

**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

19 January, 2006

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

Dear Mr James

Thank you for your letter of 16 January 2006 and for your prompt response. You remark that you refer to my letter of 12 January 2006, and other related correspondence, **regretfully however it appears that you have given little consideration to the issues raised.**

You will recall that I concluded our letter of 16 January [I quote] *'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.'* Regretfully however, in the main, your response appears just that, ie 'PR script, or is simply bluff'

I remind you that I requested that *'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? **You have made no mention of this matter.***
- *Why is it that the specific issues detailed in the letter to M. Lafont have received no response? **You have made no mention of this matter.***
- *Why is it that Lafarge offer to engage privately with the parish council but steadfastly refuse to do so with ENRAGED? **You make no comment why it is that Lafarge offer to engage privately with the parish council but steadfastly refuse to do so with ENRAGED. You refer to Local Liaison in your response.*** If you have reviewed the file you will be aware that Panshanger Park project team has not only instructed DL Walker not to engage in further correspondence, but that Lafarge has also declined to attend residents meetings or to comment in the media. Only belatedly has Lafarge chosen to make contact with the Parish Council. While Lafarge may have publicised the exhibition as you note, the facts are that Lafarge did not write to the majority of immediately impacted residents (in Hedenham, and in nearby Free Lane and Pound Lane and along the Norwich Road). That approximately 100 people visited the exhibition, after excluding the personal invitations as noted, it is only through the efforts of concerned local residents who copied the Lafarge materials and distributed this (by calling on doors) to the very community that Lafarge 'ignored', that this attendance was figure achieved. That effort, alongside the distribution by ENRAGED of a detailed mail shot to almost every household in Ditchingham, Hedenham and Broome, (together with the associated media focus) inviting residents to a residents meeting in September [at which some 130 local residents attended] was for many local residents the first that they actually become aware

of the proposed scheme. We acknowledge that some local residents visited Whitlingham, but as noted below, Whitlingham should not be considered as a comparator. You are correct that the purpose of the NTS is 'a short summary of the proposals'. Indeed this is a statutory obligation to satisfy the requirement of European Directive (85/33/EEC as amended by 97/11/EC). There is a level of concern that the NTS prepared for the Ditchingham scheme does not actually meet the statutory requirement in providing an accurate summary of the proposals in non-technical terms. I would further argue strongly that as the NTS is positioned from a PR perspective rather than to summarise the scheme it is hardly consistent with the spirit of genuine community consultation based on objectiveness and fact.

- *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? I note your remarks with regard the readymix plant.* I can only conclude that it is indeed, the intention of Lafarge to introduce a readymix plant and potentially other value added processing activities onto the Ditchingham site. While the Lafarge application and its supporting documentation makes little mention of likely supply and demand [through other nearby quarries] Lafarge is no doubt aware of the mineral reserves and planning merits that would influence the status of the Earsham capability. This is evidenced by the inclusion of readymix in the original scheme concept. That the ES is silent on the impact of this likelihood only illustrates further the arrogance of Lafarge.
- *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). I note your remarks with regard the HGV movements associated with a hypothetical readymix plant.* I can assure you that here has been no misunderstanding. At the July exhibition I discussed the issue of readymix with the 'expert' in the specific context of the question 'if there was a readymix plant as part of this application how much of this sites production would be exported as readymix' to which the metric of 'typically 60%' was the response. I thank you for the metrics provided, however this cites the current output of Earsham as a benchmark. The concern of local residents is the potential of the Ditchingham site and based on the information provided to us by Lafarge our calculations of 90- 125 HGV movements per day are consistent with the method of calculation that Lafarge use.
- *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)? I note your remarks with regard the Option Deed.* Nonetheless local residents require a legally binding obligation on Lafarge and the Estate that these schemes [ie to include possible extensions or future new schemes] can never proceed, otherwise any assurance or 'gesture of goodwill', however well intended, is worthless.
- *Why Lafarge continue to use Whitlingham as a comparator, when the facts are that the Ditchingham site (and situation) is totally different? I note your remarks with regard the Whitlingham site.* I agree that 'what is important is that they are all operated and restored to a consistently high standard, irrespective of size, circumstance or location' nonetheless the Whitlingham site is not a valid comparator to Ditchingham. The facts are

that whatever the merits (or otherwise) of the Whitlingham site, it is not an appropriate comparator viz a vie the proposed site at Ditchingham, with regard scale (size), location, or intended after use. Unlike Whitlingham, the Ditchingham site will not deliver public access or other public benefit after restoration. The success of the Whitlingham site is not to the credit of Lafarge but is the result of the generosity of Sir Timothy Coleman that made available the site to the people of Norwich and the planning conditions attached.

Mr James. To conclude I repeat the closing remarks made in my previous letter. *'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.'*

I repeat also *'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'.*

If as M. Lafont suggests Lafarge is genuinely *concerned '... to care about the local communities in which we operate'* then I would hope that Lafarge will, as Ditchingham Parish Council suggest in their letter dated 13 January 2006, extend their invitation for a meeting to the key members of ENRAGED. We confirm that we would be pleased to attend such a meeting, and indeed should either M. Collomb, M. Lafont, or yourself choose to visit Ditchingham, then we would be pleased to convey in person the very concerns that Lafarge appear not to acknowledge.

I look forward to your further response, that this time I trust, will be appropriate and *'specifically and fully addresses the questions asked above and in context of the referenced correspondence.... We do not want to receive a reply that is inappropriate, contains PR script, or is simply bluff.'*

Please address your response 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 Planning & Transportation Department, NCC; Nick Johnson, Planning Department, NCC; Stuart Ashworth, Planning Department, NCC.
- John Tomlinson. Planning Department. SNDC
- Stuart Anderson, Projects Director, Lafarge Aggregates Limited; JW Gough, DL Walker; Michael Horton, Savills.
- Ruth Rolls, RR Environmental Communications.

**Attached:**

- Dyfrig James letter 16/01/2006