

Dear Madam,

I am responding on behalf of Yoxford PC of which I am a councilor.

At LI.1.43 you have asked us in connection with the Accommodation Campus -Scale: " Please provide additional information as to why it is considered that the proposed accommodation campus would not provide enough accommodation [RR-1277]".

We are somewhat mystified by this and wonder whether the question has been asked of the wrong Parish Council. We think it is unlikely that we would have made such a suggestion unless in relation to our observation that we would expect there to be a demand for accommodation in our village from the Sizewell C work force, which would put pressure on property/rental prices to the detriment of local residents and the local tourist industry. This observation was based on our experience from the construction phase of Sizewell B. We think it unlikely that the size of the accommodation would affect this issue, because it is more a matter of individuals wishing to find their own accommodation rather than live in `barracks' under strict control, or because of their personal circumstances (such as wishing to live with a partner).

We would like to help you and will try to do so; can you please clarify the origin of your question to help us to help you.

With best wishes, your sincerely

John Sutherell

In RR-1277, in trying to cut out extraneous words to keep within the requested word count in leading into points 3 and 4, we have unintentionally created a meaning at paragraph 2 that wasn't intended.

Ideally, the quoted sentence should have been "We think that the proposed campus is not intended to provide enough accommodation for all non-home-based workers". This point was made to set the scene for points 3 and 4 about impacts on the private rented sector and repurposing tourist focused accommodation.

We did not intend to imply that the campus should be bigger without any justification or a suggestion of a more suitable size.

Of course a potential mitigation for our points 3 and 4 could be a larger campus but if, and only if, non-home-based workers would take up that accommodation rather than use the private rented sector and current tourist focused accommodation. We did not suggest that solution as we thought it would be unlikely to work. We are fairly sure that the campus and campsite have been sized assuming a percentage of workers would rather, and are going to use the private rented sector. In consequence a larger campus would sit partially unoccupied and would not mitigate the problem.

I do hope that this clarifies our submission