

4.19. An area of 0.76ha of land is allocated for approximately 20 dwellings which is considered to be a reasonable area to allow for the constraints and infrastructure requirements noted above to be incorporated into the site layout and design, whilst also reflecting the context of the site.

Consideration of NPPF Tests of Soundness: The proposal is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework Clause 79:-

79. "To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."

The village has grown considerably over the last 25 years but the limited services are minimal and have not kept pace. They comprise:

- 1) a small village school (which is often over-subscribed),
- 2) a 1960-s built small village hall. No grants have been available to give a new, better village hall other than to re-roof it periodically with a bitumen/felt covering. It is only kept going by the good will of a small number of people in the community. Cil moneys are not of the order required for replacement.
- 3) an hourly bus service to Norwich. There is only one weekly service to Wymondham, none to Hethersett (which are not practically accessible by foot).

There is no village shop. A shop did exist, but it closed, even though the village expanded.

Further, large scale housing development in Barford will not contribute to a sustainable village. Indeed, it will have the opposite effect. Many houses have been built during the recent past. As a "Service Village", the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) states that between 10-20 new dwellings are expected during the life of the plan, i.e. from March 2011 – 2026.

Barford has already had the following approvals for dwellings from March 2011 to the present: 2021/1293, 7 dwellings; 2021/1133, 1 dwelling; 2019/1117, 4 dwellings; 2016/0790, 1 dwelling; 2016/0497, 1 dwelling; 2015/0329, 2 dwellings (plus 2 holiday lets); 2014/0505, 1 dwelling; 2014/0062, 1 dwelling; 2013/1849, 1 dwelling; 2013/0388, 2 dwellings; 2011/0538, 1 dwelling. This shows an **increase of 24 dwellings** (including 2 holiday lets) over the plan period to date, with still (in theory) three years of the JCS to run.

The additional housing has **not benefited the residents** already in the village, other than to permit a few landowners to benefit from the "windfall" associated with building on green field sites.

The proposed VCBAR1 development would bring the value of new dwellings since 2011 to at least 43, which is two and a half times the upper limit of that expected for this Service Village. It will also create more pressures on the local school which is often oversubscribed (so other schools will be used resulting in unnecessary car use). The lack of a **village shop anywhere in this Village Cluster of four villages** means that residents will be obliged to drive since public transport is severely limited and we are 4-5 miles from the nearest commercial centre of significance (Wymondham). This is contrary to the use of sustainable transport.

We are not aware that any of the above dwellings built/that will be built, to be net zero compliant.