From: **Peta O'Hara** peta@paddyshotel.com.au
Subject: Brewongle Solar Farm Consultation Meetings
Date: 9 November 2017 1:13 pm
To: nick.guzowski@photonenergy.com, michael.gartner@photonenergy.com
Cc: Peter Hennessy peter_hennessy@hotmail.com

Dear Nick,

I am the Secretary of the "Brewongle Action Group," a group formed to address your Group's proposal for 397,576 solar panels at the nominated location at Brewongle.

Thank you for your phone call proposing a meeting with my husband Liam, and I assume me. Several of our group members received such calls.

You propose next Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning to meet and you propose one on one meeting's.

Next Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning are acceptable times. You will be welcome at our home at 264 Tarana Road on Tuesday afternoon for the first meeting.

At least one of our members explained our concerns about one on one meeting's and in summary:

- There will be 2 representatives from Photon Energy;
- In many instances, representatives are husband and wife teams; and
- Many of our group members are older or for one reason or another lack confidence in their ability to fully and effectively express to you their concerns or in any event feel more relaxed and confident that their concerns will be heard by having a spokesperson present.

We as a group therefore do not agree to a so-called 'one on one' meeting.

You made reference to the 6 September "consultation meeting" and expressed the view that it was unsatisfactory in some respect. We were of the view it was very satisfactory in the circumstances, however the circumstances were not satisfactory and so some elevated exchange occurred. This may not have occurred if the community had received proper and timely notification of the so-called "consultation" meeting. For Tuesday and Wednesday however, we should be ready and prepared.

The media was present on the 6 September. Perhaps they should be invited to attend the meetings on Tuesday and Wednesday.

We believe in open consultation and are of the view that this could be satisfactorily done with say twenty group members at a time. However we do note your determination for one on one meeting's. We respect the legislative process and so wish to ensure that meaningful consultation occurs. We propose therefore consultation of at least six group members and two Photon Energy representatives. The meetings will be of course be structured.

If you insist on less members being present, then in the interests of ensuring successful consultation, we will agree but partners will be together and they will be entitled to insist upon a spokesperson or two spokespersons being present. As the day wears on, no doubt the plan might, by agreement, be relaxed.

Please let us know the details of the persons you have or have endeavoured to contact and we will ensure their presence. When we have your list, we will be please to add to it if necessary to save you further effort.

Please let us know our starting and finishing times, so that we can plan a productive timetable.

Peter Hennessy informed you of a few of our preliminary concerns that we all have. They are most serious because they relate to Corporate Integrity. I confirm these concerns are:

4. Mr. Ibrahim, the "client representative" of Photon Energy submitted to the Government a “Preliminary Environmental Assessment” dated 31 August 2017. In that document, there are statements that give rise to concerns that we would like addressed.

As to the so-called “Environment” reasons, that document, signed by Mr. Ibrahim says

- The rural environment (was chosen because of) with fewer neighbours overlooking the site leading to lower visual amenity impact.

- The low environment values of the land.

What material, including documentation was relied upon to support these two bullet points above?

3. We read that the Gunning residents were told by Photon that it would “look at” compensating neighbours after approval, at some point in time. We recall Photon saying the same at Raglan on 6 September. Was this the truth?

- Has compensation been paid to neighbours in the past?

- Has Photon set aside a contingency fund for Brewongle (and Gunning)?

- If so, how is that fund guaranteed?

- What are the principles that guide Photon when “looking at” compensation?

- Would Photon contemplate or agree to the appointment of an independent arbitrator to determine compensation?

A number of group members recall, on 6 September it was mentioned that a copy of the power point presentation and minutes of the meeting would be available on your website. To date, this has not been done. Could you please email me a copy of both documents.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Peta O’Hara