

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

Dyfrig James  
Managing Director  
Lafarge Aggregates Limited  
PO Box 7388  
Granite House  
Watermead Business Park  
Syston Leicester  
LE7 1WA

12 January, 2006

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

Dear Mr James

You are aware of the proposals for 'The Ditchingham Quarry' project located in Norfolk and of **ENRAGED** (Norfolk Residents Against Gravel Extraction in Ditchingham).

I refer to Stuart Anderson's letter to Ditchingham Parish Council dated 10/01/2006 and to other recent correspondence between Lafarge (with yourself and with the 'project team' at Panshanger Park in the UK, with M. Lafont and M. Collomb in France), and with ENRAGED, and with Ditchingham Parish Council. [An abstract of the most recent correspondence is extracted from the ENRAGED web site and is annexed herewith. By following the URL [http://www.nraged.org.uk/History\\_001.htm](http://www.nraged.org.uk/History_001.htm) you will be able to download a PDF of this and other relevant correspondence].

In M. Lafont's letter dated 21/12/2005 he stated [I quote] '**... We strongly believe in an open and constructive dialogue with our stakeholders**'. . he concludes '**... I would be grateful if all correspondence be addressed to the country manager Mr. Dyfrig James who will respond to your recent and future communications as appropriate.**'

Given this express statement by the Lafarge Group Chief Executive Officer, I trust that you will now provide ENRAGED [who have the full support of Ditchingham Parish Council to represent local residents in their opposition to this application] with the courtesy of a response, that is: appropriate; addresses the specific questions raised; and provides evidence or other metrics or calculations to substantiate remarks made.

In particular I would ask you to explain:

- Why is it that Lafarge has made no mention in any communication of the invitation by Ditchingham Parish Council to M. Collomb?
- Why is it that the specific issues detailed in the letter to M. Lafont have received no response?
- Why is it that Lafarge offer to engage privately with the parish council but steadfastly refuse to do so with ENRAGED?
- Why is it that Lafarge will not categorically state that they: will not [at anytime] include a readymix batching plant in the Ditchingham scheme, or if not, that they decline to use the associated [and by implication more appropriate] traffic movements that include readymix in their application?

- Why Lafarge will not provide evidence based metrics to support specific assertions? For example, Lafarge has now stated that vehicle movements would [if readymix were part of the scheme] be 58/ day. Yet in the letter of 09/12/2005 Lafarge clearly states that readymix would not [necessarily] change traffic movements. So why then is it that the metrics have now changed? Furthermore, these statistics remain inconsistent with information previously provided by Lafarge [that indicates an extraction rate of up to 125'000 tonnes pa with 60% as readymix]. Please provide evidence of how Lafarge has calculated the new metric (eg the assumptions used on output, tonnes per movement (by product, type of vehicle, etc)).
- Why Lafarge makes a 'gesture of goodwill', when what is required is a categorical offer of an appropriate and legally binding agreement that will [for all time] deny Lafarge (and the Estate) exploiting: the other areas for mineral extraction; landfill; and for value added operations (eg readymix)?
- Why Lafarge continue to use Whitlingham as a comparator, when the facts are that the Ditchingham site (and situation) is totally different?

That Lafarge continue to ignore, or provide bluff PR responses, to our communications that attempt to establish facts, as a challenge to the selective information that has clearly, [perhaps intentionally?] been provided by Lafarge as part of their 'pre-application consultation' and subsequent selective representation of information provided in the ESS accompanying the application, is wholly unacceptable.

The Panshanger Park project team has done Lafarge no credit. We would expect more from a company that M. Lafont promotes as being concerned '*... to care about the local communities in which we operate*'.

I look forward to your prompt response. We want to receive a reply that specifically and fully addresses the questions asked above and in context of the referenced correspondence. We want metrics to support calculations. We do not want to receive a reply that is inappropriate, contains PR script, or is simply bluff.

Please address any communications to Froggs Hall, as above.

**Yours sincerely**

Julian Green  
**ENRAGED**

**Copies (France):**

- M. Bertrand Collomb
- M. Bruno Lafont

**Copies (UK):**

- Robert Tamworth; Mr & Mrs Jonathan Chadd.
- John Smith, Clerk to Ditchingham Parish Council; Alan Burrell, NCC; Richard Carden, SNDC; Richard Bacon, MP.
- Chris Tyacke, Clerk to Hedenham Parish Council.
- Mike Jackson, Director Panning & Transportation Department, NCC; Nick Johnson, Planning Department, NCC; Stuart Ashworth, Planning Department, NCC.
- Stuart Anderson, Projects Director, Lafarge Aggregates Limited; JW Gough, DL Walker; Michael Horton, Savills.
- Ruth Rolls, RR Environmental Communications.

**Attached:**

- Abstract of recent correspondence (from ENRAGED web site)

## Abstract of recent correspondence (from ENRAGED web site)

**10/01/06 Lafarge respond to Ditchingham Parish Council.** Responding to the Parish Council's letter of 21st December, the Lafarge PR engine is clearly desperate to pour oil on troubled water. The response only provides to demonstrate yet more 'smoke and mirrors' with no willingness to offer a legal undertaking not to proceed with the 'other' planning considerations, and no calculations to support their (now) revised traffic movements. That Lafarge has the audacity to insult the intelligence of the local community in this ridiculous fashion is astonishing. ENRAGED will respond appropriately. [DocH0490](#)

**21/12/05 Lafarge respond to ENRAGED.** At last? M. Bruno Lafont acknowledges ENRAGED, but yet amazingly manages to avoid any direct response to correspondence. Naively perhaps he comments that he would be grateful if all correspondence be addressed to the country manager Mr. Dyfrig James... rest assured M. Lafont. Dyfrig James has a lot to answer for, including the dismissive attitude of his UK operations staff. The least that we expect is the courtesy of a relevant response... [DocH0480](#)

**21/12/05 Ditchingham Parish Council respond to Lafarge.** Commenting on the letter from Lafarge (9<sup>th</sup> December) saying that it does nothing to allay local residents fears. [DocH0470](#)

**13/12/05 ENRAGED write to Ditchingham Parish Council.** And copy widely their comments in response to the Lafarge letter of 9<sup>th</sup> December to Ditchingham Parish Council. [DocH0450](#)

**09/12/05 Lafarge respond to Ditchingham Parish Council.** And decline the Parish Council's request to attend the parish meeting but take the opportunity to advise the clerk of further developments and clarifications that might be of interest to members & residents. The letter is pure spin and a poor [if not an increasingly desperate] attempt to distract the community from the facts. [DocH0440](#)

**06/12/05 Lafarge SA respond to Ditchingham Parish Council.** The French respond to the Parish Council's letter, yet totally avoid any comment with regard to Council's invitation to visit. It is similar to the standard response that we are becoming increasingly familiar with from Lafarge, and whilst the letter is signed by M. Lafont... the Council's letter was to M. Collomb. It would be reasonable (we would hope) to expect at least a reference to the invitation. If this is an example of the corporate standard that Lafarge [self] promotes as willingness for community involvement... there is little hope! [DocH0430](#)

**05/12/05 Lafarge respond to ENRAGED.** And decline our invitation to attend the ENRAGED residents meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> December. So much for community involvement! [DocH0420](#)

**02/12/05 Lafarge respond to ENRAGED.** Dyfrig James UK Managing Director acknowledges receipt of ENRAGED letter (18/11/05) but has little substance. [DocH0410](#)

**30/11/05 ENRAGED invite Lafarge to Residents Meeting.** In the spirit of full and free consultation ENRAGED invite Lafarge (Stuart Anderson, Ruth Rolls [RR Communications] & John Gough [DL Walker]) to the Residents meeting. [DocH0400](#)

**18/11/05 ENRAGED write to Dyfrig James (Managing Director Lafarge UK Operations).** This letter includes copies of the correspondence to his French colleagues (M. Collomb, Lafont, and Kasriel), copy press coverage, and enquires why it is that Lafarge decline to consult with the community. [DocH0380](#)

**18/11/05 Ditchingham Parish Council write to M. Collomb (Chairman Lafarge Group).** Following a request from the public at the parish council meeting 7th November, the parish council invite M. Collomb to come to Ditchingham and see for himself the destruction that Lafarge propose. Local residents are happy to provide accommodation and the Community of All Hallows has also offered for him to stay there. (This letter is in French). [DocH0370](#)

**14/11/05 ENRAGED write to M. Lafont (CEO (designate) of Lafarge Group).** Congratulating M. Lafont on his appointment, we acknowledge that he, responsible for 77,000 employees, with operations in 75 countries, and with revenues of €14.4m, is unlikely to be aware of a local scheme like Ditchingham... but nonetheless he should. So we tell him! Of the destruction, the PR spin that Lafarge use, the lack of community consultation, and of the apparently dismissive approach that LAL has of UK planning regulation. (This letter is in French). We include as annexes: LAL PR press release and the NTS, ENRAGED's information pack and commentary to the NTS, extracts from the NMLP, and a history of the scheme... including the 'smoke and mirrors' told through copy correspondence with DL Walker. ). [DocH0360](#)