

From: Bernd Stümer <email address redacted>
To: Aarhus Compliance
Date: 15/06/2015 22:48
Subject: 15.6.2015 comments on comments from the swedish government (ACCC/C/2013/81)

15.6.2015
To
United Nations
Economic Commission
For Europé

and copy to

Fiona Marshall
Environmental Affairs Officer - Secretary to the Compliance Committee
Aarhus Convention secretariat
United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

Communication to the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee concerning compliance by Sweden with provisions of the Convention in relation to permits issued for wind turbines and the applicable legislation in general (ACCC/C/2013/81)

I do not accept that the Government 15.6.2015 once again get permission to comment on my earlier submitted comments. What's the point that the same person Abresparr may comment again? And what's the point that Abresparr the second time may make comments bordering on sheer nonsense?

Here are the questions and my comments of Abresparrs comments

7. Please explain the basis or criteria on which the municipality identified who were the concerned parties.

The Swedish answer is no answer to the question 7

8. The Committee has been informed that in three separate decisions (December 2011, January 2012 and March 2012), the County Administrative Board of Södermanland found the appeals by the communicant and approximately 30 other appellants inadmissible because their properties were more than 1 kilometre from the intended location of the closest wind turbine. Were those decisions made only because of distance? If not, what other grounds were there for denying the appeals?

The Swedish answer is no answer to the question 8

9. The Committee has been informed that on 15 May 2013, the District Court rejected the communicant's appeal (Case P 129-12) because no information had been provided showing that his property was located in a neighbourhood that would be particularly affected by the wind turbines, and therefore he had no right to challenge the permit decision. On what basis was this decision made: was it solely

because of distance and if so what distance was considered by the District Court?

The Swedish answer is no answer to the question 9

11. Please each specify precisely how far away the communicant lives from the wind turbines in question.

Government's response is possibly a response to question 11
Accurate measurement gives distance 1550 meters

12. Please each provide a concise account of the communicant's requests for environmental information including:

- a. The date of each request
- b. The exact information requested
- c. The date of any response and the response provided
- d. The reason(s) given for refusing to provide the requested information, if any; and
- e. The length of any delays in providing the requested information

The Swedish answer is no answer to the question 12

13. Please each examine the draft chronology/summary of facts set out overleaf and confirm that it is correct, or alternatively make any corrections that you consider are required:

Government response to question 13, paragraph 5 is incorrect since J.Andersson demonstrably not received this information. The government must prove that Andersson received the information which it has not done.

Government response to question 13, paragraph 5 once more.

Government's response here is inaccurate as evidenced by the Land and Environment Court annuls the county administrative board's decision to grant planning permission because of shortcomings in the decision-making basis.

Bernd Stümer
Väla Gård, Helgarö
64592 Strängnäs, Sweden