

**Submission to Development application:**

Application number:	MCU/2023/15
Application type:	Material Change of Use
Location:	Lot 6 RP1777, Lot 7 RP1777

Submission date:	6/04/2024
Response type:	Submission - Objection
Response summary:	--- OBJECT --- My Grounds are --- OBJECT ---  Surname: Waugh Given Names: Bob Address Line 1: 255-261 Boundary St Suburb: COOLANGATTA State Code: QLD Postcode: 4225 Email Address: bobwaugh4152@hotmail.com

**Bob Waugh**  
**255-261 Boundary St**  
**Rainbow Bay, QLD**

**7 April 2024**

**Chief Executive Officer**  
**City of Gold Coast**  
Via email: [mail@goldcoast.qld.gov.au](mailto:mail@goldcoast.qld.gov.au)

## **OBJECTION to MCU/2023/15 239-241 Boundary St, Rainbow Bay**

### **INTRODUCTION**

These objections are in relation to the MCU at 239-241 Boundary St Rainbow Bay (Coolangatta) which seeks an increase in height above the 38m. They suggest this height increase does not become non-compliant with the City Plan and fits within parameters because of some incoherent sections of the framework.

Somehow, they conclude that the increased height fits within the flexibilities of the framework and further that it somehow complements the local character, has a sense of community cohesion and promotes wellbeing. On what planet does that relate to this box?

Overarching to this objection are two salient points Firstly, the broken GCCC process for approval of high rise developments which includes secretive approval processes and subsequent applications, which are neither ethical nor transparent. The average citizen is not actively encouraged to consider the impacts of the developments. And secondly the greedy and disrespectful approach by developers who garnish their applications by at worst, deceitful information and at best by wishy washy terms.

The broken GCCC process includes “the joke” applied by developers who make the initial application for approval under the ‘Code Assessment’ farce. These applications already exceed the town plan. But the joke actually has a root in the City Plan which allows for a 50% increase in building height in this area. So, once approved then they come back for a second dip to extend the height and subsequent apartments. This is usually made for a ridiculous excess height only to get it either approved or to take a reduction in the extended height back to what they covertly wanted to be passed.

Considering the original application which had almost non-existent setbacks, excessive bulk at podium and tower heights, landscaping which only seems to be vertical, along with the breach of privacy to neighbours, overshadowing and no consideration for increased traffic and parking due to the bedroom to parking space inadequacy. This just exacerbates the joke.

## OBJECTIONS

1. The building does nothing to interface with the local area and has no elements of local character. The wordage in this and other applications is completely misleading to appease council decision makers.
2. It detracts from local amenity by increased bulk, shadowing to nearby buildings, traffic impediments and visual inconsistency.
3. The almost non-existent setbacks are not consistent with quality designs like Columbia, Rainbow Place, The Bay Apartments, Rainbow Commodore, Classique, Carool, Rainbow Bay Resort, Arvia, Maili, The Garland, Bayview Apartments and others in the area. Rather they must be referring to the most recent developments of Flow, Esprit and Awaken which have taken advantage of procedural ineptitude.
4. Nothing about this building is at a form, scale or intensity of the local area. And it has clearly sought to contribute to the undesirable local development patterns and in a cumulative effects sense.
5. Overall it does not meet the outcomes required for increasing the height. The only beneficiaries are the developer and the GCCC.
6. The proposed development exceeds the existing density levels and provides no small scale services as required.
7. The building in no way complements the adjoining area and building types.
8. The site is 810sq m and is to contain 16 floors of apartments which may be up to 86 bedrooms and accompanying cars which are not catered for in the car parks in the basements. This site only detracts from the residential amenity of the area".
9. Rainbow Bay is a surfing precinct but everything that is occurring with developments is driving the surfers away. Disturbing anecdotes of traffic congestion requiring Surf Life Savers to be transported and dropped off to their clubs only serve to emphasize the adverse impacts of unchecked development. Rainbow Bay, renowned as a surfing precinct, faces a dire threat as developments neglect the needs of the surfing community, exacerbating issues such as inadequate parking and this gets compounded by the detrimental effects of sand pumping on the Snapper Rocks break.
10. Key infrastructure concerns, including the planning for water and sewerage systems to accommodate the anticipated surge in population due to new apartments, remain unaddressed. Streets like Eden Avenue are being overlooked, raising doubts about the city's capacity to manage the consequences of increased urbanization.
11. There have been instances of successful design integration in Rainbow Bay characterized by thoughtful allocation of space and amenities, such as with Columbia, Rainbow Place, Rainbow Commodore, Classique, Rainbow Bay Resort, Avia, and The

Bay Apartments. But the most recent applications are overshadowed by the relentless pursuit of apartment space only and of profit by developers and council alike. It is high time for a recalibration of priorities.

## Notes

**As of 6 April 2024, there are 46 'Objection' submissions.** I make the following observations:

1. Every objection is from a local owner, resident or groups.
2. Of those, 2 are from Body Corporates.
3. All are from residents of the precinct who are impacted by the development.
4. The submissions Body Corporates represent a large number (perhaps hundreds) of local residents, families and owners.
5. The approach by the Body Corporates has alleviated the need for exhaustive submissions by individuals.
6. The reasons for the objections is clearly and professionally laid out in the lengthy submission.
7. Equally other submissions have detailed reasons for their objections and have merit.

**As of 6 April 2024 there are no submissions supporting the proposal.** Does this tell you something?

It is imperative that we prioritize the long-term sustainability and livability of Rainbow Bay over short-term profits. Its time to stop the rot.

Robert Waugh  
255-261 Boundary St, Rainbow Bay