

Mr & Mrs Rentmore, Llwynteg. Deadline 5 submission

I have serious concerns over the information used by RSK to form their report on our private water supply.

When Mr Whittingham attended a meeting recently, at our home. Mr Whittingham produced a map that he had used to form his initial conclusions. We immediately saw that this map was incorrect. The map had only one collection point marked on it, whereas there are two. However, Mr Whittingham should have corrected this error, when he visited our property on the 6th of March. On this visit we walked to each location, clearly pointing out where the two catchment points were.

This missed collection point, is a lot closer to the Poles 172. This would surely have had some impact on his initial findings. However, our main concern is that although we have constantly provided them with accurate information, they are still using the wrong data.

WPD stated that we have two collection points, that go to 2 holding tanks, that feed our property. Where there are actually 3 collection points. We do not have 2 holding tanks, one tank is ours, the other tank and 1 collection point, belongs to Mrs Medland.

Therefore, misleading the Inspectorate to think, that if one tank became contaminated, then we would have a second tank to rely on and therefore, that our water situation is not that serious.

WPD has stated that there is no Site Specific Report on our Private water supply. However, they have also stated that Mr Whittingham made notes on his visit on the 6th march. Please instruct WPD to give us a copy of the notes taken on this visit. These notes are Site Specific to our property, and therefore we should have access to these notes.

WPD asked on the website, if we had any proof that their poles would contaminate the underground water? Well firstly, the poles are impregnated with Creosote, which is a toxin and is not to be used on Agricultural land. And where is the evidence that these sleeves will last the lifetime of these poles. Mr Hubbard's statement that they have used this sleeve on a pole and that it has been used for the last 6 years, is not evidence. Where is this pole, is the location similar to our own, was it removed after 6 years and why? What evidence can they provide to show that the ground/water was regularly tested for contamination, if not, how do they know that it did not impact on the surrounding ground/water. And why did it only last 6 years?