

ANNEXURE B - FIGURES

Submission by Scott Savage, Northcote Road, Lindfield NSW 2070
SSD-88004956 - Lourdes Retirement Village, 95-97 Stanhope Road, Killara

- Figure 1** The existing view from my lounge room
- Figure 2** The existing view from my bedroom
- Figure 3** What is on the site, and what is not
- Figure 4** Indicative view from my lounge room, prepared by me
- Figure 5** Detail of Figure 4, enlarged, without the outlines marked
- Figure 6** Indicative view from my bedroom, prepared by me
- Figure 7** Detail of Figure 6, enlarged, without the outlines marked

Figures 1, 2 and 3 are unaltered photographs with annotation only. Nothing has been added to them.

Figures 4 to 7 are indicative. They are not survey-verified photomontages and I do not put them forward as though they were. Every assumption is written on each image, including the two I cannot verify. The direction and scale are measured rather than estimated, using a mobile telephone tower 354m from the house at a bearing of 26.4 degrees true as a fixed reference; the two views are calibrated independently of one another and agree.

All photographs were taken by me on 30 July 2026 with a Pixel 10 at 24mm equivalent, 4000 x 3000 pixels. Camera position, time and lens are stated on each figure. Image metadata is available on request.

I ask that the applicant be required to produce survey-verified photomontages from these viewpoints. It holds the survey, the 3D model, and the camera-verification method set out in Appendix B of its own Visual Impact Assessment. Its 19 assessed viewpoints are all public domain views; no private residence was assessed.



Buildings E, F and H proposed on this ridge

mobile tower (354m) - survey reference

FIGURE 1 - The existing view from my lounge room

9:46am, 30 July 2026. Pixel 10, 24mm equivalent, 4000 x 3000px. Nothing has been added to this photograph.

The ridge marked in red is where Buildings E, F and H are proposed, 261m to 290m from the house. It carries continuous canopy today and no building is visible above or through it.

The mobile tower circled in blue is the fixed reference used to establish the direction of view: 354m from the house at a bearing of 26.4 degrees true, which places this camera's optical axis at 20.3 degrees true.

The applicant assessed 19 viewpoints, every one a public road, verge, footpath or oval. Its nearest viewpoint on this side of the valley is 337m from the site boundary - further from the site than my house is from Building H.



Buildings E, F and H proposed on this slope

mobile tower (354m) - survey reference

FIGURE 2 - The existing view from my bedroom
11:37am, 30 July 2026. Pixel 10, 24mm equivalent, 4000 x 3000px. Nothing has been added to this photograph. Every room of my house looks out on this. The slope marked in red is where Buildings E, F and H are proposed. The same mobile tower is the reference; in this frame it places the optical axis at 17.8 degrees true. This is a separate calibration from Figure 1 - a different room, a different framing - and the two agree with one another.



THE SITE - 366 of 620 living trees to go; the rest becomes Asset Protection Zone



INTERVENING BUSHLAND - not part of the site, not proposed for removal



FIGURE 3 - What is on the site, and what is not

Same photograph as Figure 1, nothing added. I have marked the two separately because they are easily run together. The GREEN band is bushland in the valley between my house and the site. It is not part of this application and no tree in it is proposed for removal. It is a large part of why the site is screened from me today.

The RED band is the site, at 261m to 365m. Within it the Arboricultural Impact Assessment proposes removal of 366 of the 620 living trees - 59 per cent - of which only 16 are attributed to bushfire; 116 are for buildings, 58 for roads, 33 for grading and 127 for landscaping. The trees remaining in the southern part of that band, nearest me, fall within the Asset Protection Zone and must be thinned and maintained to Rural Fire Service standards in perpetuity.

The applicant's visual case relies on canopy in both bands, and measures the canopy in neither: its Visual Impact Assessment contains no canopy heights, no tree removal figures, and no assessment of the site once the APZ is managed.



FIGURE 4 - Indicative view from my lounge room, prepared by me

Photograph as Figure 1 (9:46am, 30 July 2026). Nothing about the trees has been altered.
 DIRECTION is measured, not estimated. The mobile tower circled in blue sits 354m from the house at a bearing of 26.4 degrees true, taken off a north-up aerial. Its position in this frame fixes the camera's optical axis at 20.3 degrees true and the camera tilt at 1.9 degrees down. The buildings, whose bearings came off the same aerial, then fall where shown. Only the eastern part of the site clears the trees in my own garden; the western buildings sit behind them.
 DISTANCE: the nearest part of Building H is 261m from the house. The blocks shown are at 261m, 273m and 290m.
 SCALE follows from those distances and the photograph's own 2667-pixel focal length: 13.5m of facade is 138px at 261m.
 HEIGHT uses the applicant's own levels - Building H roof RL +115.80, Lower Ground 1 RL +102.30 (PBD Architects DA205). The yellow line is the roof. The two things I cannot verify are my floor level, taken as RL +96, and the tower mast, taken as 30m. A 40m mast would move the buildings about 75 pixels lower in the frame.
 The render is the applicant's own and shows FOUR levels; the EIS at s4.7.5 describes Building H as having FIVE.
 I ask that the applicant be required to produce survey-verified photomontages from these viewpoints.



FIGURE 5 - Detail of Figure 4, enlarged 2x, without the outlines marked

The three blocks are at 290m, 273m and 261m. The mobile tower reference is circled in blue at right. Indicative only. Method and assumptions exactly as set out under Figure 4.

INDICATIVE ONLY - NOT A SURVEY-VERIFIED PHOTOMONTAGE



yellow line = roof RL +115.80

mobile tower (354m)

290m

273m

261m

FIGURE 6 - Indicative view from my bedroom, prepared by me

Photograph as Figure 2 (11:37am, 30 July 2026). Nothing about the trees has been altered.
DIRECTION is measured, not estimated. The mobile tower circled in blue sits 354m from the house at a bearing of 26.4 degrees true, taken off a north-up aerial. Its position in this frame fixes the camera's optical axis at 17.8 degrees true and the camera tilt at 3.8 degrees up. The buildings, whose bearings came off the same aerial, then fall where shown. Only the eastern part of the site clears the trees in my own garden; the western buildings sit behind them.
DISTANCE: the nearest part of Building H is 261m from the house. The blocks shown are at 261m, 273m and 290m.
SCALE follows from those distances and the photograph's own 2667-pixel focal length: 13.5m of facade is 138px at 261m.
HEIGHT uses the applicant's own levels - Building H roof RL +115.80, Lower Ground 1 RL +102.30 (PBD Architects DA205). The yellow line is the roof. The two things I cannot verify are my floor level, taken as RL +96, and the tower mast, taken as 30m. A 40m mast would move the buildings about 75 pixels lower in the frame.
The render is the applicant's own and shows FOUR levels; the EIS at s4.7.5 describes Building H as having FIVE.
I ask that the applicant be required to produce survey-verified photomontages from these viewpoints.



mobile tower (354m)

FIGURE 7 - Detail of Figure 6, enlarged, without the outlines marked

Three of the nine proposed buildings at 290m, 273m and 261m from the house.
Indicative only. Method and assumptions exactly as set out under Figure 4.