Firstly further to the Parish Councils statement of support subject to "neighbours approval" we confirm that as the only immediate neighbours to the agricultural field in question we do not approve of the change of use to a beer garden/play area and therefore object to the planning application for the following reasons:

The fact that the land lies within the green belt means that the development is "inappropriate". As the NPPF in relation to green belt states 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. We do not feel that the reasons specified by the applicant do clearly outweigh the inappropriateness of the application as we feel that there are no "very special circumstances" in this case.

Sufficient and very good quality play facilities already exist in the village only a few hundred yards from the pub in the grounds of the village hall. It should also be noted that the other public house in the village also has a beer garden. The applicant's report suggests that the public house business would not be viable without the beer garden and play area, this is surely unproven, as the beer garden was insitu before the applicant purchased the property. Whilst it is true that the pub has changed hands three times in the last thirty five years there has only been one extended period (several months in 2007) when it was closed and that was following the unapproved actions of a tenant of the former owners. Following this period the pub was run by the subsequent tenant seemingly quite successfully for around five years, with an outdoor seating area in the "beer garden" but without play equipment.

As the applicants report states at point 3.*9. "Policy DC2 of the Core Strategy states that the Council will safeguard and, where possible, enhance the historic environment, areas of historic landscape character and interests of acknowledged importance" …. "remains by:*
· Resisting development which would harm or be detrimental to the special character and historic heritage of the District's towns and villages and those interests of acknowledged importance.
· Promoting development which sustains, respects or enhances buildings and features which contribute to the character or heritage of an area and those interests of acknowledged importance through the use of conservation area appraisals, design statements, archaeological assessments, characterisation studies and Master planning".
We do not see how the installation of a green metal caterpillar, swings, slide or a set of five-aside of goal posts satisfies any of the above.

The applicants report at point 5.4 states "limited impact on the openness of the Green Belt". The NPPF does not define any levels of impact on openness it either impacts on openness or it doesn't. The fact that it does therefore implies that the development is inappropriate.

Contrary to what the applicants report states the beer garden and play area is not "*afforded reasonably good screening in views from the public domain owing to the presence of existing mature hedgerows along the site boundary"* as stated at point 5.6. The area occupied by the beer garden and play area is clearly visible from:
i) the churchyard opposite, where the ground level is as high as the top of the hedge. Anyone seeking to pay quiet, peaceful respects to a loved one in the church yard would find it difficult (unless it was raining). The Diocese of Lichfield state in their churchyard regulations the following *"Churchyards are places of solace and relief for those who mourn. In addition many people find comfort in knowing that their mortal remains will be interred in a particular churchyard and in a particular setting. That comfort derives in part from a confidence that the character of that setting will be preserved. Churchyards are also an important part of our national and local heritage."* Surely the planning authority should endeavour to maintain the character of the setting;
ii) the road when approaching from the south also provides a clear view into the area and;
iii) from our property to the north the area is viewed from several of our windows and from our garden. In addition it appears that the fact that the play area is crossed by a public footpath is ignored in the applicants report, obviously in this case there is no screening from the public domain.

We feel that, in relation to this application the play equipment, particularly, is (using terminology applied in the officers report for planning application SMD/2014/0723) harmful to the open and rural character and appearance of the landscape.

The applicants report includes at point 5.11. the following -'*Paragraph 9 of the NPPF furthermore confirms that pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people's quality of life, including: "**improving the conditions in which people** live, work, travel and **take leisure**" (our emphasis)'.*

Our emphasis is that since the inclusion of the play equipment and the enlargement of the beer garden the "*conditions in which"* we (and we are **people**) *"**live**"… "and **take leisure**"* have not been improved in fact the opposite is the case. We spend a lot of time in our garden and have to endure constant noise. It seems to have become the norm that on a summer weekend for the noise to start at around noon and carry on with short break periods until the sun sets, at which point often the play noise is replaced by increasingly loud "conversation". As the level of conversation noise rises unfortunately (as everywhere in the countryside) the background noise levels fall increasing the impact of the noise on our use of our home.

People will no doubt say that the sound of children playing is something to be welcomed, we would agree, however after 8 hours it does become annoying especially when raised adult tones, thudding footballs, constantly squeaking swings and music are added, and when this situation is repeated almost every day when it's not raining throughout most months of the year it is not an happy experience. The situation is amplified in warm weather when you cannot find escape indoors as windows are invariably required to be open, and when most windows and both doors face the "play area".

Noise isn't listed in the NPPF as having an impact on the "openness" of the green belt but we feel that it should be, surely sound impact is as important as any visual impact. Both have an effect on our senses, the only difference is that on the visual side of things you can simply look the other way, that unfortunately doesn't work with noise.

Added to the noise is the fact that now the leaves have dropped the from the hedge between our garden and the field a large proportion of our garden is not at all private and in view of the beer garden area, even at night due to the floodlighting mounted on the pub. The hedge provides no visible barrier or any barrier to noise.

SD4 of the Core Strategy states "*The Council will ensure that the effects of pollution (air, land, **noise**, water, light) are avoided or mitigated by refusing schemes*"(our emphasis!)

R1 of the Core Strategy states "*Appropriate development should **not harm the rural character and environmental quality of the area** or any sites designated for their nature conservation, **or historical interest by virtue of the scale, nature and level of activity involved** and the type and **amount of traffic generated** or by other effects such as **noise** and pollution*" (our emphasis!).

The writer of the applicants report emphasis parts of the NPPF that support their case, however it is equally as easy to emphasise the same extracts and end up at a different view point, for example:
-'*Paragraph 9 of the NPPF furthermore confirms that pursuing sustainable development involves seeking **positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment**, as well as in people's quality of life, including: "**improving the conditions in which people live**, work, travel and **take leisure***" (our emphasis)'.

The inclusion of the play equipment (swings, climbing frame, goal posts & footballs, slide) has changed the environment around this part of the village and we feel it's not a change for the better.

Finally we refer to the case of **Fordent Holdings Ltd v SSCLG [2013]** –in which it was stated that *"If a promoter of a scheme was able to obtain permission to change the use of agricultural to an open sporting ground he might well wish to construct or add to facilities in subsequent years. There would be great danger in not requiring very special circumstances to be demonstrated for future applications for the provision of facilities at existing outdoor recreation or sporting sites in the Green Belt."*
We feel that this is a huge risk on this site.