From: "Valab" <valab@helgaro-liv.se>
To: <Aphrodite.Smagadi@unece.org>
Cc: <aarhus.compliance@unece.org>

Date: 12/10/2013 19:16

Subject: 12.10.2013 Thanks for the Swedish Government's response in case ACCC/C/2013/81.

12.10.2013

Dear Mrs Smagadi.

With astonishment I read the Swedish Government's response that it refuses to answer the questions that the UN/ACCC asked in the case ACCC/C/2013/81.

We complainants have been waiting for ruling in a legal process since February 2008, waited almost six years even though the Swedish law states that building permits shall be settled promptly.

The meeting 09.03.2013 we see as the same delay. Appendix 4 on consultation, "consultation", http://www.helgaro-liv.se/FN 2013/om samrad.doc in the answers is mentioning this meeting.

Whatever court considers the fact remains that we have not been informed and were left out of decisions that affect our environment.

Further surprises the Government's sloppy and therefore incorrect reference to current Swedish law.

The government appears to have difficulty in understanding the Environmental Code on permits and therefore refers to chapter 9 of wastes instead of chapter 16 of review.

Among other things, it is surprising that the government not with one word comment on the core of my communication that infringement of the security under current Swedish law Machinery Directive, on orders from the government, is not to be applied in matters relating to wind turbines when human health and safety in the neighborhood of the turbines is threatened.

I cannot free myself from the thought that this omission is intended to mislead.

In the case that the Swedish government is given an opportunity to supplement should not also we get this opportunity.

Now that the Swedish government claims that my communication lacks clarity and when Chairman of the Committee also is Swedish, it would perhaps be better if I left my entries also in Swedish.

Yours sincerely

Bernd Stümer