From:	City of Gold-Coast-MAIL
To:	City Information Operations
Subject:	Fwd: Submission for 37 Arthur St, Mermaid Beach (OTH/2025/18).
Date:	Monday, 15 June 2026 8:10:41 AM
Attachments:	37 Arthur St objection BM.docx noname-1

This Email is From an External Sender
Stay alert and check for anything unusual before acting.

Report Suspicious

From: brent_mcmonagle@icloud.com
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2026 9:10 PM
To: mail@goldcoast.qld.gov.au
Subject: Submission for 37 Arthur St, Mermaid Beach (OTH/2025/18).

Dear Sir/Madam,
Re: Submission for 37 Arthur St, Mermaid Beach (OTH/2025/18).
I write to object to the proposed application seeking to build a 4 storey building within what is essentially a 2 storey area- see attached objection.
Kind regards,
Dr Brent McMonagle

Brent McMonagle
15 Arthur St, Mermaid Beach Qld 4218
Ph: 0406 761580; email: brent_mcmonagle@me.com

10 June 2026

The Chief Executive Officer
City of Gold Coast
PO Box 5042
Gold Coast MC Qld 9729
Via email: mail@goldcoast.qld.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam
Re: Submission for 37 Arthur St, Mermaid Beach (OTH/2025/18).

I write to object to the proposed application seeking to build a 4 storey building within what is essentially a 2 storey area.
My wife, Michelle McMonagle, and I are owners and residents at 15 Arthur Sr, Mermaid Beach, very close to the block in question.

This block has a long history with over-development proposals going back to 2017- the original 4 storey proposal was refused by the GCCC Planning Committee, with the 4th storey removed and replaced with a small, southern roof top deck and reduced overall height. Apparently, this was extended in 2024 to a full roof top deck but still 3 storeys. The applicant then applied for a six storey structure, which was duly refused by council, and now desires a four storey building comprising 7 units.

Building height:
The application proposes a building height of 13.19 m, significantly higher than the 9m maximum within the area. The current City Plan allows for consideration of an "uplift" of 50% further, but this is not a right, and must be under justifiable circumstances, not the mere ambitions of a property developer. The proposal fails to satisfy the relevant performance-based assessment benchmarks required to justify any departure from the acceptable height outcomes. Currently the highest buildings on that side of the street are 10 and 10.2m only, and as such, a building like this would tower over the remainder of the street.

Storeys:
The application proposes a four storey building within a two storey area. Within the entirety of Arthur St, there is one 3 storey building, two 2 ½ storey buildings and an equal mix of one and two storey buildings, out of approximately fifty dwellings. This is significantly in excess of the current City Plan and not in keeping the surrounds.

Amenity:
The City Plan guidelines dictate a maximum of 40% site coverage- this application has 50-59% site coverage which is grossly excessive, and would create excessive bulk and domination of the streetscape. In addition, the setbacks are reduced to

allow for this, placing this structure too closely to neighbours, reducing privacy and significantly affecting amenity.

Car-parks:
The proposal has provision for only eleven car-parks, and two of these are for visitors. This means seven units will have to manage with only nine car-parks, placing even more pressure on street parking, already a limited resource in this neighbourhood. This comes at a time when the GCCC is apparently about to introduce street-parking restrictions on Arthur St.

Summary:
The application is excessive in virtually every respect and should be refused. The fact that there has been approval for three storeys with full roof-top deck has already pushed the limits and tolerance of this community. The neighbourhood is outraged by this proposal and the long and frustrating history of similar excessive proposals going back to 2017. If this was refused in 2017/8 under the same City Plan, and the GCCC must maintain consistency- otherwise the floodgates will open and similar excessive proposals will ensue. There were over 300 objections back in 2017/8, and I can assure the GCCC the neighbourhood feels very strongly about this- there would be no hesitation in a community funded appeal to the Planning and Environment Court if this is approved.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Brent McMonagle

Dr Brent McMonagle