

From: Christine Metcalfe <email address redacted>
To: Aarhus Compliance
Date: 12/01/2016 11:34
Subject: Re: Decision V/9n concerning compliance by the United Kingdom - invitation to comment on Party concerned's second progress report

Dear Fiona,

Thank you for your email of the 27th. November 2015 and the invitation contained therein. I apologise for, and regret the unavoidable delay in submitting my comments, but this has been due to waiting for an important decision on a current Inquiry into Whitelee 3 wind farm which sadly, has yet to be made, despite this being due for determination by 30th. November 2015. Also awaited is the response for the '**Request for Action**' under ELD2004/35/CE, water contamination and wind farms, which was lodged with the Scottish Government and agencies in July. I had hoped to include both due to their particular relevance to both Articles of the Convention and the UK progress report.

I therefore trust that this short delay in providing information will not prevent it being passed to the Committee for their consideration.

Comments are the result of research and dialogues, not only with professionals, but many at the grass roots of society both here and abroad who are now experiencing what it is like to live with the results of imposed energy policies. Having experienced the professionalism and humanity shown by the Committee during their handling of my complaint ACCC/C/2012/68 and subsequent ratification of their decision, I should like to join others in voicing appreciation of the work undertaken in all aspects of the subjects in hand by Committee members.

My comments on the second progress report from the UK on Decision V/9n and the position of the UK on matters of energy policy involving articles of the Aarhus Convention and wind power are attached as are the three documents referred to in the Comments pdf.

I should also like to support the representation made by Alistair MacIntosh and Dr. Ashley Lloyd on their Access to Justice point 3. involving the 'restriction which also favours the developer in such cases, and which has been long resented by environmental campaigners in Scotland, remains in the existence of a *right of appeal* for the developer in an environmental case, but no right of appeal for the objector.' Also the Access to Justice points and others made by RSPB and FoE.

I should be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this email and the 4 attachments.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. V (Christine) K. Metcalfe.