

**Froggs Hall
Norwich Road
Ditchingham
BUNGAY
Suffolk
NR35 2JU**

Writing to
Title
Organisation
A1
A2
A3
A4

03 November, 2005

RE: The Ditchingham Quarry (Land off Norwich Road B1332).

Dear Salutation

Please find attached copy correspondence (to JW Gough at David L. Walker) for your records. It is with deep regret that I write this letter at all.

The subject matter is self-explanatory... but in summary it concerns potentially defamatory allegations. This is a serious matter.

For the benefit of the copy recipient of this correspondence I wish it to make it absolutely clear, that from the advent of this scheme, that I myself and other members of ENRAGED, have only ever endeavoured to establish exactly what it is that the Ditchingham Estate and Lafarge (and others acting as their agents) have been seeking to promote on [their] land in Ditchingham.

Only through our efforts has the true extent of the current and potential scope of the proposals been revealed... this includes discovering the existence of the option agreement between the Estate and Lafarge that identifies not just one site (the current application at Fen Lane), but a further three sites in addition.

That Lafarge (and the Estate):

- are silent on matters as significant as the future potential of the scope of quarrying activity within a broader remit (as evidenced by the option agreement) is unacceptable and disingenuous
- are proud to promote a public exhibition in Bungay yet make only 'limited' effort to inform the community of their plans and at the exhibition the ecology expert was 'sick' with no deputy provided, or that the experts that were available were unable to provide informative answers on even basic questions (eg traffic movements, environment, hydrology, ecology, etc) does not convince the community that this is open and free consultation

- are willing to provide only adequate information concerning the application and the environmental impact to the broader community at a cost of £95 (or by inspection at official premises) is similarly inconsistent with willing and participative public consultation

If indeed Lafarge (either directly, or acting through DL Walker as their agents) have concerns about disinformation they should make available a full comprehensive and accurate summary of the scheme that considers the scheme now and the future implications thereof. Not just the context of the current application which potentially misrepresents the longer-term goal. It should be noted that

- information provided should not be selective as it appears to be in the 'Non Technical Summary' (NTS) as produced by Lafarge and distributed to a small number of recipients. ENRAGED has published a commentary on the NTS on their web site www.nraged.org.uk.
- the full environmental statement summary (ESS Volume1) as lodged with Norfolk County Council also fails to do so and appears to contain many inconsistencies and/ or inaccuracies. The ESS and the detailed experts reports included as annexures (some 1000+ pages) are not documents that the general public would find easy to read.

As residents we, and ENRAGED as the appointed residents organisation with the full support of; Ditchingham Parish Council; our District and County Councillors; and of our MP, are entitled to expect from Lafarge (as a company that holds itself out as operating under the highest business ethics, albeit that these are self-promoted), full and complete disclosure of all facts relevant to its plans. It is unfortunate Lafarge, apparently acting through their agents appear not to share this view.

It is not unreasonable to assume therefore, that if Lafarge genuinely wish to consult with the community then it would be in their interest to produce materials that are appropriate for that purpose. This would avoid the need to make allegations with regard to disinformation.

By including you as a copy recipient of this correspondence I wish to reinforce your awareness that Lafarge propose to introduce this scheme into an attractive rural landscape and on a site that on highways, environmental and amenity grounds is wholly unsuitable. Furthermore, this site is not identified in the Norfolk Minerals Plan.

I have written separately to Bruno Lafont.

If you should you have any queries in connection with the attached please do not hesitate to contact us. In this instance please address any communications to Froggs Hall, as above.

Yours Sincerely

Julian Green
ENRAGED