

From: [Phil Glover](#)
To: [Alana Jelfs](#)
Subject: Further Comments on Gunnedah Solar Farm
Date: Wednesday, 5 December 2018 11:19:02 AM

For Attention Independent Planning Commission

Firstly I would like to thank the Commission for taking time to visit "Weetaliba" and Galton's on Friday 30th November.

I have looked at the IPC website and the transcripts have provided some interesting reading.

Photon told you about successful consultation ... we spoke to them in March 18 and have had no other communication from them until I met them on the site tour last week. I don't call that successful.

Photon also spoke about "anecdotal evidence" on flooding they received from potential receivers. I think all the anecdotal stories have been backed up by the Carroll to Boggabri Flood study and data presented. They were not anecdotal. The potential receivers have lived through the floods and understand that floods are serious events, which have far reaching impact.

Photon also said they have presented us with "Scientific evidence from modelling". The modelling we were shown was so poor when they last made contact in March, it would be hard to accept it as scientific. Their professional flood modeller had not realised that flood levels in Gunnedah township did not relate to our local area because another river (the Mooki) joins the Namoi between here and town. High floods here need not be high in town, and vice versa. The model we were shown was based on the 1984 flood (when the 1955 is locally considered the benchmark) and we were told that there would not be more than a 200 ml effect on any recipient. As we showed you at "Weetaliba", that 200 ml makes a huge difference. The changes in the modelling which have been done since have not been shown to us by anyone. We have been left to read about them in the Environmental Impact Statement, and we learnt about proposed fence changes in the recent Assessment Report.

I would like to make some additional comments on the fence.

1. There seems to be some conflict on whether the security fence should be there or not. Photon says it is a regulatory matter yet Ms Mitchell says that it "is about protecting the asset.... rather than protecting the public from the asset" It might clarify things if it was established whether or not the security fence is a regulatory requirement.
2. There was also a brief description of the fence design which I have not heard until now (at no time have Photon conveyed

their thoughts or plans on this to the people most concerned). It is unacceptable that “sacrificial fittings” have to “break” for the fence to fall down. This means that water and rubbish would already be building up against the fence and already **interrupting** the flow of the flood. Worse still the “break” may not occur and this major blockage of the floodway would continue. The design must include a fence that is dropped automatically once the flood warning is given for the Peel Namoi system.

Perhaps it is time for Photon to be innovative for the security of the property. Firstly the property is relatively isolated and very few people would ever go near it. A chain mesh fence is overkill. It could simply be a single “hot wire” in an electric fence system with a series of warning signs. This would keep straying stock out of the site and warn people. Remote videos and Infra Red sensing could then be used to monitor the fence perimeter. There is a 24 hour security monitoring company in Tamworth that could alert staff of a breach. A single wire would not interrupt the flow of any flood water.

Photon should not be given consent to proceed with a chain mesh fence.

Thank you for your time.

I am happy to add any commentary on any of these matters and can be easily contacted on

[REDACTED]

Regards
Phil Glover

[REDACTED]