



Major Development SEPP and Greystanes SEL Concept Plan Consideration

Major Development SEPP

Part 22 of Schedule 3 of the Major Development SEPP provides a range of development standards that apply to development within the Greystanes SEL. Consideration of the relevant development standards is presented in the following table.

It is noted that clause 19, Part 22 of Schedule 3 provides that the development standards imposed by the SEPP may be varied for major projects if the Director-General of the Department of Planning is satisfied, and issues a certificate to the effect, that:

- (a) compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case; and
- (b) there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify exempting the development from that development standard.

In deciding whether to issue a certificate, the Director-General must consider:

- (a) whether contravention of the development standard raises any matter of significance for State or regional environmental planning;
- (b) the public benefit of maintaining the development standard; and
- (c) any other matters required to be taken into consideration by the Director-General.

Table 1: Major Projects Development Standard Compliance

Clause (Part 22, Sch.3)	Issue	Key Controls Summary	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference
13	Building Height	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Maximum height is 15 metres in IN2 zone	No (but non-compliance is already approved)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Although the SEPP provides that the maximum building height for buildings within the IN2 zone is 15 metres, the project approval for the DEXUS Estate project provides that buildings up to 40 metres height can be developed on certain lots in the estate. This approval was granted in large part because the site is ideally situated for taller buildings given its location at the base of a former quarry. The approval (for taller buildings) followed comprehensive visual and other environmental assessment in the original EA for the project, and is reflected in the height distribution plan in Appendix 3 of the project approval.The proposed modification does not involve any change to approved building heights.



Clause (Part 22, Sch.3)	Issue	Key Controls Summary	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference
14	Gross Floor Area (GFA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum office GFA in IN2 zone is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50%, for lots within 400 metres of bus stop; and 30%, for lots more than 400 metres of bus stop. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed masterplan complies with the maximum office GFA for all development lots.
15	Floor Space Ratio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum floor space ratio in IN2 zone is 0.75:1 	No (but non-compliance subject to separate application)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed masterplan complies with the standard for all development lots, with the exception of the Fujitsu Data Centre Facility. This non-compliance is subject to a separate application (MOD 4).
16	Hotel Accommodation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project does not involve hotel development
17	Child Care Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project does not involve child care centre development
18	Car Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car parking rates include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Warehouses or distribution centres, 1 space per 300 m²; Offices, 1 space per 40m² 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has been designed to comply with the car parking rates.
21	Design Excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires buildings to achieve a high level of architectural design merit 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed masterplan has been designed in accordance with standard. Design excellence for individual buildings is addressed as part of specific building applications.
22	Architectural Roof Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows decorative architectural roof elements above the maximum building height under certain circumstances 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed masterplan does not affect compliance with this standard. Addressed for individual buildings as part of specific building applications.



Clause <i>(Part 22, Sch.3)</i>	Issue	Key Controls Summary	Complies <i>(Yes or No)</i>	Comments / EA Reference
23	Public Utility Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires infrastructure to be provided, including potable water, electricity, gas and sewerage 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All required infrastructure for the Greystanes SEL has been approved.

Greystanes SEL Concept Plan

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 2: Greystanes SEL Concept Plan Approval Compliance

No.	Clause	Project As Approved <i>(inc. pending MOD 4)</i>		Project As Proposed	
		Complies <i>(Yes or No)</i>	Comments / EA Reference	Complies <i>(Yes or No)</i>	Comments / EA Reference
1	Development Description				
(a)	Subdivision of the site into industrial and business park precincts;	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is consistent with (and forms part of) the industrial precinct as defined in the concept plan. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
(b)	A maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 493,215m ² across the industrial and business park precincts;	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has a maximum GFA of approx. 251,000m², which is less than that originally assumed for the site in the concept plan. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal has a maximum GFA of 252,000m², which remains less than that originally assumed for the site.
(c)	The following maximum GFA for each broad land use:	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project does not involve development in the business park precinct of the concept plan 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
	(i) A maximum of 97,500m ² shall be developed for business park uses.				



No.	Clause	Project As Approved (inc. pending MOD 4)		Project As Proposed	
		Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference
	(ii) A maximum of 6,500m ² shall be developed for the purposes of service retail uses	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project does not involve development in the service retail area of the concept plan 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change
	(iii) A maximum of 5,000m ² shall be developed for the purposes of hotel accommodation on Lot 75.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project does not involve development on the hotel site as identified in the concept plan 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
(d)	Despite the above, the total maximum floor space ratio (FSR) shall not exceed:	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has a total FSR of 0.57:1. One development lot – the Fujitsu Data Centre Facility – exceeds the FSR maximum. 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed masterplan has an overall FSR of 0.57:1. The proposal does not change the level of non-compliance with this standard for individual development lots.
	(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"> The project does not involve development on the hotel site as identified in the concept plan 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
(e)	Conceptual road design.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project road layout is generally consistent with the concept plan, maintaining the 3 key intersections with Reconciliation Drive. As noted for the approved project, the internal road layout is slightly different to that shown in the concept plan, although it provides a similar function. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change (apart from a minor extension to the southern access road).
(f)	Urban design, maximum height, landscape, open space and heritage design concepts outlined in “Greystanes Estate Southern Employment Lands	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is generally consistent with the urban design, landscape, open space and heritage design concepts in the final Urban Design Plan (Issue J, 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal remains generally consistent with the UDP (see analysis in separate table below); The proposal does not involve any change



No.	Clause	Project As Approved (inc. pending MOD 4)		Project As Proposed	
		Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference
	<i>Urban Design Plan</i> ” prepared by Turner Hughes Architects and dated September 2006 must be amended within 3 months of this approval.		<p>July 2008) (see analysis in separate table below);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> However, the project involves building heights up to 25 metres and 40 metres, whereas the UDP states that building heights ‘should not exceed 15 metres; See Sections 4.3 and 6 of the EA. 		to approved maximum building heights.
(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"> Office 1/40m² Retail 1/20m² Industrial 1/77m² Warehouse 1/300m² 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has been designed to comply with the applicable car parking rates for all lots. (Nb. The Fujitsu Data Centre Facility and Solaris Paper Facility have been approved with parking rates below the required parking rates under the concept plan, in accordance with proposed staffing levels). 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
(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 Commitment Nos. 21-24, Statement of Commitment Nos. 27-28 and Statement of Commitment No. 30).	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development contributions for the Greystanes SEL have been resolved by Boral as part of the concept plan approval. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.



No.	Clause	Project As Approved (inc. pending MOD 4)		Project As Proposed	
		Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference
(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"> Staging would follow the approved staging plan, which defines the staged release of the site from Boral to DEXUS (for stages 1-4); Following the release of stages 1-4 (which includes infrastructure provision), DEXUS proposes to develop the site in a flexible manner in accordance with market demand. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
2	<i>Development in Accordance with Approved Plans and Documentation</i>				
	The development shall generally be in accordance with the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Assessment; Preferred Project Report, and the Statement of Commitments; and Urban Design Plan (as amended), except as otherwise provided by the conditions and Statement of Commitments. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is consistent with the approved plans and documentation, except as identified in the following table below. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
3	<i>Inconsistency between Plans and Documentation</i>				
	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"> Noted. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.



No.	Clause	Project As Approved (inc. pending MOD 4)		Project As Proposed	
		Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference
4	Lapsing of Consent				
	Approval shall lapse unless an application under the concept plan is submitted within 5 years.	Yes	• Noted.	Yes	• No change.
6	Determination of Future Applications				
[sic]					
	Determination for future applications for development to be generally consistent with the terms of approval for the concept plan	Yes	• Noted.	Yes	• No change.
7	Business Park Precincts – Minimum Floor Plates				
	Minimum floor plate of 3,000m ² within the business park precinct	Yes	• The project does not involve development in the business park precinct of the concept plan.	Yes	• No change.
8	Industrial Precinct – Associated Office Space				
	Within the industrial precinct: • 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 • 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.	Yes	• The project masterplan has an ancillary office component of 10% of the GFA	Yes	• The proposed revised masterplan has an overall ancillary office component of approx. 9% of the GFA



No.	Clause	Project As Approved (inc. pending MOD 4)		Project As Proposed	
		Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference
9	Hotel Accommodation				
	Requires additional analysis for development on the hotel site	Yes	• The project does not involve development on the hotel site as identified in the concept plan	Yes	• No change.
10	Heritage – Site Interpretation Strategy				
	Requires the project site interpretation strategy to retain a selected number of industrial heritage items.	Yes	• The project would be undertaken in a manner that it consistent with the site interpretation strategy	Yes	• No change.
11	Stormwater Management Plan				
	Requires the project Stormwater Maintenance Management Plan to be prepared in consultation with relevant agencies	Yes	• The project would be undertaken in a manner that it consistent with the Stormwater Management Plans	Yes	• No change.
12	Groundwater Management Plan				
	Requires the project Groundwater Management Plan to be prepared in consultation with relevant agencies	Yes	• The project would be undertaken in a manner that it consistent with the Groundwater Management Plan	Yes	• No change.
13	Ecologically Sustainable Design Principles				
	Requires the ESD principles in the UDP to be revised within 3 months of the approval.	Yes	• The project has been designed in accordance with the ESD principles in the revised UDP	Yes	• No change.



Table 3: Greystanes SEL Urban Design Plan Compliance

ID	Section / Development Control	Project As Approved		Project As Proposed	
		Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference
2	Concept				
2.1	Concept	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is generally consistent with the concept, providing for a high standard industrial estate. However, the project provides for generally larger facilities than indicated in the concept plan, in line with the current market demand for industrial space. The project also involves a minor amendment to the internal road layout, although it maintains the 3 key intersections with Reconciliation Drive. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
2.2	Aims & objectives	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is consistent with the aims and objectives of the concept plan. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
2.3	Site Analysis	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
3	Urban Design Principals				
3.1	Character	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is consistent with the desired character for the Greystanes SEL. The 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. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
3.2	Land Uses	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is consistent with the proposed landuses in the UDP (warehousing, distribution, manufacturing, and café). The ancillary office component complies with the development standards. The lot sizes are somewhat larger than envisaged in the concept plan, in line with the market demand for industrial facilities in western Sydney. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.



<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 / EA Reference</i>	<i>Complies (Yes or No)</i>	<i>Comments / EA Reference</i>
3.3	Transport Infrastructure Overview	Yes	<p><i>Roads</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project road layout is consistent with the concept plan, maintaining the 3 key intersections with Reconciliation Drive. The internal road layout is slightly different to that shown in the concept plan, although it provides a similar function. <p><i>Transitway</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project does not affect the layout or function of the transitway. <p><i>Pedestrian Network</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project includes pedestrian facilities consistent with the concept plan. <p><i>Bicycle Network</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project does not affect the layout or function of the cycleway in the transitway corridor. 	Yes	<p><i>Roads</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change (apart from extension to southern access road). <p><i>Transitway</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change. <p><i>Pedestrian Network</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change. <p><i>Bicycle Network</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
3.4	Subdivision	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change (although the subdivision layout has been amended slightly).
3.5	Indicative Built Area	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is consistent with the indicative built area in the concept plan (in terms of site cover, setbacks, etc.), however the project has a lower density than shown in the concept plan, in line with the market demand for industrial facilities in western Sydney. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change (although the layout has been amended).



<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 / EA Reference</i>	<i>Complies (Yes or No)</i>	<i>Comments / EA Reference</i>
3.6	Streetscape	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is generally consistent with the streetscape in the concept plan, however the east-west 'Basalt Road' road would be constructed within an expanded 23 metre corridor (ie. the 20 metre 'Section D – Local Road' of the concept plan plus a 3 metre landscaped median in the centre of the roads); The project road layout provides the opportunity to incorporate the quarry walls as a striking backdrop to the streetscape of the east-west internal roads. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
3.7	Stormwater Management Concept	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is consistent with the stormwater management concept, with minor amendments to the layout of the internal pipe network in accordance with the revised internal road layout. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change (apart from minor internal amendments to accommodate revised subdivision layout).
3.8	Groundwater Management Concept	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is consistent with the groundwater management concept. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
3.9	Services	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change (apart from minor internal amendments to accommodate revised subdivision layout).
4.0	General Site Controls				
4.0.2	Ecological Sustainable Development Principles	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All ESD principles of the concept plan have been adopted for the project. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
4.0.3	Landscaping	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project landscape masterplan has been designed in a manner that is consistent with the UDP landscape concept plan. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change (although layout has been amended slightly).
4.0.4	External Materials and Colours	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed external materials and colours are consistent with the UDP. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.



ID	Section / Development Control	Project As Approved		Project As Proposed	
		Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference	Complies (Yes or No)	Comments / EA Reference
4.0.5	Access, Parking and Loading	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 (Nb. The Fujitsu Data Centre Facility and Solaris Paper Facility have been approved with parking rates below the required parking rates under the concept plan, in accordance with proposed staffing levels). 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
4.0.6	Bicycle Parking	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project includes bicycle facilities as per the UDP. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
4.0.7	Safety and Security	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has been designed in a manner that is consistent with the UDP. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
4.0.8	Lighting	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has been designed in a manner that is consistent with the UDP. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
4.0.9	Signage	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has been designed in a manner that is consistent with the UDP. DEXUS has developed an Estate Signage Strategy for the project. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
4.2	Precinct 2 – Industrial Development				
4.2.2	Objectives	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is consistent with the objectives for the industrial precinct. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
4.2.3	Development Siting Controls	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project as approved allows minor non-compliances with the front setback controls (ie. at the rear of the estate on the eastern portion of Bellevue Ct). 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.



<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 / EA Reference</i>	<i>Complies (Yes or No)</i>	<i>Comments / EA Reference</i>
4.2.4	Built Form	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project FSR (57%) complies with the maximum allowable FSR (ie. 75%); Project site cover (59%) complies with the maximum allowable site cover (ie. 70%); Project height (up to 40m) exceeds the maximum height (ie. 15m); Project ancillary office component (ie. 10% GFA) complies with the maximum office component (ie. 50% GFA within 400m of bus stop and 30% GFA more than 400m from bus stop 	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed overall FSR (57%) complies with the maximum allowable FSR (ie. 75%); Proposed overall site cover (60%) complies with the maximum allowable site cover (ie. 70%); The proposal does not involve any change to approved maximum building height (ie. up to 40m); Proposal overall ancillary office component (ie. 9% GFA) complies with the maximum office component (ie. 50% GFA within 400m of bus stop and 30% GFA more than 400m from bus stop
4.2.5	Fencing	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has been designed in a manner that is consistent with the UDP. DEXUS has developed an Estate Fencing Strategy for the project. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.
4.2.6	Site Water Management	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has been designed in a manner that is consistent with the stormwater and groundwater management strategies in the UDP. 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change.