

House 67. (168)

Front — Thomas Jeffers. 315025 (h)  
✓ 702211 (w)  
619111 (w)

1.) Pergola — front.

(NO) — not to ground.

2.) Retaining wall. — under 1 metre  
(NO)

✓  
C/gard. — Retaining wall. & paving.

under 1 metre

Ed Harris. House 15. 513412. (h) me.  
Path to No. 49.  
past. ✓ ✓

**Thomas & Margo Leffers  
67 Urambi Village  
Crozier Circuit  
KAMBAH ACT 2902**

*filled at #66  
Chud*

**Telephone (06) 231 5025**

Date : 14 April 1997

The Secretary  
The Body Corporate Committee  
The Proprietors of Units Plan No. 119  
Urambi Village

COPY

*J. L. P. 10/11/97*

Dear Secretary

### **PETS IN URAMBI VILLAGE**

We request that the Body Corporate Committee (BCC) review the current policy on allowing pets into the village.

It is our understanding that the Unit Titles Act does not permit pets within Units Plans but that the articles of Urambi have been approved which allows pets subject to BCC approval.

We have for some time been inconvenienced by the barking our neighbours dog. We had mentioned this to the neighbours shortly after the dog arrived (c. early 1995) and since then we have had to call them on a number of occasions about the dog's barking. The problem now really only occurs when the dog is left at home by itself or when only the children are at home.

We had (unhappily) resigned ourselves to the situation but have recently heard that we are not the only residents suffering the invasion of privacy brought about by dogs. We are aware that there are a number of dogs in the village that do not cause any problems and we see no reason for those owners to suffer because of the lack of appreciation/consideration by other pet owners of the effect their pet has on surrounding residents.

We therefore request that the pets policy be reviewed. We further suggest that serious consideration be given to new approvals being initially granted for a short probationary period, during which time the pet owner is required to obtain the agreement of surrounding residents (similar to the structures policy) to the pet remaining. Subsequent approvals should be for a fixed period, say annually. The pets policy should then be thoroughly enforced.

This suggestion puts the onus back on the pet owner to ensure that the pet is not causing problems.

Yours sincerely

**IF ALL ELSE FAILS ....  
HUG YOUR TEDDY**



**Thomas & Margo Leffers  
67 Urambi Village  
Crozier Circuit  
KAMBAH ACT 2902**

**Telephone (02) 6231 5025**

Date : 11 November 1997

Body Corporate Committee  
The Proprietors of Units Plan No. 119  
Urambi Village  
KAMBAH ACT 2902

Att. David Keightley  
Structures Officer  
55 Urambi Village

#### SPLIT SYSTEM AIRCONDITIONING

I refer to our telephone discussions about the issue of installing a split system air conditioning unit into our townhouse.

We are keen to install such a unit for a number of reasons:

- Provide for summer cooling, as you yourself are aware, the upstairs areas of tri-levels can become very hot and uncomfortable during heat spells, and because of the orientation of the house there is little relief from opening the doors when the outside temperature drops.
- Enable us to reduce the impact of noise from the swimming pool by keeping the doors closed during the days when we are home, and from the community centre during the occasions there is a function in progress.
- Replace the existing twenty-one year old 4.8kW electric wall heater with a energy efficient heat source - 7.10kW output for an input of only 2.68kW.

After our initial discussion, I contacted the ACTEW for further information on the potential for noise problems, they provided me with a copy of the Australian Environment Council's publication *Air conditioner noise*, a copy of which is attached.

I then contacted the ACT Office of the Environment and spoke to a Noise Control Officer. They advised that the ACT Noise Control Act 1998 applies, that the Act specifies that from 7am to 10pm the noise limit is +5dBA above background, at other times the noise limit is background. They further advised that background noise in a quiet residential area is around 35dBA (normal conversation is 60dBA). They also confirmed that the decibel (dBA) (based on the Bell) is logarithmic, i.e. 70dBA is twice as loud as 60dBA.

Modern systems are considerably quieter than units available a couple of years ago. (As a visit to the ACTEW Advisory Service, where a number of systems are on display, will prove.) To further reduce outdoor noise, and based on the above advice, we are advised to install the outside unit on the wall under the balcony, this provides a four metre distance to the wing walls separating our house from the neighbours, with the wing walls providing further

attenuation. Importantly, there is no direct line (of sound) from the unit to any area of either neighbours house.

Using the formula in the attached document, and the 40dBA limit, a distance of 4 metres and the solid walls separating the house indicates that the outdoor unit could have a maximum rating of 67dBA during the day and 62dBA at night.

The unit that I am considering, a Daikin FTY60G has an outdoor noise level of only 54dBA (other units suggested, Sharp and Carrier, had 70dBA and 61dBA ratings respectively).

I do not envisage any problems being caused by the little noise generated, during the winter when the unit will operate the most, doors and windows of the neighbouring house would be closed anyway, and I don't expect the unit to be run that much over a summer.

Your advise would be appreciated.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. J. J.', written in a cursive style.

**IF ALL ELSE FAILS ....  
HUG YOUR TEDDY**



**Thomas & Margo Leffers  
67 Urambi Village  
Crozier Circuit  
KAMBAH ACT 2902**

**Telephone (02) 6231 5025**

Date : 8 December 1997

Body Corporate Committee  
The Proprietors of Units Plan No. 119  
Urambi Village  
KAMBAH ACT 2902

Att. David Keightley  
Structures Officer  
55 Urambi Village

Dear David

**SPLIT SYSTEM AIR CONDITIONING**

I refer to my letter of 11 November 1997 and our subsequent telephone discussions about the issue of installing a split system air conditioning unit into our townhouse.

I sent a similar letter each to our two neighbours, copy attached, both neighbours have advised that they have no objection to us installing a split system air conditioning unit, a copy of their advice is also attached.

The Body Corporate Committee's written agreement to now proceed is now sought. Your early advice would be appreciated to enable us to install the unit a.s.a.p.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Yours sincerely

Approval is given to install a split system air conditioning unit as per details contained in attached letter.

David Keightley  
Structures Officer  
for The Proprietors of Units Plan No 119

December 1997

**IF ALL ELSE FAILS ....  
HUG YOUR TEDDY**



**Thomas & Margo Leffers  
67 Urambi Village  
Crozier Circuit  
KAMBAH ACT 2902**

**Telephone (02) 6231 5025**

Date : 2 December 1997

Warwick & Sue Edwards  
66 Urambi Village  
KAMBAH ACT 2902



8/12/97

Dear Warwick & Sue

**SPLIT SYSTEM AIRCONDITIONING**

We are keen to install a split system air conditioning unit into our townhouse, we see a number of significant benefits:

- Provide for summer cooling, as you are aware, the upstairs areas of tri-levels can become very hot and uncomfortable during heat spells, and because of the orientation of the house there is little relief from opening the doors when the outside temperature drops.
- Enable us to reduce the impact of noise from the swimming pool by keeping the doors closed during the days when we are home, and from the community centre during occasions when a function is in progress.
- Replace the existing twenty-one year old 4.8kW electric wall heater with a energy efficient heat source - 7.10kW output for an input of only 2.68kW.

We specifically asked the ACTEW Advisory Service for further information on the potential for noise problems, they provided us with a copy of the Australian Environment Council's publication *Air conditioner noise*, a copy of which is attached.

I then contacted the ACT Office of the Environment and spoke to a Noise Control Officer. They advised that the ACT Noise Control Act 1998 applies, that the Act specifies that from 7am to 10pm the noise limit is +5dBA above background, at other times the noise limit is background. They further advised that background noise in a quiet residential area is around 35dBA (normal conversation is 60dBA). They also confirmed that the decibel (dBA) (based on the Bell) is logarithmic, i.e. 70dBA is twice as loud as 60dBA.

Modern systems are considerably quieter than units available a couple of years ago. (As a visit to the ACTEW Advisory Service, where a number of systems are on display, will prove.) To further reduce outdoor noise, and based on the above advice, we are advised to install the outside unit on the wall under the balcony, this provides a four metre distance to the wing walls separating our two houses, with the wing walls providing further attenuation to your living areas. Importantly, there is no direct line (of sound) from the unit to any area of your house.

Using the formula in the attached document, and the 40dBA limit, a distance of 4 metres and the solid walls separating the house indicates that the outdoor unit could have a maximum rating of 67dBA during the day and 62dBA at night.

The unit that I am considering, a Daikin FTY60G has an outdoor noise level of only 54dBA (see copy of Daikin brochure), other units suggested, Sharp and Carrier, had 70dBA and 61dBA ratings respectively.

The Body Corporate Committee has recommended that we check with our neighbours to see if they might have any objections, hence this letter. The next BCC meeting is on Tuesday 9 December, could you please indicate your position in space provided below and return this letter to me by Friday 5 December so that I can lodge the issue with the Structures Officer in time for the meeting. Should you have any objections, it would assist if these could be specified to see if they might be addressed.

Yours sincerely



House 66 has no objections to the above proposal.  
 House 66 objects to this proposal on the grounds set out below.

Signed :

*Julie Edwards*

Date:

*3/11/97*

*We also are thinking along*

*similar lines we will*

*be interested to see how*

*it goes.*

*Regards  
Julie*

*Received*

**03 DEC 1997**





Margot and Thomas Leffers  
67 Urambi Village  
Crozier Circuit  
Kambah ACT 2902

Dear Magot and Thomas

This is to confirm that you received permission from the Urambi Village Body Corporate Committee at its meeting last night to install an air conditioner according to the specifications in your letter to this committee.

All the best with its installation.

Stay cool!

David Keightley  
55 Urambi Village  
10 December 97

4

**Minutes**  
**Urambi Body Corporate Committee**  
**Community Centre**  
**7.30pm, 11 December 2002**

**Present:** Richard Dowe (convenor), Allan Sharp, David Keightley, Anne Lomax, David Watson, Michael Burton, Irma Ficarra, John Bevan

**In attendance:** David Bowditch (ACT Strata Management Services), Thomas Leffers (part meeting), Deborah Fleming (part meeting).

**1. Apologies**

Noel Pratt, Alastair Swayn

**2. Minutes of previous meeting**

The minutes of the last meeting, having previously been circulated, were approved (moved Michael Burton, seconded David Keightley)

**3. Matters arising from previous minutes**

Matters arising are dealt with under other agenda items.

**4. Reports**

*Maintenance.* David Watson said the following maintenance activities had been undertaken:

- Checkpest inspected the Community Centre for white ants and found no evidence of active termites. Checkpest will do another inspection in 12 months.
- Help Plumbing repaired a root-damaged pipe behind #56 at a cost of \$630. Mr Watson commented on the time taken to make the repairs, and a general discussion followed on whether Urambi was getting the best value for money from Help Plumbing in terms of services and pricing. The Committee agreed to try out several other plumbing firms to compare Help's services and rates.
- A new contractor, Canberra Rubbish Removals, has been engaged to remove prunings at a cost of \$120 a truckload.
- A vandalised mushroom lamp near #55 has been repaired at a cost of \$100.
- A new combination lock has been installed on the golf club road access gate.
- bollards has been installed to block car access to units to the left of carpark C.

A general discussion followed on continuing problems with roof guttering on single-storey units in Urambi after a resident reported a ceiling collapse following recent heavy rain. It was acknowledged that because of a design fault the guttering on these units was inadequate for the roof area. The most lasting solution appeared to have the guttering replaced. The BCC agreed the problem had implications for future insurance premium levels and that professional advice was needed on how best to address the matter. Ms Ficarra said she had engaged a plumber to replace guttering on her unit and, as a first step, would seek his opinion.

*Landscaping.* Ms Ficarra reported that:

- Arborcare will begin \$1200 worth of tree surgery in the village in the New Year
- Mr Nelson (#64) has agreed to pay for the removal of a ringbarked tree at the rear of his unit
- ACT Urban Services has removed two problem trees on the Urambi frontage on Crozier Circuit
- #15 will arrange for their own contractor to remove a tree on their property.

The BCC noted a request from the new owner of #27 (Geraldine Robertson) for the lopping of a large gum tree overhanging the property. Ms Ficarra said Arborcare did not consider the tree a priority at this stage. Given the substantial cost of undertaking the work (\$1280) the BCC agreed to ask Arborcar to 'keep an eye' on the tree and advise when action was required.

Ms Ficarra agreed to obtain a quote from Arborcare for the removal of several stumps near carpark D.

*Structures.* Mr Leffers (#67) asked the BCC to reconsider its earlier decision (October 2002) not to allow an oblique angle abutment on a proposed balcony extension on his unit. Mr Leffers said the oblique angle was considered necessary to maximise sunlight in his backyard and to provide privacy to the adjoining unit (#66). He said the owners of the adjoining units had no objections to the proposed extension. The BCC said it had been guided by the advice of Mr Swayn and would stand by its earlier decision pending an on-site inspection by Mr Swayn and his subsequent recommendation.



In other maintenance items, the BCC :

- approved a request by #27 for a proposed additional timber awning window (2100mmH/850mmW) to the rear bedroom;
- noted that there had been no progress on renovations to #72, but that the property was about to go on the market;
- noted a response from Mr Jecminek (#70) to a BCC request that he repaint the exterior of his unit to comply with the recommended palettes (Mr Jecminek holds to the view that he was authorised to paint his house in its current colours)
- noted that Mr Ferry (#58) had agreed to meet the cost of replacing his back the brushwood fence. The BCC agreed Mr Ferry should be given 3 months to undertake the work.

*Golf Club liaison.* Mr Dowe said the secretary/manager of the Murrumbidgee Country Club, Mr Wise, had offered to talk to the BCC about proposed developments at the club now that it had consolidated its leases. The BCC agreed to accept Mr Wise's offer and to invite him to a meeting earlier in the New Year.

*Community Centre.* Mr Sharp confirmed that Julia Brown had taken over as Community Centre manager from Jan Brabazon and had indicated she would attend a future meeting to discuss issues relating to the centre.

#### **5. Urambi questionnaire**

Deborah Fleming (#61) presented a draft questionnaire on community consultation that she and Michael Robbins (#21) had prepared and asked for comments from BBBC members by mid-January.

#### **6. Transact**

Mr Keightley said Transact expected to start work on laying to coaxial cable through Urambi in the near future.

#### **7. Christmas party**

The BCC voted \$150 for Christmas party expenses.

#### **8. Other business**

(i) *Parking numbers.* Mr Watson will arrange for the parking space numbers at entrance E to be repainted.

(ii) *Working group.* The BCC supported an initiative by Mr Pryor (#29) to establish a working group to look at ways of conserving water and other natural resources within Urambi. Mr Pryor will seek funding from the ACT Government for the initiative.

(iii) *Arawang concerns.* Mr Watson said he had written to Arawang Body Corporate about their concerns over the tidiness of entrance A of Urambi. Ms Lomax said a questionnaire had been sent to residents in entrance A to canvass options for dealing with prunings that are currently left near the entrance A bin area. She said all residents had agreed to other locations to leave their prunings pending their removal. The BCC agreed to Ms Lomax, Mr Watson, Mrs Ficarra and Mr Kerruish to discuss landscaping options around carpark A, including the removal for the tree at the carpark entrance, and to create an extra two paid parking spaces.

**9. Date of next meeting**

The next meeting will be held at the Community Centre, 7.30pm, 12 February. 2003.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.50pm.