate, but we would see it as more sensible to take account of the nature of the surrounding fairways and existing or potential local topography and planting rather than to be tied to a fixed 200 feet, which might be too little in some circumstances, e.g. where long hitting is likely, and too much in others, e.g. between fairways.

So far as privacy is concerned, we are pleased to see that the major foot access to housing in the north-west is now routed north of the major dam. There could, however, be problems for Urambi Village with the designated housing areas to the south-west where there is a far greater housing concentration than ever before

contemplated. It would have to be expected that children, in particular, from that area would pass close to Urambi Village and we would like any possible route (formal or otherwise) to be diverted from our close proximity. We will be particularly interested to see the potential solution to that problem, one caused by the sharp increase in the amount of housing which the proposal attempts to incorporate in areas not formerly designated or anticipated for this purpose.

To sum up, Urambi Village housing was designed to maximise the benefits which we would get (and will get) from an adjoining golf course, but were based on assurances of an appropriate buffer zone. We sought and accepted these assurances in good faith. We do not argue for an arbitrary amount (such as the 200 feet talked about in 1974 by NCDC planners or the 100 metres between housing areas mentioned by Mr. Hindmarsh). We are happy to arrive at pragmatic solutions based on consultation. This letter attempts only to set out the historical expectations which we see as relevant to solutions of interface problems between Urambi Village and your development.

22 Urambi

Mr M Fretwell
President
Murrumbidgee Country Club
P.O. Box 816
WODEN ACT 2606

Dear Mr Fretwell

You will recall earlier discussion with the Urambi Body Corporate Committee and interested residents on 7 June, and our letter to you in July in which we set out the basis of Urambi residents' expectations about the prospective golf course development.

It is our view that the Murrumbidgee Country Club's golf course and other facilities should and can be developed in a way consistent with these expectations.

We appreciate that your Club's intentions for development of the site are still at the concept planning stage. Accordingly we believe it may be useful to you in considering the range of possibilities to know the views of Urambi residents on a number of aspects of the proposed development.

As background we again point out that it was never our expectation that there would be residential development on the golf course site at anything like the scale contemplated in your recent public announcement. Whilst our discussions with the NCDC in 1973 and 1974 included reference to residential development in association with the golf course, the course was seen as a part of Canberra's sporting infrastructure and not as a self-financing commercial development to which the golf course would be incidental. For this reason we believe it would be very much in the interests of your Club to take into account the list of points which follows in your further planning. Planning of an attractive and sympathetic golf course development would not only minimise the difficulties which may be encountered in obtaining final planning approval, but would also encourage support for the Club from Urambi residents (e.g. as members).

We believe that the following points should be reflected in your further planning.

- (i) Development near Urambi should respect the original concept of an adequate buffer zone between Urambi and the course including its associated housing. The determination of a buffer zone should be based on the reasonable protection of privacy of residents and on ensuring safety from activities on the course. Appropriate landscaping and siting of fairways and any nearby housing should enable these objectives to be met without difficulty. (At the eastern end of Urambi we would prefer that the existing trees be retained and the area landscaped as a reserve).

- (ii) If there is to be additional housing close to Urambi (i.e. immediately across the buffer zone), that housing should be designed and built of materials harmonious with Urambi's architecturally consistent whole. It would be both undesirable and unnecessary to detract from the appearance of the neighbourhood by additional development of an architecturally unsympathetic character. In particular it would be desirable for adjacent housing to employ earth-toned bricks, tiles and stained timber as the principal external materials.
- (iii) Residential development in the area allotted to the golf course and associated development should be the minimum consistent with the need to finance construction of the golf course. (We note it is unlikely that elsewhere in Australia the greater part of the cost of constructing new golf courses for private clubs is met from the public purse. The present proposal is vulnerable to the charge that such a transfer is inequitable. The case could be made that any premium on residential land sales, supposedly attributable to the proximity of the golf course, ought to finance only part of the cost of the course. Other arguments might also be advanced, but it is not necessary to canvass them here.)
- (iv) Land should be released for residential development in association with the golf course only if the developer/marketer of the land enters into a contractual obligation to construct the golf course simultaneously, or nearly so. By this means, we would believe, the chance that housing might proceed in advance of, and ultimately at the expense of recreational development would be minimised.
- (v) Residential development should be located so as to cause the least possible visual intrusion for Urambi residents. In general terms this would require that housing (and other structures) be located-
- . to the north and west of the major dam near the Kambah Pool Road;
 - . to the west of and below the same dam;
 - . beyond the major tree clumps present around the creeks to the north, west and south of Urambi;
 - . beyond and below the first ridge line to the south of Urambi and west of Learmonth Drive.
- (vi) Larger-scale buildings (the club house, machinery sheds and other storages and garaging etc) in particular should be located discreetly so that visual amenity of Urambi residents is preserved so far as possible. One good site would be to the north and west of the major dam referred to above.

- (vii) Existing trees on the golf course site, especially near Urambi should be carefully preserved, and the golf course (and residential development) laid out so as to facilitate this. (It hardly needs to be pointed out that the trees have a major contribution to make both to the course and to residential development, and that new plantings will take many years to achieve the effect created by the existing large trees).
- (viii) If it is necessary (e.g. for legal reasons) for any parts of the golf course to be fenced than such fencing should be the least required to achieve its purpose and as discreet as possible.
- (ix) Desirably recreational access, essentially for local residents, through the golf course/residential site to the undeveloped areas beyond should be preserved for strollers, equestrians and others pursuing quiet and non-intrusive recreation.
- (x) It would be highly desirable that additional vehicular traffic flows generated by the new development (residential and sporting) should:
- . not be channelled into roadways not designed to carry larger volumes of traffic;
 - . not be distributed so as to exacerbate existing problems e.g. in Boddington Circuit near local schools;
 - . not be channelled into narrow house-lined streets where alternatives (e.g. especially Learmonth Drive and the Kambah Pool Road, up-graded as necessary) are available.

In our view none of these points is unreasonable or excessively restrictive. Many simply reflect a commonsense approach to practical problems of urban design and the development of recreational facilities. If their intent is reflected in your further concept planning we would expect that the MCC's proposals would find general (if not unanimous) support in the neighbourhood.

It would be constructive if there could be an early meeting between your representatives and representatives of the residents of Urambi to exchange views on revised concept planning. We also believe it

would be very valuable if we could meet with you on site in the near future to review the points we are making and to consider mutually acceptable solutions.

Yours sincerely



D.F. Gascoine
Convenor
Urambi Body Corporate Committee

10 August '82