



## Greystanes SEL Concept Plan Consideration

Consideration of the proposed modification against the Greystanes SEL concept plan – including the concept plan approval as modified (MP 06\_0181) and the concept plan's Urban Design Plan – is provided in the following tables.

**Table E1: Greystanes SEL Concept Plan Approval Compliance**

No.	Clause	Project As Approved		Project As Proposed	
		Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EIS Reference	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / SEE Reference
<b>1</b>	<b>Development Description</b>				
(a)	Subdivision of the site into industrial and business park precincts;	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development is consistent with (and forms part of) the industrial and business park precincts as defined in the concept plan.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change to broad precincts.</li> </ul>
(b)	A maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 493,215m <sup>2</sup> across the industrial and business park precincts;	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The approved masterplan has a maximum GFA of 135,508m<sup>2</sup>, which is more than the masterplan approved in MOD 5 and more than the originally approved QuarryWEST project (127,765m<sup>2</sup>).</li> <li>Together with the QuarryEAST site approved GFA (ie. 250,607m<sup>2</sup>), the total proposed GFA across the DEXUS Estate (including Precinct F) is 386,115m<sup>2</sup>, well within the allowable GFA..</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed masterplan has a maximum GFA of 135,938m<sup>2</sup>, which is slightly more than the masterplan approved in MOD 6 and more than the originally approved QuarryWEST project (127,765m<sup>2</sup>).</li> <li>Together with the QuarryEAST site approved GFA (ie. 250,607m<sup>2</sup>), the total proposed GFA across the DEXUS Estate (including Precinct F) is 386,545m<sup>2</sup>, well within the allowable GFA.</li> </ul>



No.	Clause	Project As Approved		Project As Proposed	
		Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EIS Reference	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / SEE Reference
(c)	The following maximum GFA for each broad land use:	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The approved masterplan has a maximum GFA in the business precinct of 71,885m<sup>2</sup>, which complies with the maximum GFA</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed masterplan has a maximum GFA in the business precinct of 72,315m<sup>2</sup>, which complies with the maximum GFA.</li> </ul>
	(i) A maximum of 97,500m <sup>2</sup> shall be developed for business park uses.				
	(ii) A maximum of 6,500m <sup>2</sup> shall be developed for the purposes of service retail uses	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The approved masterplan does not involve any service retail uses.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
	(iii) A maximum of 5,000m <sup>2</sup> shall be developed for the purposes of hotel accommodation on Lot 75.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project does not involve development of a hotel on Lot 75 (warehouses are approved on this lot)</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
(d)	Despite the above, the total maximum floor space ration (FSR) shall not exceed:	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed masterplan has an overall FSR of 0.52:1 in the industrial precinct, with all individual buildings well below 0.75:1.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
	(i) 0.75:1 for development within the industrial precinct; and				
	(ii) 1:1 for development for the purposes of hotel accommodation on Lot 75.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project does not involve development of a hotel on Lot 75 (warehouses are approved on this lot)</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
(e)	Conceptual road design.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project road layout is generally consistent with the concept plan, maintaining the 3 key intersections with Prospect Highway (with the northern intersection to be extended into the site). The internal road layout is slightly different to that shown in the concept plan, although it provides a similar function.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>



No.	Clause	Project As Approved		Project As Proposed	
		Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EIS Reference	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / SEE Reference
(f)	Urban design, maximum height, landscape, open space and heritage design concepts outlined in “ <i>Greystanes Estate Southern Employment Lands Urban Design Plan</i> ” prepared by Turner Hughes Architects and dated September 2006 must be amended within 3 months of this approval.	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is generally consistent with the urban design, landscape, open space and heritage design concepts in the final Urban Design Plan (Issue J, July 2008) (see analysis in separate table below);</li> <li>However, the project involves minor departures from the development controls for streetscape, setbacks, building heights and landscape areas in some areas of the site;</li> <li>See Sections 4.3 and 6 of the original EIS.</li> </ul>	No (existing non-compliance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal remains generally consistent with the UDP (see analysis in separate table below) and the approved project, with no changes to the existing departures.</li> </ul>
(g)	Provision of car parking for the proposed office, retail, industrial and warehouse uses in accordance with the following rates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Office 1/40m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Retail 1/20m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Industrial 1/77m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Warehouse 1/300m<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has been designed to comply with the applicable car parking rates for all lots.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
(h)	Improved amenities and services which may include a mix of financial contributions and works in kind towards roads and community facilities (including provision of child care facilities) and dedication of certain infrastructure and facilities (as outlined in Statement of	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development contributions for the Greystanes SEL have been resolved by Boral as part of the concept plan approval.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>



No.	Clause	Project As Approved		Project As Proposed	
		Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EIS Reference	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / SEE Reference
	Commitment Nos. 21-24, Statement of Commitment Nos. 27-28 and Statement of Commitment No. 30).				
(i)	Staging in accordance with Staging Plan 108-SK60F dated 12 October 2007 prepared by Turner Hughes Architects.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staging would generally follow the approved staging plan, however Stages 5 and 6 have been swapped and may be developed concurrently;</li> <li>See Section 3.10 of the original EIS.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b><i>Development in Accordance with Approved Plans and Documentation</i></b>				
	The development shall generally be in accordance with the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental Assessment;</li> <li>Preferred Project Report, and the Statement of Commitments; and</li> <li>Urban Design Plan (as amended), except as otherwise provided by the conditions and Statement of Commitments.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is consistent with the approved plans and documentation, except as identified in the following table below.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b><i>Inconsistency between Plans and Documentation</i></b>				
	The conditions of the approval prevail in the event of any inconsistency with the plans and documentation in Modification 2 above	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b><i>Lapsing of Consent</i></b>				
	Approval shall lapse unless an application under the concept plan is submitted within 5 years.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>



No.	Clause	Project As Approved		Project As Proposed	
		Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EIS Reference	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / SEE Reference
<b>5</b>	<b><i>Business Park Precincts – Minimum Floor Plates</i></b>				
	Minimum floor plate of 3,000m <sup>2</sup> for buildings for the purpose of office premises within the business park precinct	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project does not involve development of standalone office premises in the business park precinct.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
<b>6</b>	<b><i>Industrial Precinct – Associated Office Space</i></b>				
	Within the industrial precinct: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a maximum of 50% of the GFA can be developed for associated office space where the site is within 400 metres of a bus stop; and</li> <li>a maximum of 30% of the GFA can be developed for associated office space where the site is more than 400 metres from a bus stop.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed masterplan has a maximum ancillary office component of 14% of the GFA per precinct.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
<b>7</b>	<b><i>Hotel Accommodation</i></b>				
	Requires additional analysis for development on the hotel site	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project does not involve development of a hotel on Lot 75 (warehouses are approved on this lot)</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
<b>8</b>	<b><i>Heritage – Site Interpretation Strategy</i></b>				
	Requires the project site interpretation strategy to retain a selected number of industrial heritage items.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project would be undertaken in a manner that is generally consistent with the site interpretation strategy</li> <li>See Section 6.6 of the EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change, apart from location change for jaw crusher and associated rocks.</li> </ul>



No.	Clause	<i>Project As Approved</i>		<i>Project As Proposed</i>	
		<i>Complies (Yes or No)</i>	<i>Comments / EIS Reference</i>	<i>Complies (Yes or No)</i>	<i>Comments / SEE Reference</i>
<b>9</b>	<b><i>Stormwater Management Plan</i></b>				
	Requires the project Stormwater Maintenance Management Plan to be prepared in consultation with relevant agencies	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project would be undertaken in a manner that it consistent with the Stormwater Management Plans</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
<b>10</b>	<b><i>Groundwater Management Plan</i></b>				
	Requires the project Groundwater Management Plan to be prepared in consultation with relevant agencies	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project would be undertaken in a manner that it consistent with the Groundwater Management Plan, as amended given the findings of the groundwater review</li> <li>See Section 6.2 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
<b>11</b>	<b><i>Ecologically Sustainable Design Principles</i></b>				
	Requires the ESD principles in the UDP to be revised within 3 months of the approval.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has been designed in accordance with the ESD principles in the revised UDP</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>



**Table E.2: Greystanes SEL Urban Design Plan Compliance**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Section / Development Control</b>	<b>Project As Approved</b>		<b>Project As Proposed</b>	
		<b>Complies (Yes or No)</b>	<b>Comments / EIS Reference</b>	<b>Complies (Yes or No)</b>	<b>Comments / EA Reference</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Concept</b>				
2.1	Concept	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is generally consistent with the concept, providing for a high standard industrial estate. However, the project provides for less business-related uses and generally larger warehouse facilities than indicated in the concept plan, in line with the current market demand for industrial and business space. The project also involves a minor amendment to the internal road layout, although it maintains the 3 key intersections with Prospect Highway;</li> <li>See Section 4.3 of the original EIS.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
2.2	Aims & objectives	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is consistent with the aims and objectives of the concept plan.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
2.3	Site Analysis	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>Urban Design Principals</b>				
3.1	Character	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is consistent with the desired character for the Greystanes SEL. The business-related uses are somewhat less than that envisaged in the concept plan, however DEXUS believes that the proposed mix of development in the business precinct is more aligned with current market demand than the more intensive vision in the concept plan. Further, the proposed warehouses are somewhat larger and less dense than that envisaged in the concept plan, in line with the market demand for industrial facilities in western Sydney.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>



<i>ID</i>	<i>Section / Development Control</i>	<i>Project As Approved</i>		<i>Project As Proposed</i>	
		<i>Complies (Yes or No)</i>	<i>Comments / EIS Reference</i>	<i>Complies (Yes or No)</i>	<i>Comments / EA Reference</i>
3.2	Land Uses	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is generally consistent with the proposed landuses in the concept plan (warehousing and distribution and service retail uses). However, as outlined above the proposed masterplan provides for less business-related uses and generally larger warehouse facilities than indicated in the concept plan, in line with the current market demand for industrial and business space.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
3.3	Transport Infrastructure Overview	Yes	<p><i>Roads</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project road layout is generally consistent with the concept plan, maintaining the 3 key intersections with Reconciliation Road. The internal road layout is slightly different to that shown in the concept plan, although it provides a similar function. The main differences are (1) the northern intersection has been extended into the site, forming a short cul-de-sac access; and (2) the internal road to the north of Basalt Road has been removed and replaced by a minor access road which is proposed to remain privately-owned.</li> </ul> <p><i>Transitway</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is noted that the Prospect Highway corridor was reduced in 06_0181 MOD 2 from 50 metres to 35 metres, with the transitway corridor reduced from 25 metres to 10 metres.</li> <li>The project does not affect the layout or function of the transitway.</li> </ul>	Yes	<p><i>Roads</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul> <p><i>Transitway</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul> <p><i>Pedestrian Network</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul> <p><i>Bicycle Network</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>





ID	Section / Development Control	Project As Approved		Project As Proposed	
		Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EIS Reference	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference
			<i>Pedestrian Network</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project includes pedestrian facilities consistent with the concept plan.</li> </ul> <i>Bicycle Network</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project does not affect the layout or function of the transitway corridor in which a cycleway is proposed.</li> </ul>		
3.4	Subdivision	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is generally consistent with the subdivision plan in the concept plan, however the lot sizes are larger than shown in the concept plan (the concept plan acknowledged that its subdivision layout provides for flexibility and consolidation to meet the needs of end-users).</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change, apart from minor internal lot boundary adjustment.</li> </ul>
3.5	Indicative Built Area	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is generally consistent with the indicative built area in the concept plan, however the project provides for less business-related uses and generally larger warehouse facilities than indicated in the concept plan, in line with the current market demand for industrial and business space in western Sydney.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>



<b>ID</b>	<b>Section / Development Control</b>	<b>Project As Approved</b>		<b>Project As Proposed</b>	
		<b>Complies (Yes or No)</b>	<b>Comments / EIS Reference</b>	<b>Complies (Yes or No)</b>	<b>Comments / EA Reference</b>
3.6	Streetscape	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is generally consistent with the streetscape in the concept plan, however the east-west 'Basalt Road' road would be constructed largely within a 20.5 metre corridor, rather than the 30 metre 'Estate Boulevard' layout as shown in the concept plan. A small section of 30 metre corridor would be constructed adjacent Reconciliation Road to match the corridor width on Basalt Road (East) and to act as a key estate entry marker. It is considered that the reduction in road corridor width over the remainder of Basalt Road (West) is justified, given that the masterplan involves development of warehouses and distribution centres in this area of the estate rather than the business-related uses envisaged in the concept plan.</li> <li>See Section 4.3 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	No (existing non-compliance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
3.7	Stormwater Management Concept	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is consistent with the stormwater management concept, with minor amendments to the location of bio-retention basins, and layout of the internal pipe network in accordance with the revised internal road layout;</li> <li>See Section 6.2 of the original EIS.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed modification has been designed to be consistent with the stormwater management concept.</li> </ul>
3.8	Groundwater Management Concept	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is consistent with the groundwater management concept, as amended given the groundwater review</li> <li>See Section 6.2 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>



<b>ID</b>	<b>Section / Development Control</b>	<b>Project As Approved</b>		<b>Project As Proposed</b>	
		<b>Complies (Yes or No)</b>	<b>Comments / EIS Reference</b>	<b>Complies (Yes or No)</b>	<b>Comments / EA Reference</b>
3.9	Services	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is consistent with the servicing strategy in the concept plan, with minor amendments to the layout in accordance with the revised internal road layout.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change (apart from minor internal amendments to accommodate revised masterplan layout).</li> </ul>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>General Site Controls</b>				
4.0.2	Ecological Sustainable Development Principles	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All ESD principles of the concept plan have been adopted for the project, insofar as they are relevant.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
4.0.3	Landscaping	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project landscape masterplan has been designed in a manner that is consistent with the UDP landscape concept plan;</li> <li>See Section 6.1 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant change.</li> </ul>
4.0.4	External Materials and Colours	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed external materials and colours are consistent with the UDP</li> <li>See Section 3.4 and 6.1 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant change.</li> </ul>
4.0.5	Access, Parking and Loading	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has been designed in a manner that is consistent with the UDP, including parking rates, car park design, shade tree provision, loading facilities and separation of cars, trucks and pedestrians</li> <li>See Section 3.5.1 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
4.0.6	Bicycle Parking	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project includes bicycle facilities as per the UDP;</li> <li>See Section 3.5 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
4.0.7	Safety and Security	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has been designed in a manner that is consistent with the UDP</li> <li>See Section 3.8 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
4.0.8	Lighting	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has been designed in a manner that is consistent with the UDP;</li> <li>See Section 3.8 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>



ID	Section / Development Control	Project As Approved		Project As Proposed	
		Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EIS Reference	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference
4.0.9	Signage	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has been designed in a manner that is consistent with the UDP. DEXUS has committed to developing a Signage Strategy for the project;</li> <li>See Section 3.9 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 Precinct 1 – Business Park &amp; Service Retail Uses</b>					
4.1.2	Objectives	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is generally consistent with the objectives for the business precinct, although the approved masterplan involves a less intensive scale of business uses than that envisaged in the UDP</li> <li>See Section 3 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
4.1.3	Development Siting Controls	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The UDP outlines a relatively complex range of building setbacks for differing land uses in the Business Park;</li> <li>DEXUS proposes a consolidated and simplified heirarchy of setbacks within the QuarryWEST site, namely a 4.0 metre landscape setback and a 7.5 metre building setback;</li> <li>These setbacks generally comply with the controls in the UDP, however some do not;</li> <li>Detailed consideration of setbacks is provided in Section 4.3 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	No (existing non-compliance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
4.1.4	Built Form	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project soft landscaping area in the business precinct (10%) does not meet the development control (15%), however it does when assessed over the overall developable site area for the QuarryWEST site (16%);</li> <li>Project building heights (15.8m max.) comply with the 25m maximum, however building heights along the</li> </ul>	No (existing non-compliance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant change to project soft landscaping area in the business precinct (10%);</li> <li>Project building heights (14.6m max.) comply with the 25m maximum, however building heights along the east-west</li> </ul>



<b>ID</b>	<b>Section / Development Control</b>	<b>Project As Approved</b>		<b>Project As Proposed</b>	
		<b>Complies (Yes or No)</b>	<b>Comments / EIS Reference</b>	<b>Complies (Yes or No)</b>	<b>Comments / EA Reference</b>
			east-west boulevard do not comply with the 9m maximum within 30m of the frontage; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project GFA for the precinct (71,885m<sup>2</sup>) complies with the maximum allowable (104,000m<sup>2</sup>).</li> </ul>		boulevard do not comply with the 9m maximum within 30m of the frontage; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project GFA for the precinct (72,315m<sup>2</sup>) complies with the maximum allowable (104,000m<sup>2</sup>).</li> </ul>
4.1.5	Fencing	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has been designed in a manner that is generally consistent with the UDP. DEXUS has committed to developing a Fencing Strategy for the project;</li> <li>See Section 3.8 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
4.1.6	Site Water Management	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has been designed in a manner that is generally consistent with the stormwater and groundwater management strategies in the UDP</li> <li>See Section 3.5.2 and 6.2 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Precinct 2 – Industrial Development</b>				
4.2.2	Objectives	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is consistent with the objectives for the industrial precinct;</li> <li>See Section 3 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>



<i>ID</i>	<i>Section / Development Control</i>	<i>Project As Approved</i>		<i>Project As Proposed</i>	
		<i>Complies (Yes or No)</i>	<i>Comments / EIS Reference</i>	<i>Complies (Yes or No)</i>	<i>Comments / EA Reference</i>
4.2.3	Development Siting Controls	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project generally complies with the front setback controls to Prospect Highway (ie. 15m) and other local roads (7.5m), although small encroachments into the Prospect Highway setback are proposed for the ancillary office components of the warehouses on Lot 1. It is considered that this encroachment is minor and consistent with the allowable setbacks to Prospect Highway for buildings within the business precinct immediately to the north of this lot;</li> <li>See Section 4.3 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	No (existing non-compliance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
4.2.4	Built Form	Yes/No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall project FSR for buildings in the industrial precinct (0.52:1) complies with the maximum allowable FSR (ie. 0.75:1);</li> <li>Project site coverage in the industrial precinct (57%) complies with the maximum allowable site coverage (ie. 70%);</li> <li>Project building heights (generally up to 13.7m, and up to 20m for the buildings on Precinct F) comply with the maximum height (ie. 15m, and 25m for Precinct F), apart from Warehouse B2 which has been approved with a maximum height of 17.4 metres;</li> <li>Ancillary office component in the industrial precinct (ie. 8% GFA overall and max. 14% GFA for individual lots) complies with the maximum office component (ie. 50% GFA within 400m of bus stop and 30% GFA more than 400m from bus stop).</li> </ul>	Yes/No (existing non-compliance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>



<i>Project As Approved</i>				<i>Project As Proposed</i>	
<i>ID</i>	<i>Section / Development Control</i>	<i>Complies (Yes or No)</i>	<i>Comments / EIS Reference</i>	<i>Complies (Yes or No)</i>	<i>Comments / EA Reference</i>
4.2.5	Fencing	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has been designed in a manner that is consistent with the UDP. DEXUS has committed to developing a Fencing Strategy for the project;</li> <li>See Section 3.8 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>
4.2.6	Site Water Management	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has been designed in a manner that is generally consistent with the stormwater and groundwater management strategies in the UDP</li> <li>See Sections 3.5.2 and 6.2 of the original EIS</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> </ul>