

SEARS Requirement	Legal Requirement (SSD Policy/ SEARs)	EIS/Appendix Gap	Community Impact	Community Ask
<b>Building Height &amp; Density</b>	Must demonstrate context-sensitive design and minimise adverse impacts. (SEARs, SSD Policy).	<p><b>Density Analysis:</b> The EIS and Annexure state that no new buildings are proposed as part of the demolition/remediation works, so there is no assessment of building height, density, or compliance with planning controls at this stage.</p> <p><b>Deferrals:</b> These matters are deferred to the Main Works SSDA. No information or indicative analysis is provided on the likely future built form, height, or density, even though these are key community concerns and relevant to understanding the <i>cumulative impact</i> of the project.</p> <p><b>Excessive Height rationale:</b> The EIS provides no justification for the proposed height of up to 42 metres (38 storeys). This omission is significant such scale is clearly inconsistent with the surrounding context and raises serious planning concerns. There is no assessment of lower-scale built forms that could achieve project objectives while better integrating with the existing urban fabric. This lack of analysis undermines the principle of least-impact development. The EIS fails to address cumulative impacts, including overshadowing, wind effects, and visual bulk on existing residents. These omissions deny the community and decision-makers a complete understanding of the project's true implications.</p>	Excessive height and visual bulk will overshadow homes and public spaces, eroding amenity and creating a sense of enclosure. Wind tunneling and loss of mature trees will diminish outdoor comfort and livability. Increased traffic and congestion, coupled with inadequate infrastructure capacity, will strain roads, public transport, and essential services.	<p>The EIS should provide clarity on the future height and density of the development, including whether bonuses or exceptions will apply, and how these will affect local amenity, traffic, and infrastructure.</p> <p>The EIS should assess alternate lower scale built forms that respects the local context and the traditions that define our neighbourhood – which is clearly not high rise.</p>
<b>Visual Impact</b>	Provide visual analysis for all phases (SEARs page	<b>Visual Analysis:</b> The EIS dismisses visual impact as irrelevant during demolition and remediation, citing no new buildings. This position is problematic by omitting any visual analysis,	Community is likely to be impacted by the visual change resulting from the removal of existing buildings and trees,	The EIS should include visual representations (e.g photomontages, perspectives) of both the interim (post-

SEARS Requirement	Legal Requirement (SSD Policy/ SEARs)	EIS/Appendix Gap	Community Impact	Community Ask
	3 Visual Impact).	<p>photomontages, or perspectives, the EIS denies stakeholders a clear understanding of the immediate and transitional impacts.</p> <p><b>Interim Assessment:</b> There is a complete absence of assessment for interim visual impacts, such as cleared sites, demolition scars, and loss of mature trees. The failure to provide indicative visuals of the future built form significantly limits community transparency and informed engagement.</p> <p><b>Visual Integration:</b> The EIS neglects to address how the proposed development will integrate with its surroundings. This omission disregards context sensitive design principles and undermines confidence in the project's ability to harmonize with the existing landscape.</p>	and the interim appearance of a cleared or remediated site.	demolition) and future (post-development) appearance of the site, to better understand the project's impact on local character and amenity.
<b>Amenity (Noise, Dust, Wind, Privacy)</b>	Must assess and mitigate all amenity impacts at every stage (SEARs).	<p><b>No Demolition Phase Assessment:</b> The EIS completely fails to assess demolition-phase impacts, including dust, noise, wind, and loss of privacy. There are no enforceable mitigation measures for these effects, leaving the community exposed to significant disruption without clear protections.</p> <p><b>Dust:</b> While the EIS refers to generic dust control measures such as water spraying and covering stockpiles, it defers actual planning to a future Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) that is not provided. This approach is unacceptable deferring critical mitigation denies</p>	The proposed works will impose significant adverse impacts on the community, particularly vulnerable individuals such as children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing health conditions. Extended exposure to dust, noise, and disruption during demolition and remediation phases risks exacerbating asthma, stress, and sleep loss, while daily routines may be severely affected for months or even years. Dust management is deferred to a future Construction Environmental Management Plan, leaving homes, schools, and businesses exposed without enforceable safeguards. The	<p>The EIS must provide clear, site-specific plans for managing noise, dust, and other amenity impacts during demolition not vague commitments to future plans.</p> <p>Residents expect a thorough assessment and mitigation strategy for privacy and wind impacts resulting from tree and building removal.</p> <p>As a community, we are entitled to transparent communication about the timing, duration, and</p>

SEARS Requirement	Legal Requirement (SSD Policy/ SEARs)	EIS/Appendix Gap	Community Impact	Community Ask
		<p>transparency and accountability at the approval stage.</p> <p><b>Wind and Privacy:</b> The EIS dismisses wind and privacy impacts as irrelevant because no new buildings are proposed at this stage. This reasoning is flawed. Demolition and site clearing create interim conditions that can severely affect privacy and wind exposure for adjacent properties, yet these impacts remain unassessed and unmanaged.</p>	<p>removal of mature trees and existing structures will compromise privacy and alter wind conditions for adjacent properties, yet these impacts remain unassessed. Combined with the temporary loss of amenity and increased inconvenience, these omissions represent a failure to adequately protect community health, wellbeing, and quality of life.</p>	<p>mitigation of disruptive works, which this EIS fails to deliver.</p> <p>Above all, meaningful engagement is essential, including a clear process for raising and resolving complaints, and ensuring all communication is accessible and responsive.</p>
<b>Social Impact</b>	<p>Must prepare Social Impact Assessment (SIA) if significant impacts are identified (SEARs).</p>	<p>The EIS fails to comply with guideline expectations by omitting a full Social Impact Assessment and providing no evidence that community feedback was meaningfully considered. It is implausible that only one impact was identified, leaving residents without adequate protection or transparency. This omission undermines informed decision-making and disregards the requirement for a comprehensive assessment of social and community consequences.</p>	<p>The EIS minimizes its obligations by acknowledging only minor, temporary disruption while ignoring broader social impacts such as the permanent loss of green space, significant visual change, and cumulative effects on amenity and community wellbeing. This narrow approach fails to meet guideline expectations for a <i>comprehensive social impact assessment</i> and leaves residents without a clear understanding of the full consequences of the development.</p>	<p>The community expects the EIS to recognize that residents have the right to request tailored requirements for this project. These requirements must address cumulative impacts on infrastructure, transport, health services, education, visual amenity, public space, and access. Residents are entitled to proactive measures that safeguard livability and ensure equitable outcomes. This includes transparent planning, enforceable mitigation strategies, and meaningful engagement that respects community needs and provides clear channels for input and accountability.</p>

SEARS Requirement	Legal Requirement (SSD Policy/ SEARs)	EIS/Appendix Gap	Community Impact	Community Ask
<p><b>Noise &amp; Vibration</b></p>	<p>Must provide enforceable, site-specific mitigation and monitoring (SEARs, EPA Guidelines).</p>	<p>The EIS fails to meet guideline expectations and leaves the community without enforceable protections:</p> <p><b>Deferred CNVMP:</b> The EIS defers the Construction Noise &amp; Vibration Management Plan to a later stage, rather than providing a detailed, site-specific and enforceable plan at approval. This approach undermines transparency and accountability.</p> <p><b>No Effective Mitigation:</b> The EIS predicts exceedances yet offers only generic, non-binding mitigation measures. There are no enforceable commitments to protect residents from high-noise demolition activities.</p> <p><b>No Complaints Process:</b> There is no clear, documented process for community complaints or response protocols for exceedances, denying residents a mechanism for redress.</p> <p><b>Operational Noise Assessment Missing:</b> No operational noise assessment is provided, and while not strictly required for demolition, this should be clarified. There is also no plan for respite periods during high-noise works, exposing residents to sleep disturbance and mental health impacts.</p> <p><b>No Evidence of Consultation:</b> The EIS provides no evidence of community consultation on noise impacts or how feedback shaped mitigation strategies, breaching principles of meaningful engagement.</p>	<p>Residents working from home will face prolonged disruption from construction noise, severely impacting their ability to work productively.</p> <p>Students at nearby schools – Victoria Avenue and St Ambrose may experience interruptions to learning due to elevated noise levels, undermining educational outcomes. <i>Some demolition and remediation activities are predicted to exceed recommended noise limits</i>, causing significant interference with daily routines and eroding amenity for local residents. By acknowledging only minor, temporary disruption, the EIS leaves the community defenseless against intolerable impacts on health, wellbeing, and quality of life.</p>	<p>The community expects enforceable commitments to minimize disruption and protect amenity. Specifically, residents require:</p> <p><b>Quiet Periods:</b> Guaranteed noise-free periods during exams, evenings, and overnight to protect health and learning.</p> <p><b>Advance Notice:</b> Clear, timely communication of high-noise activities such as jackhammering or demolition.</p> <p><b>Physical Mitigation:</b> Installation of additional noise barriers or acoustic insulation for homes and classrooms.</p> <p><b>Transparency:</b> Real-time noise and vibration monitoring data made publicly accessible.</p> <p><b>Direct Contact:</b> A dedicated, responsive contact for urgent complaints and rapid resolution of exceedances.</p>

SEARS Requirement	Legal Requirement (SSD Policy/ SEARs)	EIS/Appendix Gap	Community Impact	Community Ask
<p><b>Contamination &amp; Remediation</b></p>	<p>Must ensure site is safe for future use, with validation and monitoring (SEARs, SSD Policy).</p>	<p><b>Lack of Integrated Assessment:</b> The geotechnical report (Appendix N) explicitly states on page 2: <i>“testing for possible soil or groundwater contamination was outside the agreed scope of the investigation.”</i> This admission breaches SEARs minimum criteria and fails to address how contaminated soils, acid sulfate soils, or groundwater will be managed during excavation and shoring.</p> <p><b>No Joint Risk Assessment:</b> There is no integrated analysis of how geotechnical risks such as stability, vibration, and groundwater ingress interact with contamination and remediation activities, particularly for deep excavations and basement construction.</p> <p><b>Deferred Waste Classification:</b> While the geotechnical report recommends waste classification for excavated soils, it does not coordinate with the Remedial Action Plan (RAP) or waste management plan, leaving contaminated material management fragmented and unenforceable.</p> <p><b>Acid Sulfate Soils:</b> Both the RAP and geotechnical report acknowledge acid sulfate soils, yet no integrated Acid Sulfate Soils Management Plan is provided. Responsibilities between geotechnical and contamination management remain unclear.</p> <p><b>Groundwater Management:</b> Groundwater monitoring is recommended, but there is no integrated plan for managing contaminated</p>	<p>The absence of an integrated geotechnical and contamination risk assessment creates unacceptable uncertainty about safety. Residents are left fearing excavation instability, ground movement, and the spread of contaminated soil or groundwater into homes and gardens. Without coordinated controls, toxic substances could migrate offsite, threatening local health, waterways, and food sources. Vulnerable individuals—children, the elderly, and those with health conditions—face heightened risks of serious illness, including cancer, birth defects, and chronic disease. Compounding this, the EIS offers no clear communication on how vibration, dust, groundwater, or soil movement will be managed, nor who will be accountable if harm occurs. This failure leaves the community exposed and defenseless against hazards that demand rigorous, transparent planning and enforceable protections.</p>	<p>The community demands an <b>integrated, enforceable risk management plan</b>, independently reviewed and certified by a qualified site auditor. This plan must clearly demonstrate how geotechnical and contamination/remediation risks will be jointly managed throughout all site works including excavation, groundwater control, and soil movement. It must set out clear lines of responsibility, robust monitoring and reporting protocols, and be made publicly available before any works commence, in full compliance with SEARs and statutory obligations.</p>

SEARS Requirement	Legal Requirement (SSD Policy/ SEARs)	EIS/Appendix Gap	Community Impact	Community Ask
		<p>groundwater during excavation and remediation, creating a compliance and environmental risk.</p> <p><b>No Validation or Contingency:</b> The EIS provides no clear criteria for validation, ongoing monitoring, or contingency planning for unexpected contamination, leaving the project vulnerable to uncontrolled hazards.</p>		
<b>Hazards &amp; Emergency Risks</b>	<p>Must assess and manage all hazards and risks (SEARs).</p>	<p><b>Material Management / Integration of Hazardous Waste:</b>  The Demolition Waste Management Plan (DWMP) does not address hazardous materials management, despite SEARs requiring a comprehensive approach to all waste streams. On page 7, paragraph 2.3, the DWMP explicitly states:</p> <p><i>“The management of any hazardous materials is not addressed in this report. This report should not be relied upon for any detail regarding hazardous materials.”</i></p> <p>This admission confirms hazardous waste management is not integrated into the demolition waste strategy, which is inconsistent with SEARs and unacceptable from a compliance perspective.</p> <p><b>Deferred Hazardous Waste Detail:</b>  The DWMP defers all detail on hazardous materials to the Hazardous Materials Survey but fails to integrate or summarize how hazardous waste will be managed as part of the overall demolition waste strategy. This fragmented</p>	<p>The lack of a clear, integrated hazardous waste management plan heightens community fears about health, safety, and environmental risks during demolition. Residents remain uncertain about how asbestos, lead, and other toxic materials will be safely handled, contained, and disposed of, creating unacceptable exposure that could harm families, contaminate gardens, and pollute waterways. This omission erodes trust and leaves vulnerable individuals such as the elderly and those reliant on weekly service visits at real risk, especially with no emergency response plan for spills, fire, or runoff.</p>	<p>The community demands transparency and enforceable safeguards, including an independent, auditor certified plan that integrates hazardous waste and geotechnical risk management, sets out clear responsibilities, monitoring, and reporting, and is made publicly available before works commence, in full compliance with SEARs and statutory obligations.</p>

SEARS Requirement	Legal Requirement (SSD Policy/ SEARs)	EIS/Appendix Gap	Community Impact	Community Ask
		<p>approach undermines enforceability and accountability.</p> <p><b>No Emergency Response Plan:</b> There is no emergency response plan for demolition-phase risks such as fire, explosion, or chemical spills. This omission leaves the community and workers exposed to unmanaged safety hazards.</p>		
<p><b>Community Engagement</b></p>	<p>Must show how feedback changed the proposal and resolve community concerns (SEARs page 2 Engagement, SSD Guidelines Section 5.2 Engagement).</p>	<p>The EIS demonstrates a systemic failure to meet procedural fairness and genuine engagement obligations:</p> <p><b>Transparent and Responsive Consultation:</b> Listing engagement activities is insufficient. The EIS must show how community feedback influenced the proposal—particularly on critical issues such as height, density, and amenity. No evidence of this exists.</p> <p><b>Consideration of Unresolved Issues:</b> The EIS omits a summary of unresolved community concerns and provides no explanation of how these will be managed or why they are disregarded. This omission breaches principles of transparency and accountability.</p> <p><b>Incomplete Record of Community Input:</b> I have retained a full record of resident concerns, which can be provided to the Department. The EIS publishes only a curated subset of queries (see Table 11 – Stakeholder Views), omitting the full scope of feedback. This selective disclosure misrepresents community engagement.</p>	<p>Community voices are not genuinely considered when feedback fails to influence demolition methodology, mitigation measures, or ongoing engagement processes.</p> <p>Residents with limited English proficiency or accessibility needs are effectively excluded if materials and consultations are not provided in multiple languages and accessible formats. <i>I have contacted both the proponent and DPHI on several occasions regarding accessibility concerns, yet these issues remain unresolved.</i></p> <p>Selective publication of feedback or restricted access to information undermines trust and breaches procedural fairness.</p> <p>These gaps deny the community meaningful participation and transparency, leaving vulnerable groups</p>	<p><b>Transparent Engagement:</b> The community demands a transparent, ongoing engagement process, including a public register of all feedback and developer responses, with clear explanations for how each issue is addressed or, if not, why not.</p> <p><b>Multilingual and Accessible Information:</b> All project information, notifications, and engagement materials must be provided in key community languages and accessible formats, with interpreters available at public meetings. CALD considerations are non-negotiable.</p> <p><b>Inclusive Participation:</b> Targeted engagement is required for vulnerable and hard-to-reach groups, including</p>

SEARS Requirement	Legal Requirement (SSD Policy/ SEARs)	EIS/Appendix Gap	Community Impact	Community Ask
		<p><b>No Ongoing Engagement or Complaints Process:</b> The EIS fails to outline a clear, transparent process for ongoing engagement and complaints resolution, relying instead on one-off consultation. This denies residents procedural fairness and a mechanism for redress.</p> <p><b>Procedural Fairness Gap:</b> There is no evidence that feedback influenced demolition methodology or mitigation measures. No summary of unresolved issues or management strategies is provided, leaving the community without enforceable protections.</p>	<p>already at risk from health, safety, and amenity impacts without a voice in decisions that profoundly affect their lives.</p>	<p>culturally and linguistically diverse residents, people with disabilities, and renters, ensuring no voices are excluded.</p> <p><b>Independent Oversight:</b> An independent community liaison or ombudsman must oversee the engagement process and complaints resolution to guarantee accountability and procedural fairness.</p>
<p><b>Transport &amp; Traffic</b></p>	<p>Must provide robust, enforceable mitigation for all construction impacts (SEARs).</p>	<p><b>No Transport Impact Assessment (TIA):</b> Only a Preliminary Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) is provided. There is no standalone TIA, no quantitative assessment of network performance, intersection capacity, or safety impacts. This omission prevents the consent authority from determining whether traffic impacts are manageable.</p> <p><b>Lack of Quantitative Analysis and Modelling:</b> The CTMP does not assess pedestrian or cyclist safety during demolition. This is particularly concerning given the proximity to schools and commuters from public transport.</p> <p>Traffic modelling <i>underestimates trip generation</i>, particularly during peak hours, and proposed intersection upgrades may not fully address projected volumes. The modelling does not take</p>	<p>The absence of a comprehensive Transport Impact Assessment and robust traffic controls will have severe consequences for the community.</p> <p>Local streets risk becoming gridlocked, causing significant delays for residents and emergency vehicles, while inadequate safety assessment leaves children and other vulnerable pedestrians exposed to danger walking to school or through the area.</p> <p>Emergency access is not guaranteed during peak construction periods, creating unacceptable safety risks. Cumulative impacts from overlapping projects remain unaddressed, compounding congestion and hazards.</p>	<p><b>Reduce Density and Building Heights:</b> Lower density is essential to directly reduce traffic generation and congestion risks.</p> <p><b>Full Transport Impact Assessment (TIA):</b> Require a comprehensive TIA with quantitative modelling of network performance, intersection capacity, and safety impacts before approval.</p> <p><b>Public Exhibition of Final CTMP:</b> Demand that the final Construction Traffic Management Plan be publicly</p>

SEARS Requirement	Legal Requirement (SSD Policy/ SEARs)	EIS/Appendix Gap	Community Impact	Community Ask
		<p>into account the increase crowds during Olympic Park events, including concerts, holiday programs where many commuters would ordinarily park and walk through Bicentennial Park.</p> <p>The EIS provides no robust guarantees that local roads will be protected from congestion.</p> <p>Appendix L offers only qualitative statements and general vehicle numbers, with no intersection modelling, queue analysis, or assessment of impacts on bus/train services or active transport. Without quantitative evidence, the consent authority cannot make an informed decision.</p> <p><b>Inadequate Cumulative Impact Assessment:</b> Appendix L acknowledges other projects but fails to include cumulative traffic modelling or a coordination plan, leaving the community exposed to compounded congestion and safety risks.</p>	<p>Residents have no formal avenue to report or resolve traffic-related issues, as the CTMP lacks monitoring, enforcement, and complaints processes.</p> <p>The failure to provide transparency or allow community review of final traffic arrangements undermines accountability and trust</p>	<p>exhibited and reviewed by relevant agencies for transparency and accountability.</p> <p><b>Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety:</b> Insist on robust safety measures for vulnerable users especially children and elderly during all construction phases.</p> <p><b>Monitoring and Complaints Process:</b> Require a formal, enforceable process for monitoring traffic impacts, compliance, and rapid resolution of community complaints.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impact Assessment:</b> Mandate full assessment and mitigation of cumulative traffic impacts, including coordination with other local projects.</p> <p><b>Guaranteed Emergency Access:</b> Ensure emergency vehicle access at all times, supported by detailed contingency planning and enforcement mechanisms.</p>
<b>Water, Flood, &amp; Erosion</b>	Must provide detailed, phase-	<b>Incomplete Drainage and Water Quality Assessment:</b> Appendix G provides only a concept plan, lacking	The failure to provide robust drainage, contamination, and emergency response planning exposes the community to	The community demands mandatory, detailed, council-approved drainage, flood, and

SEARS Requirement	Legal Requirement (SSD Policy/ SEARs)	EIS/Appendix Gap	Community Impact	Community Ask
	<p>specific mitigation and contingency (SEARs).</p>	<p>detailed design, hydraulic calculations, or confirmation of council approval. This omission prevents proper evaluation of flood and water quality risks.</p> <p><b>No Evidence of Council Consultation or Approval:</b> There is no correspondence or documentation confirming council review or approval of the proposed drainage strategy, undermining transparency and compliance.</p> <p><b>No Detailed Emergency Response Plan:</b> The EIS does not include a site-specific emergency response plan for flood events during demolition and remediation, leaving the community and workers exposed to unmanaged safety risks.</p> <p><b>Inadequate Erosion and Sediment Control Detail:</b> The EIS lists generic erosion and sediment control measures but fails to provide site-specific details, monitoring protocols, or contingency planning for heavy rainfall events. This gap increases the risk of sediment runoff into local waterways and properties.</p>	<p>unacceptable risks. Residents and properties may face unmanaged flooding during demolition due to the absence of interim flood modelling and emergency protocols.</p> <p>Inadequate drainage and sediment controls could allow polluted runoff to enter local waterways, harming public health and ecosystems, while the lack of groundwater monitoring raises the risk of toxic substances migrating offsite into Powells Creek and contaminating local water supplies.</p> <p>Acid sulfate soils remain unaddressed, risking acid generation that could damage infrastructure and ecosystems. Insufficient validation of imported fill creates the potential for recontamination, undermining the safety of future residents.</p> <p>Compounding these hazards, there is no public notification or reporting of remediation milestones or incidents, leaving the community uninformed and unable to respond.</p> <p>Gaps in waste tracking and auditing may lead to unlawful dumping of hazardous materials, and without long-term monitoring and independent auditing, residents could face ongoing exposure to harmful contaminants. These failures</p>	<p>erosion control plans for all phases of the project—not just post-development. These plans must include enforceable measures, monitoring protocols, and contingencies for heavy rainfall and flood events to protect homes, businesses, and public spaces.</p> <p>We also require a comprehensive, integrated Remediation Action Plan (RAP) that addresses acid sulfate soils, groundwater contamination, and long-term monitoring, with EPA and independent auditor sign-off to guarantee compliance and safety.</p> <p>Finally, the scale of development must be reconsidered. <i>Lower-density living is essential to ensure local roads, drainage systems, and environmental capacity are not overwhelmed</i>, and to safeguard the health, safety, and amenity of current and future residents.</p>

SEARS Requirement	Legal Requirement (SSD Policy/ SEARs)	EIS/Appendix Gap	Community Impact	Community Ask
			sacrifice community health, safety, and environmental integrity for expediency—an outcome that is unacceptable and contrary to SEARs and statutory obligations.	
<b>Trees &amp; Landscaping</b>	Must retain significant trees and manage landscape impacts (SEARs).	<p><b>Landscape Plan Deferred:</b> The EIS treats demolition/remediation as a separate stage and defers landscaping details to the Main Works SSDA. While common, this approach does <b>not satisfy SEARs</b>, which require a landscape plan at this stage to ensure continuity and amenity protection.</p> <p><b>Canopy Coverage Unclear:</b> Although the EIS and Appendix K provide data, they do not explicitly state the percentage of canopy to be retained during demolition/remediation, leaving uncertainty about compliance with urban canopy targets.</p> <p><b>Root Mapping Deferred:</b> Appendix K identifies areas requiring root mapping but defers actual investigation to pre-construction. This omission prevents early identification of tree retention feasibility and risks unnecessary loss of mature trees.</p> <p><b>Community Impact Ignored:</b> The EIS fails to assess the social and amenity impacts of tree loss and provides no evidence of community consultation specifically addressing trees, despite their significance to neighbourhood character and wellbeing.</p>	<p>The EIS fails to acknowledge the profound social and amenity consequences of tree loss, offering no detailed assessment and no evidence of genuine community consultation on this issue.</p> <p>Trees are not just landscaping—they provide shade, privacy, biodiversity, and a sense of place that defines neighborhood character. Their removal will strip the community of environmental quality and visual comfort, sacrificing livability for developer convenience. This disregard erodes trust, diminishes wellbeing, and ignores the voices of residents who value green space as essential to health, climate resilience, and quality of life.</p>	To fully comply with SEARs, the EIS should include a landscape plan (even if indicative), quantify canopy retention, and provide more detail on community consultation and impact regarding trees and landscaping.

SEARS Requirement	Legal Requirement (SSD Policy/ SEARs)	EIS/Appendix Gap	Community Impact	Community Ask
		<p><b>Tree Removal Numbers Inconsistent:</b>  The EIS and Appendix K state that 158 trees will be removed, but Appendix K notes some are “exempt” (not protected). The EIS does not clarify whether the 158 includes or excludes exempt trees, creating a potential legal issue and uncertainty about the actual number of protected trees to be removed. References to tree removal numbers are inconsistent across documents.</p>		