

TELEPHONE CALL EVIDENCE SUMMARY — 42 RECORDINGS

Frederick Road / Mount Pleasant and associated public-body contacts

Source note: Summaries are based on the generated timestamped transcripts in the original 36-call batch, together with three additional Southern Water records from 13 August 2026, one further 13 August 2026 Environment Agency/Robert contact preserved through a later contemporaneous recorded account because the original Robert-call recording is currently unavailable, one earlier Southern Water recording dated 24 June 2026 added to the chronology on 14 August 2026, and one Consumer Council for Water (CCW) recording dated 14 August 2026. Where a transcript is empty, garbled, conflicts with a filename, or speaker identification depends on surrounding correspondence, that limitation is stated. The summaries distinguish what was said/reported during the calls from independent proof of the underlying contamination allegations. A written-evidence update section is appended after the 42 recording entries to preserve the 13 August 2026 DWI response and the same-day formal safeguarding referral sent to Children's Services/SPoA and the other notified organisations. These written records are not counted as additional telephone recordings.

Date	Time	Organisation / person	Telephone	Duration	Reference / note
24 June 2026	Not verified	Southern Water – earlier email / connection-safety escalation	Not captured	16:24	Missing-email discussion; request to condemn/refuse connection until safety established
30 July 2026	Not verified	House of Commons Inquiry / Parliamentary Contact Centre – Arthur	Not captured	9:26	Professional Standards – R20230622-224257
31 July 2026	Not verified	Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards – voicemail	Not captured	6:45	R20230623-000106
3 August 2026	15:30 stated in filename	Helena Dollimore MP – constituency voicemail	Not captured	2:46	R20230626-032712
4 August 2026	Not verified	Environment Agency – incident reporting line	0370 850 6506	16:24	Site TQ8305011031; Southern Water reference WC05348056 mentioned
4 August 2026	14:37 stated in filename	Drinking Water Inspectorate – voicemail; filename says Environment Agency	Filename contains 0370 850 6506; DWI number not established from transcript	2:54	Southern Water WC05348056 mentioned
4 August 2026	15:49	Southern Water – Fiona	0330 303 0368	27:22	WC05348056; Frederick Road, Hastings / TN35 5AU; grid reference TQ8305011031
4 August 2026	16:08	Independent	020 8225 8340	43:04	2463511 /

		Water Networks Ltd (IWNL)			2463473; site TQ8305011031
6 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	IWNL – follow-up call	IWNL number not recaptured in transcript	60:00	2463541; site TQ8305011031
6 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	IWNL / GTC Group – further follow-up	Not captured	23:02	Follow-up to earlier IWNL report
7 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Environment Agency incident hotline – Bill	Environment Agency incident hotline	14:16	02540649 discussed
7 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Environment Agency – general enquiries / complaint escalation	Environment Agency	30:29	2463541 and 02540649 both mentioned
9 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	East Sussex County Council switchboard	0345 608 0190 used; 01323 747207 discussed as non-working	8:05	Frederick Road public-health concern
9 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards – automated message	Not captured	0:26	Automated Standards information
9 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Environment Agency incident hotline	Environment Agency incident hotline	7:12	2463541 and 02540649 mentioned in the call
9 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Drinking Water Inspectorate – voicemail	Not captured	2:04	2463541 / 02540649 stated
9 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Unidentified	—	EMPTY	Empty transcript
9 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	East Sussex County Council switchboard / Public Health attempt	Not captured	7:42	References stated: 2463541, 02540649, WC05348056
9 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Unidentified person/department – unavailable	Not captured	1:38	No substantive call
9 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Environment Agency – further follow-up	Environment Agency	19:53	2463541 mentioned
9 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as	East Sussex County Council – Children's	Not captured	15:48	Frederick Road; other agency references

	verified	Services / Assessment & Planning transfer			discussed later in call
9 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	East Sussex County Council – Adult Social Care Complaints voicemail	Not captured	2:09	Adult Social Care Complaints and Feedback voicemail
9 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	East Sussex County Council – Public Health voicemail attempt	Not captured	2:12	Public Health voicemail; transcription of department name is unclear
9 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	East Sussex County Council – Debbie / switchboard	Not captured	10:15	Frederick Road / Public Health
10 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Environment Agency – follow-up	Environment Agency	8:23	02540649 stated
10 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Environment Agency – short follow-up / transfer	Environment Agency	2:14	Follow-up to existing Frederick Road reports
10 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	DEFRA helpline	Not captured	5:36	DEFRA helpline; later batch references include 2026 1144E
10 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Southern Water – short contact/hold	0330 303 0368 associated with the Southern Water batch	1:47	Short Southern Water contact
10 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Matthew – organisation not established from transcript	Not captured	0:33	Short message
10 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Unidentified / transcription unusable	—	12:13	Whisper output largely unusable
10 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Unidentified – no answer	—	0:45	No-answer attempt
10 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Environment Agency complaints – Katherine	Environment Agency	15:55	Existing Frederick Road reports/complaints searched
10 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Callback – Paul; organisation not explicit in the transcript	Not captured	19:10	2463541 / 02540649 and Southern Water references discussed
10 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as	Metropolitan / BUUK – Gary; call intended for Power	Number not captured	18:29	Site TQ8305011031

	verified	On			
10 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Power On – Natalie	Not captured	23:03	N0024590-1; Neil Fitzsimmons name discussed
10 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Unidentified	—	EMPTY	Empty transcript
10 August 2026	Recorder clock not treated as verified	Unidentified / unusable	—	0:16	Transcript contains only 'Thanks for watching!'
13 August 2026	Not verified	Southern Water – Claire Joblin, Developer Services Lead – Strategic Projects and Compliance	07840 718463	3:47	GDPR invoked while discussing publicly available Frederick Road technical/site documents
13 August 2026	Not verified	Southern Water – voicemail requesting Claire Joblin's manager	07840 718463	0:58	Escalation: request for Claire Joblin's manager details and urgent callback
13 August 2026	Not verified	Southern Water customer services / technical – manager escalation; Adam	Not captured	13:27	WC05348056; requested manager; transferred to technical then offered transfer back to customer services
13 August 2026	Earlier that day; exact time not verified	Environment Agency – Robert (identified in later recorded account)	Not captured	Recording unavailable	Asked three times whether he would reread the 2017 report re Ribeiro/Riberio issue; later account says he did not confirm he would
14 August 2026	Not verified	Consumer Council for Water (CCW) – Claire	0300 034 3333	23:13	Southern Water complaint process; Stage 1 / Stage 2; referral to CCW

1. Southern Water – earlier email / connection-safety escalation — 24 June 2026

Date: 24 June 2026

Time: Not verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: approximately 16:24

Reference: Frederick Road / Mount Pleasant; missing-email discussion; request to condemn/refuse connection pending safety evidence

Source recording/transcript: 2026-06-24-Southern-Water-Why-not-condemned-R20230705-061556.timestamped.txt

Key points:

- The call records an earlier Southern Water discussion in which expected emails were not appearing in your inbox or spam. You checked both during the call and said nothing had arrived.
- You expressly asked why Southern Water was not condemning/refusing the Frederick Road site connection until notice or evidence had been provided that the connection was safe.
- The Southern Water speaker said they would email/go back to the internal team with the information and later referred to communications appearing in a different application within the company.
- You asked for the email/contact details of the person behind the decision-making process. The Southern Water speaker repeatedly declined to provide that information or transfer you to that person.
- Later in the call you again stated that you were not receiving Southern Water emails and identified only a general SMW Sussex automatic response as having arrived.

Why this call matters: This adds an earlier chronological record showing that email/communication difficulties with Southern Water were already being discussed before the August 2026 Environment Agency routing failure. It also records that you expressly asked Southern Water to condemn/refuse the Frederick Road connection until safety had been established. The recording proves that those requests and concerns were put to Southern Water; it does not by itself establish that Southern Water agreed with the technical allegations or accepted that it had a legal duty to condemn the site.

2. House of Commons Inquiry / Parliamentary Contact Centre – Arthur — 30 July 2026

Date: 30 July 2026

Time: Not verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 9:26

Reference: Professional Standards – R20230622-224257

Source recording/transcript: Professional Standards - R20230622-224257

Key points:

- You were trying to establish why correspondence to the Parliamentary Standards / Commissioner route was being returned or was not producing a usable response.
- You asked for help reaching the correct Standards contact and for acknowledgement that your complaint/allegation had been received.
- The call discussed the published contact route and possible reasons that email delivery might be failing.
- You asked for a reference number or other confirmation that the matter had been recorded.

Why this call matters: This records an attempt to establish a functioning Parliamentary Standards contact route and obtain acknowledgement of a complaint. It is not a Frederick Road water call but is part of the 36-recording batch.

3. Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards – voicemail — 31 July 2026

Date: 31 July 2026

Time: Not verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 6:45

Reference: R20230623-000106

Source recording/transcript: Paliamentory-Standards-R20230623-000106

Key points:

- The automated message stated that complaints about MPs normally had to be made in writing and gave the Standards Commissioner route.
- You left your details after reporting difficulty using the email route.
- You said you were making a formal allegation/complaint and wanted a reference or acknowledgement.

Why this call matters: This preserves a voicemail record of your attempt to lodge a Standards complaint after difficulties with the email route.

4. Helena Dollimore MP – constituency voicemail — 3 August 2026

Date: 3 August 2026

Time: 15:30 stated in filename

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 2:46

Reference: R20230626-032712

Source recording/transcript: Helena Dolimore MP 3-30pm R20230626-032712

Key points:

- The MP's recorded message invited callers to leave a voicemail or contact the office by email.
- You left a message concerning Emily and asked the MP's office to engage with you.
- You referred the office to material you had already published or supplied.

Why this call matters: This is an Emily-related contact rather than a Frederick Road contamination call, but it is included because it forms part of the 36-call evidence batch.

5. Environment Agency – incident reporting line — 4 August 2026

Date: 4 August 2026

Time: Not verified

Telephone: 0370 850 6506

Transcript duration: 16:24

Reference: Site TQ8305011031; Southern Water reference WC05348056 mentioned

Source recording/transcript: 2026-08-04-Environment Agency 03708506506 R20230627-034653

Key points:

- You said you had already reported contamination at Frederick Road / the former Mount Pleasant Hospital site.
- You explained that your concern was contamination in the groundwater/water table rather than only remediated surface soil.
- The operator explained that the incident-reporting line could take reports but could not provide progress feedback.

- The operator agreed to log a water-pollution report and took the site location/grid reference.
- You supplied contaminant information and explained the proposed water connection.
- The operator said the report would be completed and passed to the relevant officers/local team.

Why this call matters: This records the Environment Agency receiving a detailed pollution report, including the groundwater concern, before the stated connection event.

6. Drinking Water Inspectorate – voicemail; filename says Environment Agency — 4 August 2026

Date: 4 August 2026

Time: 14:37 stated in filename

Telephone: Filename contains 0370 850 6506; DWI number not established from transcript

Transcript duration: 2:54

Reference: Southern Water WC05348056 mentioned

Source recording/transcript: 2026-08-04-Environment Agency 03708506506 14-37 47 mins R20230627-041952

Key points:

- The recording begins with a Drinking Water Inspectorate voicemail despite the Environment Agency description in the filename.
- You left a message concerning Frederick Road, grid reference TQ8305011031.
- You stated that reports recorded hydrocarbons in the water table and that DWI information had raised concern about contamination reaching drinking-water pipework.
- You referred to the proposed connection event and said Southern Water and the Environment Agency had already been notified.
- You offered to provide the underlying reports.

Why this call matters: This is evidence that the Drinking Water Inspectorate was notified of the groundwater/pipe concern. The filename/transcript organisation conflict should be retained rather than silently corrected.

7. Southern Water – Fiona — 4 August 2026

Date: 4 August 2026

Time: 15:49

Telephone: 0330 303 0368

Transcript duration: 27:22

Reference: WC05348056; Frederick Road, Hastings / TN35 5AU; grid reference TQ8305011031

Source recording/transcript: 2026-08-04 - 0330 303 0368 Southern Water 15-49 for 37 mins R20230627-050635

Key points:

- Southern Water said it had not yet taken ownership of the new estate.
- The fresh water and wastewater were still with IWNL / Independent Water Networks.
- Southern Water therefore said IWNL, not Southern Water, was the current water provider responsible for the site.
- The agent said the Environment Agency would need to attend/take samples before Southern Water could become involved.

- Southern Water expected connection works around 10 August, after which ownership might transfer.
- The agent explicitly said this was why you were being “shunned from pillar to post.”
- She advised you to contact IWNL and the Environment Agency and apologised for what was happening.
- You explained the 2006 and 2017 contamination reports, groundwater/water-table concern, and your concern that moving or covering soil did not establish that contamination had been resolved.

Why this call matters: This call is particularly useful for establishing who Southern Water said was responsible for the water supply at that date: IWNL.

8. Independent Water Networks Ltd (IWNL) — 4 August 2026

Date: 4 August 2026

Time: 16:08

Telephone: 020 8225 8340

Transcript duration: 43:04

Reference: 2463511 / 2463473; site TQ8305011031

Source recording/transcript: 2026-08-04 - 02082258340 IWNL 16-08 for 43 mins R20230627-053515

Key points:

- You reported the Frederick Road development and gave the site grid reference.
- You explained the contamination reports, groundwater/water-table concern and your concern about buried water services and lack of barrier protection.
- The IWNL agent said the information would be sent to the Water Quality Team.
- The agent said the matter might require people to be sent out to inspect it.
- The agent said the Water Quality Team should normally be able to respond quickly.
- The agent confirmed that your contact details and information had been emailed internally.
- You offered to provide the reports and said Southern Water and the Environment Agency had also been notified.

Why this call matters: This is a key notice call: IWNL was directly given the contamination/groundwater concern and said the matter was being passed to Water Quality for investigation.

9. IWNL – follow-up call — 6 August 2026

Date: 6 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: IWNL number not recaptured in transcript

Transcript duration: 60:00

Reference: 2463541; site TQ8305011031

Source recording/transcript: R20230629-225432

Key points:

- You followed up the earlier Frederick Road report and said you had previously been told somebody would inspect the site and that Southern Water would be contacted.
- You said you had been unable to get the reports/files accepted through the available IWNL upload/contact routes.
- You challenged the lack of progress and repeated the groundwater, hydrocarbons, buried-services and barrier-pipe concerns.
- The call confirmed reference 2463541.

- The IWNL agent said the matter/information had been passed on and referred to internal handling and the relevant water company.
- You repeatedly asked how you could supply the full supporting reports when the form or available email route would not accept them.

Why this call matters: This call is useful for showing that the issue remained live after the initial IWNL notification and that you were still trying to supply supporting reports and obtain the promised action.

10. IWNL / GTC Group – further follow-up — 6 August 2026

Date: 6 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 23:02

Reference: Follow-up to earlier IWNL report

Source recording/transcript: R20230629-235454

Key points:

- You continued the dispute about IWNL not providing a usable route for submission of the full reports/ZIP file.
- You said an earlier agent had said somebody from operations would contact you so that the additional information could be supplied, but that this had not happened.
- The agent said the information already shared had been passed to the correct team.
- You challenged whether the matter had actually been handled and referred again to the promised contact with Southern Water.

Why this call matters: This records continued difficulty providing the supporting evidence and your challenge that promised follow-up action had not occurred.

11. Environment Agency incident hotline – Bill — 7 August 2026

Date: 7 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Environment Agency incident hotline

Transcript duration: 14:16

Reference: 02540649 discussed

Source recording/transcript: R20230630-002659

Key points:

- You asked for an update on the Frederick Road contaminated-water/groundwater report.
- Bill said the incident hotline did not have progress information available but could re-log an ongoing incident.
- You said you had also contacted IWNL and Southern Water and were concerned no one was taking effective action.
- The call located/reference-checked the earlier report, including 02540649.
- You asked how to make a complaint about the lack of action and were given a complaints route.

Why this call matters: This records a further Environment Agency contact in which you sought progress, were told the hotline could not provide it, and moved toward a complaint because the incident remained unresolved.

12. Environment Agency – general enquiries / complaint escalation — 7 August 2026

Date: 7 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Environment Agency

Transcript duration: 30:29

Reference: 2463541 and 02540649 both mentioned

Source recording/transcript: R20230630-004123

Key points:

- You explained the Frederick Road groundwater and buried-water-pipe concern and challenged the lack of action by the Environment Agency and IWNL.
- You supplied/quoted the existing references and said the connection event was approaching.
- You referred to Southern Water's position that it had not yet taken ownership and to the barrier-pipe issue.
- The call moved into complaint/escalation handling and discussion of forwarding the matter to the local/development team.
- You put on record that you did not accept liability for consequences or costs arising from what you described as neglect.

Why this call matters: This call shows escalation from incident reporting into formal complaint territory and repeated notice of the claimed groundwater/pipe pathway.

13. East Sussex County Council switchboard — 9 August 2026

Date: 9 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: 0345 608 0190 used; 01323 747207 discussed as non-working

Transcript duration: 8:05

Reference: Frederick Road public-health concern

Source recording/transcript: R20230702-223732

Key points:

- You first reported that the published number 01323 747207 was immediately dropping the call.
- You then explained the Frederick Road contamination/water concern and said you were not receiving a response from Public Health or planning-related departments.
- You said you had already contacted IWNL and the Environment Agency.
- You asked for a Public Health adviser to call you urgently.
- The call was transferred/queued but did not produce a substantive Public Health response.

Why this call matters: This records an attempt to place East Sussex County Council/Public Health on notice and the practical difficulty reaching an appropriate officer.

14. Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards – automated message — 9 August 2026

Date: 9 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 0:26

Reference: Automated Standards information

Source recording/transcript: R20230702-224620

Key points:

- The recording contains the automated House of Commons Standards message explaining that complaints about MPs must be made in writing.
- No substantive conversation is captured.

Why this call matters: This is an automated/administrative recording, not a Frederick Road water call.

15. Environment Agency incident hotline — 9 August 2026

Date: 9 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Environment Agency incident hotline

Transcript duration: 7:12

Reference: 2463541 and 02540649 mentioned in the call

Source recording/transcript: R20230702-224719

Key points:

- You called again about Frederick Road and said the water connection was occurring/approaching while the reported groundwater contamination remained unresolved.
- You referred to earlier Environment Agency and IWNL references and repeated the drinking-water-pipe concern.
- The hotline agent said he answered phones and sent reports onward but did not action or track the work himself.
- You asked what had happened as a result of the previous report; the agent said he did not have that information.
- The agent said he had already sent off a report with the information available.

Why this call matters: This records repeated notice to the Environment Agency and the limitation of the hotline: reports could be forwarded, but the caller could not obtain substantive progress information there.

16. Drinking Water Inspectorate – voicemail — 9 August 2026

Date: 9 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 2:04

Reference: 2463541 / 02540649 stated

Source recording/transcript: R20230702-225453

Key points:

- You reached the DWI voicemail and asked for an urgent response.
- You described a concern about contaminated water/groundwater being connected to water supplies in the South East.

- You gave the two existing reference numbers 2463541 and 02540649.

Why this call matters: This is a further direct attempt to alert the Drinking Water Inspectorate and obtain assistance.

17. Unidentified — 9 August 2026

Date: 9 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: —

Transcript duration: EMPTY

Reference: Empty transcript

Source recording/transcript: R20230702-225721

Key points:

- The generated transcript is zero-length.
- No reliable organisation, speaker or content can be established from this transcript.

Why this call matters: This recording requires re-transcription or direct audio review before it can be relied on.

18. East Sussex County Council switchboard / Public Health attempt — 9 August 2026

Date: 9 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 7:42

Reference: References stated: 2463541, 02540649, WC05348056

Source recording/transcript: R20230702-225758

Key points:

- You challenged repeated transfers to unavailable staff while saying you were trying to report an urgent public-health issue.
- You repeated that the Public Health team had not responded.
- You gave the Environment Agency/IWNL/Southern Water reference numbers already associated with the matter.
- The switchboard attempted to put you through to the Director of Public Health.
- The resulting route again reached voicemail/unavailable staff.

Why this call matters: This shows repeated attempts to reach East Sussex Public Health and records that you supplied the existing agency/water-company references to the council.

19. Unidentified person/department – unavailable — 9 August 2026

Date: 9 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 1:38

Reference: No substantive call

Source recording/transcript: R20230702-230615

Key points:

- The recorded message says the person being called is on another call and asks the caller to try again.
- No substantive conversation is captured.

Why this call matters: This is an unsuccessful contact attempt only.

20. Environment Agency – further follow-up — 9 August 2026

Date: 9 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Environment Agency

Transcript duration: 19:53

Reference: 2463541 mentioned

Source recording/transcript: R20230702-230918

Key points:

- You said you had reported the water-pollution/groundwater issue repeatedly and could not get a substantive response.
- You said the connection was taking place that day and repeated the Buro Happold/QTS, groundwater and barrier-pipe concerns.
- You described difficulty supplying the full supporting ZIP/report material through the Environment Agency's upload process.
- The agent searched for the prior report/reference and said the available route was to report again or pursue a complaint.
- You said a previous complaint had also failed to produce a reference or useful feedback.

Why this call matters: This is significant as a same-day/near-connection follow-up showing repeated reports, continued absence of substantive feedback and a request for escalation.

21. East Sussex County Council – Children's Services / Assessment & Planning transfer — 9 August 2026

Date: 9 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 15:48

Reference: Frederick Road; other agency references discussed later in call

Source recording/transcript: R20230702-233202

Key points:

- You were incorrectly routed into Assessment and Planning / Children's Services while trying to report the Frederick Road public-health concern.
- You explained the contamination, groundwater and buried-pipe concerns and said the site was being connected to water services.
- The officer said the department handled children with educational needs and was not the correct destination.

- The officer nevertheless tried to find the correct department and transfer you onward.

Why this call matters: This illustrates the difficulty getting the public-health concern to the correct East Sussex department and preserves another notice of the Frederick Road issue.

22. East Sussex County Council – Adult Social Care Complaints voicemail — 9 August 2026

Date: 9 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 2:09

Reference: Adult Social Care Complaints and Feedback voicemail

Source recording/transcript: R20230702-234907

Key points:

- The recording identifies the Adult Social Care Complaints and Feedback Team voicemail.
- No substantive Frederick Road discussion is captured.

Why this call matters: This is another unsuccessful/misdirected attempt to reach an appropriate East Sussex public-health contact.

23. East Sussex County Council – Public Health voicemail attempt — 9 August 2026

Date: 9 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 2:12

Reference: Public Health voicemail; transcription of department name is unclear

Source recording/transcript: R20230702-235156

Key points:

- The recording reaches a voicemail that the transcription identifies as a Public Health-related office.
- The automatic transcription of the exact department/person name is unreliable.
- No substantive two-way conversation is captured.

Why this call matters: This is further evidence of attempts to reach Public Health, but the exact voicemail identity should be checked against the audio before quoting it.

24. East Sussex County Council – Debbie / switchboard — 9 August 2026

Date: 9 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 10:15

Reference: Frederick Road / Public Health

Source recording/transcript: R20230702-235458

Key points:

- Debbie called/spoke with you again after another transfer had reached an answering machine.
- You explained that Southern Water had said it had not yet taken over the site and that IWNL had been identified as the relevant network operator.
- You repeated the groundwater and barrier-pipe concerns and said the Drinking Water Inspectorate information was relevant.
- Debbie tried further extensions/routes within Public Health and discussed the repeated transfers into unrelated services.
- The call did not result in a substantive Public Health technical response.

Why this call matters: This is useful for documenting East Sussex switchboard's repeated attempts to locate a responsible Public Health contact and the lack of a substantive response during the call.

25. Environment Agency – follow-up — 10 August 2026

Date: 10 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Environment Agency

Transcript duration: 8:23

Reference: 02540649 stated

Source recording/transcript: R20230703-000635

Key points:

- You followed up the Frederick Road groundwater/pipe concern and gave reference 02540649.
- You challenged statements that the matter was not for the Environment Agency and referred to the water table/groundwater role.
- You said the issue had not been dealt with despite repeated reports and that Public Health contacts were also not producing action.
- The conversation focused on responsibility and the lack of substantive response rather than gathering a wholly new incident report.

Why this call matters: This records continued Environment Agency contact on 10 August and your challenge to the repeated responsibility/redirect problem.

26. Environment Agency – short follow-up / transfer — 10 August 2026

Date: 10 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Environment Agency

Transcript duration: 2:14

Reference: Follow-up to existing Frederick Road reports

Source recording/transcript: R20230703-001548

Key points:

- The transcript is short and only partially intelligible.
- It appears to be part of the continuing Environment Agency contact sequence concerning responsibility and the Frederick Road report.
- No new technical resolution is clearly captured.

Why this call matters: Because the transcript is limited, this call should be treated as a supporting contact record rather than relied upon for a detailed factual proposition.

27. DEFRA helpline — 10 August 2026

Date: 10 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 5:36

Reference: DEFRA helpline; later batch references include 2026 1144E

Source recording/transcript: R20230703-001854

Key points:

- The recording reaches the DEFRA helpline and contains its automated/queue system.
- It forms part of your escalation of the Frederick Road contamination/public-health concern beyond the local agencies.
- The transcript contains limited substantive two-way discussion.

Why this call matters: This records contact with DEFRA as part of the escalation chain; any detailed allegation should be supported by the fuller correspondence/reference record rather than this short transcript alone.

28. Southern Water – short contact/hold — 10 August 2026

Date: 10 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: 0330 303 0368 associated with the Southern Water batch

Transcript duration: 1:47

Reference: Short Southern Water contact

Source recording/transcript: R20230703-002503

Key points:

- The recording contains Southern Water hold/menu material and a short contact attempt.
- The transcript does not contain a substantial new technical discussion comparable with the 4 August Fiona call.

Why this call matters: This confirms another Southern Water contact attempt but the 4 August call remains the stronger substantive Southern Water record.

29. Matthew – organisation not established from transcript — 10 August 2026

Date: 10 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 0:33

Reference: Short message

Source recording/transcript: R20230703-003359

Key points:

- You addressed a person called Matthew.
- You stated that you intended to put the recordings online.
- The recording is very short and does not establish Matthew's organisation or role.

Why this call matters: This should not be used to attribute Matthew to an organisation unless another source independently establishes his identity.

30. Unidentified / transcription unusable — 10 August 2026

Date: 10 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: —

Transcript duration: 12:13

Reference: Whisper output largely unusable

Source recording/transcript: R20230703-003439

Key points:

- The automatic transcript consists largely of repeated 'Thanks for watching', counting and unrelated fragments.
- No reliable organisation, participant or substantive call content can be established from the transcript.

Why this call matters: This recording needs direct audio review/re-transcription before it can be used evidentially.

31. Unidentified – no answer — 10 August 2026

Date: 10 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: —

Transcript duration: 0:45

Reference: No-answer attempt

Source recording/transcript: R20230703-004946

Key points:

- The transcript contains 'Hello' and then 'No, no answer.'
- No substantive conversation took place.

Why this call matters: This is an unsuccessful call attempt only.

32. Environment Agency complaints – Katherine — 10 August 2026

Date: 10 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Environment Agency

Transcript duration: 15:55

Reference: Existing Frederick Road reports/complaints searched

Source recording/transcript: R20230703-005503

Key points:

- You challenged the lack of response to earlier Environment Agency incident reports and complaints.
- Katherine searched the complaints/enquiry records and said she could see emails that had been forwarded to an area/enquiry team.
- You repeated the Frederick Road contamination, groundwater, drinking-water and barrier-pipe concerns.
- You said you intended to ask Southern Water to condemn/refuse the site connection because other bodies were not resolving the issue.
- Katherine identified herself by name near the end of the call.

Why this call matters: This is important because an Environment Agency complaints agent located previous emails/forwarding activity, providing evidence that the matter had entered internal Environment Agency channels.

33. Callback – Paul; organisation not explicit in the transcript — 10 August 2026

Date: 10 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 19:10

Reference: 2463541 / 02540649 and Southern Water references discussed

Source recording/transcript: R20230703-061403

Key points:

- You discussed the contamination reports and the groundwater/pipe concern with Paul.
- You listed the organisations you had contacted, including DEFRA, IWNL, Network Services, the Environment Agency and Southern Water.
- Paul said he would pass/send the information on and repeatedly referred to letting 'the inspector' know.
- You asked for water testing and raised the lack of barrier pipe as you understood it from the Southern Water discussions.
- The transcript does not explicitly establish Paul's organisation, so it should not be attributed without another source.

Why this call matters: This is useful as evidence of a callback and an undertaking to pass the information to an inspector, but the organisation should remain unconfirmed unless another record identifies it.

34. Metropolitan / BUUK – Gary; call intended for Power On — 10 August 2026

Date: 10 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Number not captured

Transcript duration: 18:29

Reference: Site TQ8305011031

Source recording/transcript: R20230703-074802

Key points:

- You believed you had called Power On, but Gary explained that the number reached Metropolitan District Heating and Hot Water.
- Gary said Metropolitan and Power On were within the same wider company/group and that there was a different number for Power On.

- You gave the Frederick Road grid reference and explained the groundwater, hydrocarbon, buried-pipe and cross-contamination concerns.
- You referred to Southern Water's position that it had not yet taken over the site and to your understanding that barrier pipe had not been used.
- Gary provided/confirmed Power On contact information, including a contact transcribed as Neil Fitzsimmons, and said he would forward the information.

Why this call matters: This call is useful for tracing the route into Power On/BUUK and for showing that the contamination concern was communicated within the wider group before the direct Power On call.

35. Power On – Natalie — 10 August 2026

Date: 10 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: 23:03

Reference: N0024590-1; Neil Fitzsimmons name discussed

Source recording/transcript: R20230703-200115

Key points:

- You called Power On about planned water/service connection works at Frederick Road and were given/confirmed reference N0024590-1.
- Natalie asked whether you were reporting a public-health safety hazard; you said it was a public-health risk.
- You explained the contamination, groundwater, hydrocarbons, buried-pipe and barrier-pipe concerns.
- You gave existing IWNL and Environment Agency references and explained Southern Water's position that it had not yet taken ownership.
- You raised that email addresses you had been given, including an inspector contact transcribed as Neil Fitzsimmons, had returned errors.
- Natalie took the information and discussed the site/work reference.

Why this call matters: This is the principal direct Power On notice call in the batch. It records Power On being told of the alleged contamination/pipe risk in connection with its works and links the concern to reference N0024590-1.

36. Unidentified — 10 August 2026

Date: 10 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: —

Transcript duration: EMPTY

Reference: Empty transcript

Source recording/transcript: R20230703-202427

Key points:

- The generated transcript is zero-length.
- No reliable organisation, speaker or content can be established.

Why this call matters: This recording requires re-transcription or direct audio review before it can be used.

37. Unidentified / unusable — 10 August 2026

Date: 10 August 2026

Time: Recorder clock not treated as verified

Telephone: —

Transcript duration: 0:16

Reference: Transcript contains only 'Thanks for watching!'

Source recording/transcript: R20230703-202445

Key points:

- The only generated transcript text is 'Thanks for watching!'.
- This is almost certainly a Whisper hallucination or unusable transcription rather than meaningful call content.

Why this call matters: This recording requires direct audio review/re-transcription before any evidential use.

38. Southern Water – Claire Joblin, Developer Services Lead – Strategic Projects and Compliance — 13 August 2026

Date: 13 August 2026

Time: Not verified

Telephone: 07840 718463

Transcript duration: approximately 3:47

Reference: Frederick Road / Mount Pleasant; public-domain technical/site documents; GDPR discussion

Source recording/transcript: Timestamped transcript supplied in the 13 August 2026 correspondence record

Key points:

- You called Claire Joblin following her email and explained that you were receiving no substantive help from the Environment Agency and were asking bodies to consider the later contamination evidence, including the 2017 report.
- Claire Joblin maintained that the site was owned/managed by Independent Water Networks Ltd (IWNL) and said the matter was not Southern Water's site.
- When you continued to ask Southern Water to address the contamination and connection concerns, the Southern Water speaker stated: "We can't comment because of GDPR," and directed you toward the Consumer Council for Water / IWNL.
- Later in the same call, when you asked why Southern Water was not concerned, the speaker again relied on the site's ownership and referred to "GDPR" as part of the reason for not commenting.
- You challenged that response immediately. You stated that the documents under discussion were already in the public domain and were technical/site material rather than personal data, and that you were supplying information to Southern Water rather than seeking disclosure of personal information.
- The call also contains a disagreement about whether the IWNL system was connected to a Southern Water-operated water supply. Southern Water denied that it was connecting to Southern Water's supply,

while you challenged that position by reference to check valves and the material you had already supplied.

Why this call matters: This is the first direct record in the 13 August sequence of Southern Water invoking GDPR while declining to comment on the Frederick Road material. The evidential point is the statement actually made during the call and your immediate challenge that the documents being discussed were already in the public domain and concerned technical/site information rather than personal data.

39. Southern Water – voicemail requesting Claire Joblin's manager — 13 August 2026

Date: 13 August 2026

Time: Not verified

Telephone: 07840 718463

Transcript duration: 0:58

Reference: Escalation following Claire Joblin call

Source recording/transcript: 2026-08-13-Southern-Water-Claire-Joblin-R20230706-065236.timestamped.txt

Key points:

- The recording begins with your statement that you would go to the manager, after which the line reaches voicemail.
- You identified yourself as Martin Newbold and stated that your previous call had been disconnected.
- You asked for the details of Claire Joblin's manager.
- You asked that her manager call you back as soon as possible.

Why this call matters: This preserves the immediate escalation step after the Claire Joblin conversation. It shows that you did not leave the matter at the disputed GDPR response: you expressly requested Claire Joblin's manager and an urgent callback.

40. Southern Water customer services / technical – manager escalation; Adam — 13 August 2026

Date: 13 August 2026

Time: Not verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: approximately 13:27

Reference: WC05348056; manager escalation; GDPR/public-domain documents; circular transfer

Source recording/transcript: 2026-08-13-Southern-Water-R20230706-065506.timestamped.txt

Key points:

- You called Southern Water asking why the organisation was not addressing the reported contamination issue and stated that you were trying to reach a manager after the earlier call with Claire Joblin.
- You explained that Claire Joblin had relied on GDPR in relation to information that you said was publicly available on the internet. You again stated that the material was in the public domain and that you were providing information rather than making a GDPR request for information.
- The first Southern Water agent apologised for the poor customer service you described and said she would transfer you to the relevant department.
- After the transfer, the receiving agent identified himself as Adam. When you asked whether he was a manager, he said: “No.” You pointed out that you had specifically asked to be put through to a manager.
- You identified Claire Joblin by name and role and again challenged the use of GDPR in relation to the publicly available Frederick Road documents.
- Adam said he was in the standard technical department rather than Developer Services and said a technical manager would not be able to deal with Developer Services queries.
- You repeatedly requested a manager in the relevant team. Adam said there were managers in that team but that he could put you through only to the team line, not directly to a manager.
- During the GDPR discussion, Adam stated: “Our manager wouldn’t understand GDPR.” You then asked to be transferred to the department that dealt with GDPR/data processing.
- When you asked where he proposed to transfer you, Adam said he would transfer you to the customer service team because you wanted to speak to somebody about GDPR. You pointed out that customer services was the route you had just come from.
- Later in the call Adam said his technical function dealt with wastewater spillages and fresh water. You reiterated that the issue you were reporting concerned water and contamination and that you were supplying information, not seeking information.
- Adam ultimately advised you to send the information to the customer accounts route and said he had provided the avenues available to him.

Why this call matters: This call documents the escalation failure after the Claire Joblin conversation. You asked for a manager; customer services transferred you to a technical agent who expressly said he was not a manager; and the proposed next route was back to customer services. It also records repeated internal uncertainty about which Southern Water team could deal with the GDPR/public-domain issue and preserves your repeated explanation that you were supplying contamination evidence rather than requesting personal data.

41. Environment Agency – Robert; original recording unavailable — 13 August 2026

Date: 13 August 2026

Time: Earlier that day; exact time not verified

Telephone: Not captured

Transcript duration: Original recording/transcript currently unavailable

Reference: 2017 report; Ribeiro/Riberio issue; later contemporaneous account

Source recording/transcript: Original Robert call unavailable. Entry based on Martin Newbold’s later recorded account during the 13 August 2026 Southern Water / Claire Joblin call.

Key points:

- During the later recorded call with Claire Joblin, you stated that you had spoken with a man called Robert earlier that day while seeking Environment Agency action on the Frederick Road contamination issue.
- You stated that you asked Robert whether he would reread the 2017 report specifically in relation to the Ribeiro/Riberio part of the evidence.
- You stated that you put that question to him three times and that he did not state that he would sit down and reread the report.
- Because the original Robert-call recording is currently unavailable, this entry records only what you said about that earlier call in the later contemporaneous recording. It is not presented as a verbatim transcript of Robert or as independent proof of his exact words.

Why this call matters: This preserves the existence and substance of the earlier Robert contact without overstating the evidence. The later same-day recording provides a contemporaneous secondary record that you had already challenged Robert about rereading the 2017 report, while the absence of the original recording is expressly disclosed.

42. Consumer Council for Water (CCW) – Claire — 14 August 2026

Date: 14 August 2026

Time: Not verified

Telephone: 0300 034 3333

Transcript duration: approximately 23:13

Reference: Southern Water complaint process; Stage 1 / Stage 2; referral to CCW

Source recording/transcript: 2026-08-14-Communicattion-with-CCW-03000343333-R20230707-010021.timestamped.txt

Key points:

- The CCW adviser identified herself as Claire and explained that CCW oversees how a formal complaint has been dealt with. She said CCW is not the regulator and has no authority or enforcement power over the water company.
- Claire explained that, under the normal water-company complaint route, the formal complaint goes through Stage 1 and Stage 2 before the customer is directed to CCW. She described CCW's role as reviewing whether the formal complaint process was handled correctly, rather than necessarily changing the underlying outcome.
- You stated that Southern Water had not dealt with Stage 1 or Stage 2 and challenged why Southern Water had nevertheless referred you to CCW.
- Claire said CCW would obtain confirmation from Southern Water that the complaint was exhausted before it went forward for caseworker handling.
- When you asked for written information so that you could put the Stage 1 / Stage 2 issue back to Southern Water, Claire said she would send the relevant complaint-process information. During the exchange in which you asked her to state that the stages had not been initiated and CCW therefore could not investigate, she responded "Yeah" and said she would send the information; this should not be

treated as independent proof that Southern Water omitted the stages unless the promised written response confirms that point.

- Later, when you said there was no evidence of a Level 1 or Level 2 complaint or case number, Claire said Southern Water did not have to give you a case number. You disputed that position. No Stage 1 or Stage 2 decision, findings or complaint reference was identified during the call.
- Claire ended by saying she would send an email explaining the correct complaint process.

Why this call matters: The useful evidential issue is procedural rather than customer-service quality. The call records CCW explaining its limited role and the expected Stage 1 / Stage 2 route, while preserving your challenge that Southern Water had not evidenced completion of those stages before directing you to CCW. It also records CCW's undertaking to send the complaint-process information. The call does not independently establish the underlying contamination allegations or, by itself, prove that Southern Water failed to complete the complaint stages.

WRITTEN EVIDENCE UPDATES — 13 AUGUST 2026

A. Drinking Water Inspectorate response — Reference 2026/1178E — 13 August 2026

Date: 13 August 2026

Time received: 19:52

Organisation / person: Drinking Water Inspectorate — Samantha, Inspector

Reference: 2026/1178E

Source: Email response received from DWI on 13 August 2026

Key points:

- DWI stated that it does not approve the commissioning of new water supplies and does not have a role in requiring water companies to disclose technical documents, risk assessments, plans or test results to third parties.
- DWI stated that decisions relating to the design, construction and commissioning of water infrastructure remain the responsibility of the water company, subject to compliance with applicable legislation.
- DWI stated that contaminated land, groundwater pollution and land remediation are primarily the responsibility of the relevant environmental and local-authority regulators, including the Environment Agency and the local authority where appropriate.
- DWI stated that commonly available domestic water-testing kits are not suitable for testing drinking water to the standards required for regulatory purposes.

Why this written response matters: It places DWI's position on responsibility in writing. In particular, it identifies the water company as responsible for design, construction and commissioning decisions, while identifying the Environment Agency and relevant local authority as the principal regulators for contaminated land, groundwater pollution and remediation.

B. Formal safeguarding referral sent to Children's Services / SPoA and other bodies — 13 August 2026

Date: 13 August 2026

Time sent: 20:46:49

Subject: Re: 2026/1178E - Martin Newbold - Water Quality Enquiry 2026/1144E, 02540649.FORMAL SAFEGUARDING REFERRAL REQUEST

Direct recipients: Drinking Water Inspectorate; East Sussex Adult Social Care Complaints & Feedback; East Sussex Children's Services / SPoA (0-19.spoa@eastsussex.gov.uk); Environment Agency contacts; Southern Water; Helena Dollimore MP.

Copied recipients: Robert Cornell (Environment Agency); Southern Water Customer Accounts; Ofwat; Southern Water Customer Services.

Source: Gmail sent-message record

Key points:

- The email was expressly headed "FORMAL SAFEGUARDING REFERRAL REQUEST".
- It quoted DWI's written statement that decisions relating to the design, construction and commissioning of water infrastructure remain the responsibility of the water company, subject to applicable legislation.
- It asked Adult Social Care to formally refer the Frederick Road information to East Sussex Children's Services / Single Point of Access (SPoA) for safeguarding consideration.
- It stated that the request was not for Adult Social Care to determine the technical contamination issue, but to ensure that the potential safeguarding implications for children were considered by the appropriate Children's Services safeguarding team.
- It requested written confirmation of whether the referral was made, the date and time, the Children's Services/SPoA reference number, and the team or officer to whom it was referred.
- It further requested that, if the referral were declined, the name and position of the person making that decision and the reasons for refusing be provided.
- It asked that the information already supplied to Adult Social Care be preserved and passed with the referral so that Children's Services received the evidence rather than only a summary.
- Children's Services/SPoA was itself a direct recipient of the sent email, so the safeguarding material was not dependent solely on Adult Social Care forwarding it internally.

Why this written referral matters: The sent-message record confirms direct contemporaneous notice to Children's Services/SPoA as well as Adult Social Care, DWI, the Environment Agency, Southern Water and the constituency MP. It also preserves the specific requests for a reference number, identified responsible team/officer, and reasons for any decision not to refer or act. The record should be described as formally sent and capable of being logged/retained by the recipients; it should not be characterised as guaranteed permanent retention unless a recipient's retention policy or case record confirms that.