

Appendix – Changes Required to Address Holt Parish Council's Objections

Holt Parish Council's objections to PL/2026/04774 are set out in our submission. This appendix identifies the changes the Parish Council considers necessary to address those objections while allowing Bellway to substitute its own house types. The purpose is to retain the key design principles, safeguards and quality secured through the approved Reserved Matters scheme.

References to plots are shown as approved Bewley plot → proposed Bellway plot.

1. Retaining the Approved Scale and Amenity Safeguards

Concern: Bellway's proposed house-type substitutions reduce the internal floorspace provided within the smaller two and three-bedroom market homes, introduce larger house types in sensitive locations on the eastern edge, include two three-storey Shipwright houses where building height had previously been addressed, and remove a site-specific privacy safeguard adjoining Great Parks.

Changes required: Amend the Bellway house-type substitutions to respect the scale, massing and site-specific relationships established by the approved Reserved Matters scheme. In no particular order:

1. review the proposed two and three-bedroom market house types and provide house types more closely comparable in size and accommodation to those within the approved scheme;
2. review the proposed four and five-bedroom house types on the eastern edge, particularly at Plots 30–33 and 83–84, and substitute smaller house types where necessary to protect the approved extent, darkness and ecological function of the eastern corridor;
3. replace the two proposed three-storey Shipwright houses at Plots 43 → 79 and 42 → 80 with smaller two-storey three-bedroom Bellway house types; and
4. substitute or amend the proposed house type at Plot 88 → 39 so that its first-floor window arrangement and relationship with 4 Great Parks are no worse than under the approved Reserved Matters scheme.

2. Protecting the Approved Landscape Framework

Concern: Bellway's revised house types reduce the approved landscape and ecological framework. Development now adjoins and, in places, encroaches into the approved 20m eastern ecological corridor; approved trees are removed and the submitted LEMP is not accurate.

Changes required: Reinstate and protect the approved landscape and ecological framework wherever Bellway's house-type substitutions have resulted in its loss or reduction, including in no particular order

1. reinstate the approved tree planting;
2. move the affected houses, gardens and parking at Plots 30–33 and 83–84 outside the approved 20m ecological corridor;
3. reconsider the house types at Plots 85–87 to retain a soft rural edge adjoining the Public Right of Way and open countryside;
4. submit a corrected, Bellway-specific LEMP and ecological plans based on the actual proposed layout; and
5. identify and secure the 25 swift nest bricks on the relevant Bellway plot and house-type drawings, with consideration given to increasing the provision.

Changes needed to accommodate Bellway house types should be contained within individual plots rather than resulting in wider erosion of the approved landscape and ecological strategy.

3. Protecting the South-west Landscape Buffer

Concern: Relocating the electricity substation introduces additional built infrastructure and hardstanding into the approved south-west landscaped public open space and buffer to Great Parks and results in the loss of two trees from the approved six-tree community orchard.

Changes required:

1. relocate the electricity substation outside the south-west landscaped public open space, either to its approved Reserved Matters location or another location which does not diminish the approved landscape and amenity function of that area; and
2. restore the approved community orchard and landscape treatment of the south-west corner, including the six approved orchard trees.
3. retain the approved attenuation pond as a permanently wet feature throughout the year, designed and managed in accordance with the approved Reserved Matters scheme.

4. Retaining the Heart of the Development

Concern: Bellway replaces the approved alms-house-style one-bedroom maisonettes around the central green (Plots 53–64) with a mix of one, two and three-bedroom homes (Plots 61–72), weakening the distinctive building form and parking arrangement around the central green.

Changes required: Reinstate the design principles and quality of the approved central green so that the green and its surroundings together retain their role as the heart of the development, including in no particular order:

1. restoring the distinctive building composition, character, enclosure and sense of place achieved by the approved Reserved Matters scheme;
2. using buildings of sufficient architectural quality and variety to positively frame the space;
3. reducing the prominence of street parking around the central area; and
4. reinstating appropriate visitor parking.

5. Retaining Design Quality and Integration

Concern: Bellway's proposals reduce the approved design quality and integration of the affordable housing. In particular, the removal of all affordable-housing car ports makes its parking more visually prominent in views within and into the development, including at the Melksham Road village entrance.

Changes required: Revise the affordable housing so that it retains the tenure-blind design quality, integration and appropriate parking secured by the approved Reserved Matters scheme, including:

1. reinstating the principle of the distinctive one-bedroom maisonette arrangement at the heart of the development, with architectural treatment of equivalent quality to the approved alms-house-style design;
2. reinstating the approved car ports serving affordable homes, or providing equally effective design solutions which contain and soften views of parking, particularly at proposed Plots 14/15 on the Melksham Road frontage;
3. providing convenient parking for the adaptable dwellings, particularly proposed Plots 10/11 and 51/52;
4. ensuring all affordable dwellings meet Wiltshire Council's adopted parking standards; and
5. ensuring Bellway's house-type substitutions do not result in a lower standard of design or accommodation for affordable housing than for the development as a whole.

6. Meeting Parking Standards Without Dominating the Public Realm

Concern: Bellway's revised parking arrangements remove car ports, make parking more prominent in street scenes and appear to leave a number of plots below Wiltshire Council's adopted parking standards, including proposed Plots 26, 27, 28, 29 and 55.

Changes required: Revise the Bellway parking layout to reinstate the quality and functionality of the approved parking strategy, so that:

1. all dwellings meet Wiltshire Council's adopted parking standards;
2. appropriate visitor parking is provided around the central green area;
3. parking is designed and located so that it does not become more visually prominent than in the approved scheme, including through the use of car ports where appropriate; and
4. parking supports rather than dominates the public realm.

7. Retaining a Soft, Landscape-led Entrance to Holt

Concern: The cumulative effect of Bellway's house designs, flatter roof forms, removal of feature materials, loss of a car port, increased visibility of parking and replacement of the approved hoggin path with a "mown path TBC" creates a harder and more standardised frontage. The relationship with the approved Redcliffe scheme opposite should be considered so that the two sites together provide an appropriate gateway into Holt.

Changes required: Reinstate the character of the approved Melksham Road frontage by:

1. minimising the visibility of parked vehicles, including at proposed Plots 14/15, through the reintroduction of car ports or an equally effective design solution;
2. reinstating the approved hoggin path;
3. using gabled and architecturally detailed Bellway house types in the most prominent frontage locations; and
4. retaining distinctive materials and architectural detailing on prominent frontage houses.

8. Retaining Architectural Interest

Concern: Bellway's proposed house types produce flatter, more repetitive rooflines and less architectural variety in the site's most prominent locations.

Changes required:

1. Revise the Bellway house-type substitutions, particularly around the central green, Melksham Road frontage and eastern edge, to reinstate the degree of roofline variation and architectural interest secured by the approved scheme, using gable-fronted and other appropriately varied Bellway house types.
2. provide an elevation or image showing the proposed appearance of the GRP chimneys and confirm their colour, finish and facing materials, with the chimneys shown consistently on all relevant house-type drawings.

9. Retaining Local Distinctiveness

Concern: Bellway has removed all eight approved render-and-stone-quin feature houses and the approved stone window detailing from four red-brick houses, reducing the architectural variety and local distinctiveness secured through the approved scheme.

Changes required: Reinstate the distinctive materials and architectural detailing secured through the approved scheme, including:

1. the approved render-and-stone-quin feature treatment on the eight affected houses (Plots 2 → 1, 10 → 9, 28 → 18, 20 → 26, 34 → 33, 85 → 42, 80 → 47 and 46 → 87); and
2. the approved stone window detailing to the four affected red-brick houses (Plots 25 → 21, 19 → 27, 82 → 45 and 45 → 88).

These features should be incorporated into the Bellway house types so that the architectural variety and local distinctiveness of the approved scheme are maintained.

10. Applying a Consistent Energy Standard Across the Development

Concern: Bellway's anticipated build programme could result in homes within the same development being built to different energy standards.

Changes required: Bellway should commit to applying Future Homes Standard principles, including air source heat pumps, across the whole development from the outset, providing a consistent approach to energy efficiency and sustainability across the site rather than introducing different specifications during the build programme.