

[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@gavinanderson.com.au>

To

[REDACTED] <les.baker@gunns.com.au>

cc

Subject

[REDACTED] AM

I am happy to discuss these further.

This process is critical to the defence of the Bell Bay site. If we are seen to be pushing flimsy arguments I believe there is a real risk you could be asked to better justify the choice of sites (ie undertake a detailed site selection process) which will result in additional costs and time delays. The site selection documentation is already significantly deficient in what is required in the Guidelines, given that a detailed assessment process did not take place. We only have some flora and fauna memos, a heritage memo and the very brief desktop report conducted by JP to substantiate the claim that Bell Bay is the preferred site. I have already made the most out of this limited information and it falls well short of the guideline requirements. Drawing attention to these deficiencies would not be beneficial.

The process will have no credibility if we start relying totally on anecdotal information and guesswork.

Given this is one of the first components which will come under scrutiny (in that it justifies the site location) I strongly suggest not trying to prop up the assessment just to have Hampshire not favoured under one of the economic, environmental or social assessments.

If the opponents make ground because we recognise that on the environmental criteria, Hampshire is the preferred site, they will make even more ground if they tear the assessment to shreds.

[REDACTED]
Gavin Anderson & Company