

Response # Comment

- 11 Expansion will affect the unique qualities of the town.
- 13 Think it may be necessary but would prefer not to expand.
- 18 I prefer no expansion, infill only, but only if that is not possible would I agree to a very limited expansion.
- 20 Inappropriate expansion will/does upset equilibrium / social order / provision of services - infill / limit expansion.
- 22 Expansion prevents overcrowding in town centre; as long as it's controlled, it's a good thing.
- 29 Only expansion for affordable housing if this can't be provided in any other way.
- 33 Need to keep rural feel and limit building.
- 41 Again - national park - does this not mean anything any more? It isn't just houses you build, it is roads and infrastructure.
- 45 No building on main approaches to village; small developments.
- 46 No more building on green fields.
- 50 Limited only to ensure views and look of town are maintained without new builds at every entry point.
- 52 I feel that no green space should be sacrificed for new builds and that only existing sites within the town should be used.
- 54 Expansion only if it protects the look of the town. Use brown-field sites first. Housing the other side of the town.
- 57 Important that any developments are small-scale and respect the character and appearance of the town.
- 58 No.
- 60 This is the 3rd or 4th survey I remember taking part in, but you just keep on building! Please stop building.
- 61 But only for truly affordable housing.
- 62 As above, use Thompson's site for housing and any other infill. Don't expand beyond current boundaries.
- 64 I don't understand the question - there is nothing on the website to help me understand (well not that much).
- 66 Many of us older "incomers" came here because the landscape and town are attractive. Our acceptance of expansion is based on that.
- 73 Relocate Thompsons to industrial site close to A38 and redevelop with max of housing types, light commercial, etc.
- 76 Nothing on this about transport provision.
- 81 Only if very necessary- infill for preference.
- 84 What would the objective be to expand - can you promise to improve things?
- 86 Should be around primary school area.
- 93 Thompsons ideal area for housing as brown field site- could accommodate 100 homes on this site alongside the school.
- 94 Thompsons brownfield site ideal for expansion - some housing, some industrial units for employment.
- 103 If we grow too fast the character of the town will be lost.
- 106 It's really important for Moreton that it keeps that mix of agricultural and natural spaces alongside the built-up area.
- 108 There's a danger of loss of identity.
- 110 Development must be limited to house those who need to remain, i.e. children of residents.
- 111 Infrastructure will not cope (i.e. roads, health centre, schools etc.).
- 113 Why? The infrastructure would not cope.
- 116 Enough to achieve B1.
- 117 There are already two infill expansion sites which could provide adequate housing provision.
- 118 There are already sites planned for expansion.
- 119 Identified needs of current population, i.e. new carpark, social housing / 1 bed affordable private rental.
- 120 If rate of growth continues at about the same rate, new home figures can easily be met by development of the town.
- 124 Possible space for new car park.
- 125 We need more social housing and affordable homes, and won't get these unless there is more available land.
- 126 Ensure infrastructure is improved and expanded to account for new homes.
- 127 No more building - only social housing and infill.
- 129 I think we need to allow for more creative / ecological ideas when it comes to planning permission. I don't think we should be too restrictive.
- 131 Green spaces should all be protected. No more housing built unless social housing and more small a

135 Broad expansion is not desirable in a rural community within a National Park particularly when there
138 See [B1] above. There is a limit to how far housing can extend before it turns into a ring of sterile est
143 Small town size surrounded by stunning National Park scenery should be maintained - this is why pec
146 Moretonhampstead does not need to become too much bigger.
147 Why should it? The benefits are not clear and obvious.
154 To include Forder Farm, Bradford Meadow and Thompsons Yard.
155 Very limited expansion. Include development of Forder Farm above the school, top of Thompsons Y:
156 To sustain a viable commercial centre, we need more younger working people.
157 See above - preserve countryside.
159 Care needed with design of housing put upon the approaches to the town - first impressions count.
160 Before any expansion the commercial sites (e.g. Thompsons) should be developed. The argument it
161 We live in a national park. Urban sprawl does not belong here.
162 No - I don't think it should be expanded.
163 Definitely not.
164 Absolutely not.
167 If it's done sensitively in certain areas such as Betton Way & Station Road & behind Court St bungalo
170 The reason I live here is because it's small and has a good community - this would be spoilt if expand
171 Green spaces with-in the town should be preserved. Building only needed for industrial use and for :
175 In small parcels that don't impact on the view of the village as it is approached.
176 I would be happy to give a detailed response to this on behalf of Moreton's Special Qualities.
177 As above: the aesthetics of the town as it is approached should be considered.
180 See above [Being overdeveloped, crowded estates, poor quality housing].
187 Again, would ruin any natural areas.
190 Chagford has been ruined. Please don't ruin Moreton.
191 No! Plenty of unused houses in Bovey, Newton and Chagford.
200 At the moment 2018 not too much infill only. But in about 20 years who knows.
201 Build on existing (brown field) e.g. Thompsons before green field sites.
203 Unless the road to Exeter and Bovey Tracey is improved properly more people can't travel around sa
207 Small developments, low impact.
209 The only housing we need is social housing for rent. Any other expansion needs to be business-relat
213 This is a National Park! Covering green land with housing, even contemplating it, is outrageous. The
215 We could end up with boundary "creep".
216 Bradford Meadow, Forder Farm and Thompsons should be first choices.
221 Should use brown field sites before green - e.g. Thompson's Yard. Steward Community Woodland sh
222 Use brown field sites i.e. Thompsons site before green areas.
226 Allotments. Very important and I had one elsewhere in the County for 20 years. I won't be applying
228 Consider allowing building in areas that are more difficult to access.
237 I think Moretonhampstead works very well the size it is.
240 Only to accommodate/provide for locals to either buy or rent at affordable prices.
247 A difficult balance between retaining Moreton's character and providing sufficient housing. The exis
254 More homes/parking needed = more space.
257 Expanding the boundary would impact the character of the town.
260 This should be the first option, linked to ensuring any empty properties are brought back on stream.
268 At a controlled rate - yes.
269 We need advice to answer the question about why? - town planning advisors?

274 Encourage infilling and small scale expansion only. Don't spoil Moreton with estates spoiling approach.
297 The danger of expanding the settlement boundary appears to be that anything within it would be covered.
300 Expand only into areas that wouldn't change the character of the town on its approach.
306 Until all infill has been used for housing, expansion should not be considered.
309 We need to preserve the beauty of the town.
311 We live on Dartmoor, it's beautiful. I have chosen to live in a rural area for this reason. I don't think
313 There's no infrastructure to allow any expansion.
314 No need to expand current boundary. Huge potential in Thompsons Yard.
315 There seem to be ample infill spaces for expansion.
316 Every house built will have 2 cars. The road and infrastructure cannot support more.
323 Roads from the town are poor, with many pinch points. It's not sensible to expand the settlement at
324 I spent several minutes looking for the settlement boundary as per instructions, but no luck!
327 I don't want to see more new builds, especially not on green fields - keep development realistic. Any
337 We need new build but not too much.
342 The preference would generally be for limited expansion of existing settlements rather than huge new
344 Fill in existing areas, as in Coleridge Mews.
345 There are enough corners that could be infilled. We are not here to guarantee profits for developers
347 Plus infill.
348 Why one box only!! I would like to see majority of infill AND possibly limited expansion.
349 But for small surrounding hamlets to have expansion.
350 There is ample space for building houses at the same rate as since 1945.
351 Any more expansion is limited by road infrastructure and parking.
354 Expansion can only harm the village, and make lots of money for a small number of individuals.
368 [Opposes extensive development. Need for affordable housing clear and could be catered for by infill
369 See reply to B1. It's a tourist attraction in a national park. Don't f**k it up!
371 Again, expanding too far will dilute the community and informal character of the town.
373 Infrastructure would not be able to cope; lose the village feel of the town.
380 I want Moreton to remain a village which is a very separate entity. I want enough shops and businesses
382 Housing, please - lots needed.
387 See housing and infrastructure comments.
388 There is ample space for development within the boundary.
389 The existing boundary is already adequate. We need to keep the town's appearance and feel as at present
390 Do we really want to expand? Perhaps we need to really consider our own young people's needs before
391 WE ARE IN A NATIONAL PARK.
392 With a lack of police presence and limited doctor / schooling, Moreton is already over capacity.
399 Green space is important for residents - it is also what brings in visitors/ trade.
405 As a country, we as a population live on top of each other. Preserve the space that is left or lose it.
414 I do not think any expansion should compromise the approach views and fields. This is a very special
415 There should be more opportunities to build in different places, not just in town. DNP needs to adopt
417 Scrap DNP and empower local parish council.
424 Aren't there any "brown field" sites to benefit from before gobbling up green fields.
425 Important not to compromise the local area or the local community.
429 And mindful infill; see also replies to QB1 and Q1 about housing styles and materials.
439 Expansion only for affordable homes (for people under age of 35-40). Mixture of one- and two-bed
440 In order to fulfil housing needs some expansion may be needed. This should be done in a very sensitive

sion but using brownfield sites if at all possible.
ited expansion has worked successfully for centuries.

ds and roads fill with houses and mean more houses - look at Okehampton.

nt.
own should be built on.
of Forder Meadow wouldn't look too bad. Is that within the boundary?
own.

efore we become full of second homes and buy-to-lets.

ary.
at I could see).
ance and welcome into the town reflects the strong and confident stable community already here.
ommerical, heritage crafts with a good supermarket.

one - some employment areas needed.
it opportunities.

re ancient town's settlement pattern. Endless infill to the town boundaries will turn it into yet another dormitor

ital accommodation, can be met by development within existing settlement boundaries.
rent on land already within the current settlement boundary. I feel strongly that the current settlement bounda
ble building land.

t was so sad that Steward Wood was closed - it was one thing that made me proud of Moreton. As a young prof
nd very small (cheap) business units provided.

There is no increase in employment, and in infrastructure such as roads.
tates, and what makes Moreton special is lost
ople choose to live here!

ard and, possibly, Bradford Meadow.

gives employment to locals is a myth.

ws. But they have to be affordable and so some kind of compulsory purchase is needed. This shouldn't be a goal
ed and it will never have the infrastructure for it due to wiggly hills / roads which is part of its charm.
social housing.

fely.

ed - for more jobs and improvement in local incomes.
re is brown field land available - use it.

ould have been allowed to remain. Why to DNP reject sustainable housing and grant planning <permission> for
here as I no longer want the tie. Hopefully the landowners don't see it as a future "cash cow".

ting boundaries should not be breached except in exceptional circumstances.

Expansion only if and when population growth is expressly linked to sustainability / environmental impacts.

ch and views, like Chagford or Bovey Tracey.

nsidered as "fair game" to develop, rather than ring-fencing open spaces as may be assumed.

we should destroy nature by expanding the settlement boundary.

s it will just increase commuter traffic. Major expansion should only be considered for settlements which lie bes

/ development should be eco-friendly and sustainable and in keeping with the landscape. This can be done as ch

w towns like Cranbrook, provided infrastructure can meet increased demand.

.

ill sites. We should oppose use of green space to build developments of questionable quality for developer profi

ises that it is sustainable and I want it to remain a village / small town where a complete mix of people want to li

resent.

th in housing and employment. Can we really afford to lose any more farming land?

l, valuable quality of Moretonhampstead.

ot a slightly more flexible approach to planning applications.

homes. Expansion could include dedicated residents' car parking area.

ive way, avoiding large commercial housing development and preferring smaller innovative developments such

ry town. Keeping those historic views and ancient boundaries is the key to its charm and prosperity.

ry should not be expanded for housing until appropriate development has occurred on land already identified w

essional, I would love to see more possibilities for buying land to build our own sustainable housing- not being :

d mine for the landowners.

· concrete estates on farm land and green field sites<?>.

ide the major roads: A30, A38, and A386.

ieaply as conventional new-builds.

it - learn from Chagford! Apart from environmental destruction, developers have no interest in necessary parall

ive and are welcome.

as self-build, low impact and conversions. These should be considered even if not adjacent to the current settler

ithin the current settlement boundary. The only circumstance in which I would support very limited expansion c

sold out to developers.

el development of infrastructure; town already has traffic problems. Evictions from Steward Wood shameful - a

ment boundary if they are sensitive and useful. This type of development would lead to a much more diverse an

of the settlement boundary would be to facilitate the creation of a well-designed and appropriately-positioned c:

dded to housing pressure; prejudicial behaviour toward alternative lifestyle.]

id interesting character for the parish.

ar park.