

From: [City of Gold-Coast-MAIL](#)
To: [City Information Operations](#)
Subject: Fwd: RE: RE-SUBMITTED OBJECTION - 37 ARTHUR ST. MERMAID BEACH - APPLICATION REFERENCE: OTH/2025/18
Date: Monday, 15 June 2026 3:03:08 PM
Attachments: [REVISED 37 ARTHUR ST. MERMAID OBJECTION.docx](#)

This Email is From an External Sender

Stay alert and check for anything unusual before acting.

[Report Suspicious](#)

From: coltra1@bigpond.com
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2026 5:38 PM
To: mail@goldcoast.qld.gov.au
Subject: RE: RE-SUBMITTED OBJECTION - 37 ARTHUR ST. MERMAID BEACH - APPLICATION REFERENCE: OTH/2025/18

To The Assessment Officer,
Please find the attached **re-submitted** objection for the abovementioned development for your attention.
Kind regards,
Jo-Anne Lee
30-32 Arthur St. Mermaid Beach 4218
Email: coltra1@bigpond.com
Mobile: 0407752254

12th June 2026

Chief Executive Officer
City of Gold Coast
P.O. Box 5042
GOLD COAST MC 9726

Via email: mail@goldcoast.qld.gov.au

CC: Nick Marshall – Division 12 Councillor – division12@goldcoast.qld.gov.au

ATTENTION: The Assessment Officer

I wish to re-submit my objection due to cancellation of my previous objection dated 5th June 2026 due to confusing information on proposal documents.

RE: OBJECTION TO DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR MULTIPLE DWELLING (INCREASE TO 7 APARTMENTS AND BUILDING HEIGHT TO 4 STOREYS AND 13.19M)

Lot 23 RP 41194, Lot 1 RP85529 - 37 & 37A Arthur Street, Mermaid Beach Qld 4218

Application Reference: OTH/2025/18

I wish to OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT of 4 storey building (increase to 7 apartments) and a building height of 13.19m) for the following reasons-

As a resident and owner of the neighboring property (30-32 Arthur St. Mermaid Beach) I am concerned that the relevant property is approximately 527.4 m2 on a constrained site and the proposed building does not comply with the RD4 zone within the Gold Coast City Plan and will have a detrimental impact on the area and my property.

My specific grounds for objection are: -

Building Height/Density

The proposed development seeks to accommodate 7 apartments, basement parking, and a unit/recreation area on level 4 and exceeds the maximum height of 9m. The proposal is 13.19m.

The proposed development is excessive and inconsistent with the established character of the neighbourhood. The scale of the development will result in visual dominance and is out of keeping with the surrounding low-density area.

The excessive building height does not visually integrate with the character of neighbouring properties, which are all single and double heights.

Overshadowing

The height and boundary setbacks of the proposed building will result in significant overshadowing of neighbouring properties, loss of direct sunlight and airflow. It would also affect people who have installed solar panels.

Privacy/Noise

It will allow direct views in to private living areas or private backyards, causing an unacceptable loss of privacy. The reduced residential density would increase the number of occupants living in the property causing extra noise pollution.

Infrastructure

It will cause excessive strain on local water, sewerage, or storm water drainage networks.

Car parks and traffic

The proposal has provision for only 11 car parks, 2 of these are for visitors, and 7 apartments will only have the use of the remaining 9 car parks, which is insufficient taking into consideration of our already congested street parking.

The development should provide the appropriate amount of car parks to prevent street overflow. Inadequate parking provisions cause increased traffic congestion, or unsafe vehicle access.

This application is excessive in every respect and represents an attempt to maximize development yield and should be refused. The proposed building height of 4 storeys and 13.19m exceeds the uplift provision for the maximum building height. The justification to inappropriately exceed uplift provisions based on proximity to the light rail and current shortage of housing is profusely **rejected**. Any additional increase in height and density will drastically change the current residential area of Arthur Street and is strongly opposed. The GCCC must maintain consistency – otherwise it will set a precedence for future developments.

For the reasons outlined above, I believe this development application in its current form is inappropriate for the site and the surrounding community.

It is requested the Assessment Officer takes all of the information mentioned in this letter into consideration. Please keep me informed of the progress of this application.

Kind regards,

Jo-Anne Lee (nee Colman)
30-32 Arthur Street
Mermaid Beach.

Email: coltra1@bigpond.com

Mob: 0407752254