

Lourdes Retirement Village Killara

Continuation of Submission

of The Hon Peter Graham K.C. of 3 August 2026

objecting to the proposed State Significant Development Application of
Levande Pty Limited

1. The developer says that Community stakeholders were identified for pre-lodgement engagement (EIS para 6.1.1 on page 79) including:

“Opal HealthCare (Residential Care Facility Operator), Lourdes Retirement Village residents, traditional owners and knowledge holders [whatever that means], neighbouring property owners, local residents and businesses.”

It is fanciful to say that local residents (those most affected by the proposal) were identified. So far as I know, no residents in Stanhope Road, west of the neighbouring properties, were contacted, as happened when Lourdes itself was established by the Roman Catholic Church 40 years ago and when Dr Nemeth established a failed business, establishing more seniors living in Stanhope Road, opposite Redgum Avenue, some years later.

I was certainly not invited to consider the current development application dated 19 June 2026, which was said to have been the subject of a “Doorknock and letterbox drop to residents adjacent to and opposite the subject site in December 2025”!

Whether local businesses were contacted is doubtful as Killara has no businesses anywhere near the site! The shops are at Lindfield on either side of the north-south railway line.

2. The application significantly fails to disclose that the nearest intersection with Stanhope Road from the site is at Rosebery Road, Killara and that Rosebery Road forms the eastern boundary through to Wattle Street, Killara, and beyond, of the Heritage Conservation Area known as the “Springdale Conservation Area”, the southern boundary of which through to Werona Avenue and the North-South Railway line is Stanhope Road.

The Springdale Conservation Area is described in C21 (KLEP 2015) as follows:

“The Springdale Conservation Area has historic significance as part of the Jane Bradley’s 1839 160 acre land grant whose boundaries are evident through the following streets: Karanga Avenue, Locksley Street, Rosebery Road and Stanhope Rd. The area has aesthetic value for the high number of intact Federation and Inter-war buildings, as well as significant twentieth century development. The area is characterised by medium to large lots with well-established gardens. ...”

The Heritage Map (Figure 6), included in the application, fails to show one of the most significant and beautiful part of the whole of Killara to the west of Kardella Avenue.

The EIS itself says of the Existing Visual Context (page 90):

“The current visual environment around the site is characterized by “leavy” streets with mature tree canopy and landscaping, grand homes, and Federation-style architecture on large plots further contributing to the natural and varied neighbourhood character. ...”

The current spread out low-rise residences at the site are inconspicuous. Whilst the Visual Impact Assessment seeks to present a different point of view, the 9 large high-rise buildings with elevators and floors of car parking spaces underneath, if permitted, would scar the landscape. They would be horribly conspicuous and entirely out-of place in the leafy suburb of Killara. Presumably all of the observations of urbane design group were at ground level.

My surmise is that the buildings will all be apparent from my large front upstairs balcony both in the daytime and when their lights are on at night.

3. Why should buildings that are so incompatible be permitted?

Why should the Ku-ring-gai LEP be disregarded for one site in its R2 zone, to the detriment of all its neighbours and nearby residents?

How can it be said that compliance with development standards is unreasonable?

Why should a subdivision of the site be permitted to allow a business offering residential accommodation to be divorced from a business that provides residential care facilities for the occupants of that accommodation?

The two areas of activity need to remain united on the one property?

Somewhere down the track, maybe in 20 years' time, "seniors" will become elderly and need to have residential care facilities available for them, as current residents already do. Splitting the property into two will have dire consequences if the Lots 1 and 2 in the proposed subdivision fall into different ownership.

4. How will residents fare when blackouts require residents to climb 5 or 6 storeys to reach their penthouses?