

Application Information

Application Number	OTH/2025/18
Property Address	37 Arthur Street MERMAID BEACH QLD 4218
Application Description	Other Change Application Impact Assessment Other Change to MIN/2024/478 - 37 Arthur Street, MERMAID BEACH QLD 4218
Application Type	Other Change
Lodgement Date	17/04/2025
Status	In Progress - On Public Notification
Appeal rights	Submitters who lodge a properly made submission have appeal rights against Council's decision for this application. The dates in which a submission is considered properly made for this development application are published on the public notification material (property sign, letter notification and newspaper advertisement) for this application. If you require any further information about this application, you can visit Development.i and enter in the property address or application reference number.

Contact Details

Submitter	Tracey Bailey
Email Address	tracey_biome@icloud.com
Residential or Business Address Details	unit 2/6 Arthur Street, Mermaid Beach, QLD, 4218, Australia

Submitter Acknowledgements

Time of Lodgement	15/06/2026 20:28
Submitter agrees to the terms and conditions	Accepted
Submitters contact details displayed during assessment phase?	Yes
Customer declaration	Accepted
Number of attachments	1
Application numberOTH_2025_18 37 Arthur Street MERMAID BEACH.pdf	86.67 KB

Submission Details

Support or Oppose or Other	Oppose
Grounds	I oppose the proposed development application OTH/2025/18 for 37 & 37A Arthur Street, Mermaid Beach for the reasons outlined in the attached letter.

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

I write to formally object to the proposed development application **OTH/2025/18** for 37 & 37A Arthur Street, Mermaid Beach for the reasons outlined below.

While the applicant has amended the proposal following Council's Information Request, the revised application remains inconsistent with the Gold Coast City Plan.

The proposal increases the dwelling yield from four approved dwellings to seven dwellings on a 527.45m² site while relying on a four-storey built form that exceeds the intended Medium Density setback envelope, does not satisfy the criteria necessary to justify a height uplift, and fails to adequately address Council's concerns regarding built form, neighbourhood character, landscaping and visitor parking.

1. Conflict with the Building Height Overlay & Strategic Framework

The site is mapped under the Building Height Overlay as 2 storeys and 9 metres. The Strategic Framework permits building height increases of up to 50% only where all specified outcomes are satisfied. Applying a 50% uplift results in a maximum outcome of 3 storeys and 13.5 metres.

Importantly, the Strategic Framework states: "Where the Building height overlay map shows both storeys and metres, the **lesser of the two** shall apply."

Council's Information Request adopted this interpretation and expressly identified the applicable uplift as 3 storeys and 13.5 metres. The applicant acknowledges that the revised proposal remains 4 storeys and 13.19 metres and therefore exceeds the uplifted outcome in storeys.

The applicant's contention that the uplift should not restrict storeys provided the building remains below 13.5 metres is inconsistent with both the Strategic Framework and Council's stated assessment position.

2. Failure to Satisfy the Height Uplift Criteria

The Strategic Framework only contemplates height increases where all prescribed outcomes are satisfied. Council has already advised that the proposal did not satisfactorily:

- reinforce local identity and sense of place;
- provide a well-managed interface with nearby development;
- provide a varied, ordered and interesting local skyline; and
- provide deliberate and distinct built form contrast.

The revised proposal does not adequately demonstrate that these concerns have been resolved.

Elevation 3 (page 50 of the Revised Proposal Plans) identifies the Gold Coast City Council Medium Density setback line by a dotted red line. The proposed building extends beyond this setback line across multiple levels, demonstrating that the exceedance is characteristic of the overall building form rather than a minor upper-level element.

Rather than stepping back as the building rises, the development presents as a continuous four-storey form that exceeds the intended built form envelope and fails to achieve the transition in scale anticipated by the City Plan.

The architectural drawings therefore support Council's conclusion that the proposal does not satisfy the criteria necessary to justify a departure from the Building Height Overlay Map.

3. Excessive Building Bulk & Scale

The proposal presents as a visually dominant four-storey building that is inconsistent with the intended scale of development for a site mapped at two storeys.

The building's departure from the Medium Density setback envelope across multiple levels results in excessive visual bulk and a built form that appears substantially larger than its measured height alone would suggest.

While the applicant states that the proposal remains below 13.5 metres, the issue is not simply numerical height. The proposal presents as a full four-storey building and does not achieve the built form transition, skyline outcomes or neighbourhood character outcomes required by the Strategic Framework.

4. Increased Development Intensity and Yield

The applicant states that the number of apartments has been increased from six to seven units to maintain project feasibility following the reduction in building height.

The site area is only 527.45m² and is located within the RD4 Residential Density Overlay, which identifies a density outcome of up to 50 dwellings per net hectare (1 dwelling per 200m²).

The proposal represents a substantial increase in intensity compared with the previously approved four-dwelling development. The increase to seven proposed dwellings represents a 75% increase in dwelling yield on a relatively small site.

The proposal also exceeds the 50% site coverage outcome and maintains upper-level floorplates of approximately 59% of the site area. While these exceedances may appear modest in isolation, they indicate an attempt to maximise development yield on a constrained site.

This helps explain why the proposal continues to rely upon a four-storey built form, exceeds the intended setback envelope, reduces landscaping opportunities and generates additional parking demand.

5. Visitor Parking Deficiency

The revised proposal contains seven dwellings. The supporting traffic material indicates that **three visitor** parking spaces are required. However, only two visitor spaces are proposed, resulting in a parking shortfall.

Council previously identified concerns regarding visitor parking provision and specifically requested additional visitor parking spaces. The revised proposal does not satisfactorily resolve this issue.

6. Inadequate Frontage Landscaping & Deep Planting

Council's Information Request specifically requested that deep planting be reinstated within the frontage to support large canopy tree planting and improve the streetscape outcome.

The revised proposal does not adequately address this concern.

Deep planting plays an important role in reducing the visual dominance of built form, enhancing neighbourhood character and a higher-quality streetscape. The proposal does not achieve the outcome sought by Council and further reinforces the overdevelopment of the site.

Conclusion

The proposal remains inconsistent with the Gold Coast City Plan. The applicant acknowledges that the development exceeds the uplifted outcome of three storeys contemplated by the Strategic Framework. The proposal continues to present as a visually dominant four-storey building, exceeds the intended Medium Density setback envelope across multiple levels, is attempting to squeeze maximum yield from a very small site, and fails to adequately address Council's concerns regarding built form, landscaping and parking.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that Council refuse the application or require substantial amendments to achieve the intended character outcomes, and reduce the negative impacts on residents and the amenity of Mermaid Beach.

Yours faithfully,

Tracey Bailey

Unit 2, 6 Arthur Street, Mermaid Beach